



STIFTUNG
MOZARTEUM
SALZBURG

Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum Salzburg - Bibliotheca Mozartiana: Digitale Sammlungen

Mozart-Jahrbuch ... des Zentralinstitutes für Mozartforschung der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum Salzburg

Albert von Mölk: Mozart Myth-Maker? - Study of an 18th Century
Correspondance

Clarke, Bruce Cooper

Kassel [u.a.], 1995

Digitalisiert im Rahmen der [Digitalen Mozart-Edition](#)

Nähere Informationen zu diesem Werk im [Online-Katalog der Bibliotheca Mozartiana](#)

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die Inhalte dieses Projekts unterliegen einer [Creative Commons CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 International License](#).

urn:nbn:at:at-moz:2-13373

Bruce Cooper Clarke

ALBERT VON MÖLK: MOZART MYTH-MAKER?
STUDY OF AN 18TH CENTURY CORRESPONDENCE

One of the most famous passages in Mozart biographical literature is:

Wolfgang was small, frail, pale in complexion, and completely lacking in all pretensions of face and form. Apart from his music he was and remained almost always a child; and this is a major trait on the dark side of his character; he would always have need of a father, a mother, or some other supervisor¹.

These deprecating words are found at the very end of a compilation of answers written by Mozart's sister to a list of questions. The traditional view is that these are her own words. But they are not in her handwriting. If she was the author, why do they appear in someone else's handwriting? If she was not, why are they present at the end of her compilation?

This study examines the correspondence surrounding the preparation of her compilation and suggests there may be reason to revise the view of Mozart's sister as author of the paragraphs from which the above citation is drawn².

1. Introduction

The framework of this study is the exchange of correspondence initiated by Friedrich Schlichtegroll in Gotha, Germany, that took place principally in 1792 and culminated in the printing of an obituary on Mozart in "Der Nekrolog", a publication edited by Schlichtegroll, probably in the spring of 1793. Before it was over, the correspondence came to include two friends of the Mozart family – Albert von Mölk and Johann Andreas Schachtner, both in Salzburg – and Mozart's sister, the Baroness Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg (known to all as Nannerl), then living in St. Gilgen am Wolfgangsee.

The focus of this study is on two letters that make up an integral part of the correspondence and to which relatively little attention has been paid: a letter

¹ Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1212, pp. 199 ff., lines 410 ff.; in the German original: "aber der Sohn *Wolfgang* war klein, hager, bleich von Farbe, und ganz leer von aller Prätenzion in der Physiognomie und Körper. ausser der Musick war und blieb er fast immer ein Kind; und dies ist ein HauptZug seines Charakters auf der schattigten Seite; immer hätte er eines Vatters, einer Mutter, oder sonst eines Aufsehers bedarfen".

² The author is deeply indebted to colleagues who reviewed and commented on this study in its early stages.

from Schlichtegroll to Mölk dated 25 May 1792 and the undated letter in draft it occasioned, prepared by Nannerl for Mölk.

At Annex is a review of the history of the correspondence as reflected in the seven-volume collection of Mozart family letters published by the Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum in Salzburg in the years from 1962 to 1975 (cited as “Bauer-Deutsch”). The review examines the exchange of correspondence in detail and proposes a reconstruction of its chronology. Briefly to recapitulate the early stages of the exchange:

- Schlichtegroll initiated the series, probably early in the year 1792, to collect information from Salzburg that would be useful for an obituary on Mozart, writing to Mölk and almost certainly including a list of questions. Schlichtegroll’s letter is missing, but the list of questions exists.
- Mölk forwarded the questions to Mozart’s sister in St. Gilgen with a letter of his own. This letter is also missing.
- Nannerl compiled answers to the questions in a document of several pages (later referred to by Nannerl as her article) and mailed them to Mölk in Salzburg. There probably was an accompanying letter, but it is missing; the article written in Nannerl’s hand still exists, with entries added in another hand.
- Mölk then wrote a letter (also missing) to Schlichtegroll in Gotha and forwarded Nannerl’s manuscript with the changes and additions he probably had made to it.
- As soon as he had received Mölk’s letter with Nannerl’s article, Schlichtegroll wrote back immediately thanking Mölk for writing and including some additional questions about Mozart he would like answered.

2. The Schlichtegroll letter to Mölk, dated 25 May 1792

The text of the letter was published, apparently for the first time, in an article by Rudolph Angermüller in the *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1971/72³. The text in translation follows⁴:

Reverend, Honorable,

Gotha, 25 May, 1792

Most Esteemed Herr Canon and Consistorial Councillor!

It would distress me very much indeed if I should let some days lapse without being able to express my gratitude to Your Reverence for the letter you wrote and for its enclosure received some hours ago. I had already turned to Herr von Retzer in Vienna a few weeks earlier to seek information about the late Mozart and am, at present, still awaiting an answer. Your Reverence can imagine therefore

³ Rudolf Angermüller, *Nissens Kollektaneen für seine Mozartbiographie*, in: *MJb* 1971/72, p. 221 f.

⁴ Regarding the translations: Except as noted, all translations are the work of the author. The translations of those German texts used here and found in the collection of Mozart family letters published by the Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum (ISM) – in: *Bauer-Deutsch* – reflect its line-numbering system, adapted for technical reasons as follows: here, each paragraph or separate entry begins with the actual line number in brackets (for example: [38]).

how pleasantly surprised I was by your kind, unsolicited enclosure, the more so because it covers a period in the life of the late Mozart which the people in Vienna probably could not have told me so much about and with such precision.

It belongs to the most rewarding aspects of my otherwise very strenuous enterprise that, in addition to my involvement with the worthy *dead*, it brings me into written contact with so many worthy *living persons*, to whom my heart feels gently drawn by a community of interest. Surely I may confidently be allowed to ask of a person who has been so obliging the first time that he will in the future as well keep “Der Nekrolog” in mind when someone in his vicinity dies, someone whose unique fate or silent virtues could usefully be brought to the attention of the public and posterity. The proper study of mankind certainly is still man, and over time “Der Nekrolog” shall, I would hope, promote this important and beneficial study, as long as that is made possible by means of many and varied contributions, especially about modest, unknown merit and virtue, which can dwell often in a corner, often in a monastery cell. May I ask you too to render my thanks, however you wish, to the kind author of the article?

With most respectful compliments, I am,
Your Reverence,
yours most obediently,
Schlichtegroll, Professor

P. S. If it were possible that the article’s accommodating Frau Professor could call to mind some typical features from the departed’s youth, and if she would write them down, then I would receive them with the greatest of thanks. For example: In his early years, apart from his involvement with music, what were his favorite playtime activities? As a child, how did he behave towards adults and the admiration they showed? What subject did he most like to learn? What languages did he understand and which ones did he like to speak and write and did so best? Special peculiarities, sayings, daily routines – Also I would like to have the circumstance more clearly explained: how did it happen that the last time he took his aging mother with him to Paris?

What you won’t think of a man who is so impertinent that when one gives him a finger he immediately wants the whole hand!

P. S. If the rules of the Institute do not render it impossible, and Your Rev. could on occasion inform me of the author of reviews [obituaries?] in the Ob[er]d[eutschen] L[it]eratur[z[eitung]], I would be very much obliged to you for this acquaintance with a benefactor studiorum meorum.

It is evident from the text of this letter that, at roughly the same time he wrote to Mölk in Salzburg seeking information about Mozart, Schlichtegroll had also written with the same purpose to a certain Herr von Retzer in Vienna. With his letter, Mölk obviously was the first to respond and Schlichtegroll was “pleasantly surprised”, especially by the “kind, *unsolicited* enclosure” it contained.

The word “unsolicited” is emphasized to draw attention to its use. In German, the phrase is “Ihr gütiger, unerbetener Beylag”. There are many other possible translations of the adjective “unerbeten” such as „unrequested, unsought, unbidden, unbid, unasked, or unasked-for” (even under some circumstances, “unwelcome”), but they all go in one direction: something done or received that was not previously requested or sought. If the professor had been anticipating only some rudimentary response from Mölk, he might have spoken of the article as

“unerwartet” that is, “unexpected”. Or if his pleasant surprise had been at the length and detail of a contribution from the sister of Mozart he had been looking forward to, he could have used “unverhofft”, that is, “unhoped-for”. But instead he had received, he said, an “unsolicited” contribution.

In this connection, notice that Schlichtegroll never mentioned Mozart’s sister by name. Moreover, his letter was not directed in the least to Nannerl and, taken as a whole, was only peripherally concerned with Mozart. The real business of Schlichtegroll’s letter was to advertise himself and the “Nekrolog” series he had initiated. Central to this was his hope that Herr von Mölk in Salzburg would keep him in mind the next time someone died “whose unique fate or silent virtues could usefully be brought to the attention of the public and posterity”. With that taken care of, there was a pro forma bow to “the kind author of the article” and the letter was signed with a flourish, “yours most obediently”, and done with.

It was only at that point, I suggest, that Schlichtegroll took another glance through the enclosure, just “received some hours ago”, and realized there was more information on Mozart’s childhood that he might now be able to collect. Because he had already signed the letter, his further request had to come in the form of a postscript, levying additional questions on “the accommodating Frau Professor”. This occasioned a somewhat sheepish apology for his imposition. Then came yet another postscript soliciting Mölk’s support for his “Nekrolog” enterprise.

The feeling of pleasant surprise in Schlichtegroll’s mind when he wrote back to Mölk in May 1792 was still there later when he was assembling the materials that make up the Mozart obituary. As published, the text contains two editorial remarks by Schlichtegroll; the second is keyed to the end of the introductory first paragraph. “Never”, he wrote, “since the start of his enterprise has the publisher of “Der Nekrolog” been so pleasantly surprised as he has been with the interesting unsolicited contributions [die unerbetenen interessanten Beiträge] to the biography of this great composer”. The reference to “contributions” in the plural could include not only Nannerl’s “unsolicited” article but also the equally unsolicited letter of reminiscences from Schachtner, fully utilized in the text of the obituary.

This letter from Schlichtegroll, his second to Mölk, raises many questions, not the least being why in his quest for information on Mozart did Schlichtegroll write to Mölk in the first place. To find plausible answers, it is necessary to have a picture of the context within which Schlichtegroll’s correspondence took place.

Rudolph Angermüller provides details on the history of Schlichtegroll’s publishing enterprise and on the specific volume of “Der Nekrolog” that contained

the Mozart obituary⁵. Born in 1765, Schlichtegroll pursued an academic career that began with the study of law in Jena and culminated with the study of theological philology in Göttingen. Following completion of exams in 1787, he returned to his hometown of Gotha and took a position as instructor in the local gymnasium, a post he occupied until 1800. Archeological matters were the subject of his first scientific writings. Further, Angermüller writes: “Schlichtegroll was not only interested in archeology, however. In addition, he devoted himself to biographical presentations. In 1790, he drew up the plan for ‘Der Nekrolog’, a publication intended to memorialize recently deceased persons and their personal qualities. His ‘Nekrolog’ series containing ‘accounts of the lives of noteworthy persons [who had died in the given year]’ appeared in the years from 1791 to 1806. For its preparation he frequently used the duke’s library in Gotha”.

From the information in Angermüller’s article, the first edition of “Der Nekrolog” evidently was published in 1791 with obituary accounts of persons who had died in 1790. The second edition, devoted to persons who died in 1791, came out in at least two volumes. The Angermüller article does not specify when the first volume was printed, but it probably was in 1792. Mozart’s obituary is found in the “second volume” of the “second edition” (“Zweyter Jahrgang. Zweyter Band”), published in 1793, probably in the spring⁶.

What did this second volume of the second edition look like? It had 388 pages (compared to present-day publication practice, the amount of text on each page was relatively small). The first 300 pages were taken up with obituary articles on ten persons, all of whom had died in 1791. (The last 88 pages were concerned with “Brief accounts of [other] persons who died in 1791” and a section devoted to “Biographies outstanding, corrections, and supplementary information”.) The ten persons included a theologian, academicians, clerics, government officials, a scientist (Ignaz von Born), and a composer (Mozart); three had died in Vienna, two in Berlin, others in such places as Hannover and Stuttgart. The longest obituary was given over to the theologian, covered 81 pages, and came at the head of the book; one obituary was as short as 14 pages. Most of the others ran between 20 and 30 pages. Mozart’s obituary, with 31 pages, was the next longest and this may be why it appeared in second place. Otherwise, the order of appearance of the ten obituaries seems entirely arbitrary; it is certainly not based chronologically on either date of birth or death. The presence of remarks concerning “biographies outstanding” suggests Schlichtegroll was working on other obituaries as well that he intended to publish sooner or later, and that the ten in this volume constituted all that were ready for publication in late 1792 or early 1793.

⁵ Rudolf Angermüller, Friedrich Schlichtegrolls Nekrolog auf Ignaz von Born, in: *Mitteilungen der ISM* 35 (1987), p. 42–55.

⁶ In Bauer-Deutsch (Eibl) VI, p. 433, the commentator notes that a copy of “Der Nekrolog” with Mozart’s obituary exists with a signed dedication to his sister; Schlichtegroll’s signature is dated 14 April 1793.

How did Schlichtegroll go about identifying the personalities whose obituaries he would publish and how did he assemble the material? Consider the two obituaries published in the same volume, Mozart and Born. Both were public figures who had made a name for themselves during their lifetimes and whose deaths were widely reported. There is no evidence that Schlichtegroll enjoyed a personal acquaintance with either one. Nor is he likely to have known personally all of the other eight persons represented in the second volume. If this is so, then it would appear Schlichtegroll did not choose and prepare the obituaries based on personal contact, but on the basis of what he judged to be individuals of general public interest and on what he potentially could learn about them from the published record and from others. His problem, then, was where to go for information and to whom.

As Angermüller mentioned, Schlichtegroll “frequently used the duke’s library in Gotha”. So, to the extent possible, Schlichtegroll could have turned to whatever documentary or journalistic sources had been published on the deceased during their lifetimes and afterwards, and were locally available. In addition, he evidently would write to colleagues and acquaintances of the deceased, indicating the kinds of information he would like to have and soliciting contributions. In the case of Mozart’s obituary, for example, we know that he wrote to M \ddot{o} lk in Salzburg and to Retzer in Vienna. Moreover, we know that a list of 12 questions entitled “Data needed for the biography of the late Wolfgang Mozart” was sent to Salzburg; it is reasonable to assume that Retzer in Vienna received a similar list.

Why, out of a large number of other possible sources of information in Salzburg, would Schlichtegroll approach M \ddot{o} lk in the first place? Did he know of the personal connection between M \ddot{o} lk and Mozart’s sister? And why, out of a large number of other possible sources of information in Vienna, would Schlichtegroll approach Retzer? Probably too little is known in detail about Schlichtegroll and his *modus operandi* to make any but very tentative judgments, and almost nothing is known about Albert von M \ddot{o} lk. But we do know something about both, and the following is offered in the hope it will help suggest reasonable answers.

“H. von Retzer in Wien”: Who was the gentleman in Vienna to whom Schlichtegroll also wrote “seeking information about the late Mozart”? In Heinz Schuler’s “Mozart und die Freimaurerei”⁷ we find the following:

Retzer, Joseph Friedrich Freiherr von, born Krems 25 June 1754 – died Vienna 15 October 1824, k. k. Hofkonzipist (court official attached to the royal chambers) and literary censor; along with Born and Sonnenfels, was one of Vienna’s “three most prominent leading lights”, as well as linguist, philosopher, and all-round man of letters; “a noble, generous and erudite man, in regular contact with important personages of his time and, in his dealings with others, engaging and enter-

⁷ Heinz Schuler, *Mozart und die Freimaurerei. Daten, Fakten, Biographien*, Wilhelmshaven 1992, p. 131.

taining". Münter (II, page 118)⁸ took a somewhat more sober view of him: "A pleasant person but no intellect, that is immediately obvious. His 'Choice of English poets' is a mere compilation. His hero of heroes is Voltaire. He has multiple copies of Voltaire's works in his room. That is more than enough. He is a literary censor and in this regard very tolerant". - Joined the lodge "Zur wahren Eintracht" 24 May 1782, passed to Fellow-Craft Degree 3 July 1782, made a Master Mason 8 November 1782; in lodge "Zur Wahrheit" 1786.

When the celebrated Ignaz von Born died in Vienna on 24 July 1791, an obituary on him clearly was grist for the Gotha mill. In his introductory paragraphs to the published obituary, Schlichtegroll lauded Born with these words: "among those to die this year certainly the greatest as far as sheer intellect and innate universal talent were concerned". Evidence that Schlichtegroll had turned to Retzer for a contribution in preparing Born's obituary lies in the fact that the published obituary contains an extensive quotation of dedication to Born in Retzer's name. This is the sole such personal touch in an otherwise unsourced account of Born's life and accomplishments, and may be the coin Schlichtegroll used to repay Retzer for his contribution to Born's obituary.

Because Born died some five months before Mozart, it is reasonable to assume that Schlichtegroll's contact with Retzer in connection with Born occurred before he wrote to him in connection with Mozart. As it happened, Retzer probably had a greater personal acquaintance with Born than he did with Mozart; the Schlichtegroll letter to Mölk dated 27 May 1792 appears to be the sole existing document that mentions Retzer in relationship to Mozart (other than possible lists of Masonic lodge memberships that may exist). But Schlichtegroll may not have known whether the connection was close or not, and it may not have been an overriding consideration. In this connection, Walther Brauneis has observed in a personal communication: Schlichtegroll's turning to him could be associated with the fact that Retzer maintained a far-reaching correspondence with prominent persons. Schlichtegroll may have been aware of this and turned to him accordingly in the hope that, if Retzer could not reply himself, he would be in a position to identify persons of Mozart's acquaintance who could.

There is no direct evidence on how Schlichtegroll in Gotha knew of Canon and Consistorial Councillor von Mölk in Salzburg. Given his theological background in studies in Jena and Göttingen, his general attention to the intellectual scene, and his long-term interest in developing "Der Nekrolog" series, however, Schlichtegroll may have known of Mölk and looked on him as a logical and even necessary person to turn to when he needed information about Salzburg residents. It is evident from reading Schlichtegroll's letter dated 25 May 1792 that the letter which preceded it was his initial contact with Mölk and, pleased

⁸ Frederik Münter, *Et Mindeskraft II: Aus den Tagebüchern Friedrich Münters. Wander- und Lehrjahre eines dänischen Gelehrten*, herausgegeben von Ojvind Andreasen, Band I-III, Kopenhagen/Leipzig 1937.

with having gotten a response, he wanted carefully to cultivate the contact in the event of future need. This latter point was so important to Schlichtegroll that he made it twice, in the body of the letter and in his second postscript.

Why, then, would Schlichtegroll turn to Mölk in the first place? One possible answer would be along this line: Through clerical and intellectual ties, Schlichtegroll knew of Mölk and his position in Salzburg. Probably as in the case of Retzer in Vienna, Schlichtegroll hoped that if Mölk was not himself able to provide biographical data on Mozart, at least he would be in a position to suggest someone who could. As it turned out, he was and he did.

Did Schlichtegroll know of a personal connection between Mölk and Mozart's sister? On the one hand, question number 9 in the first questionnaire makes it clear he knew there was a "daughter who was still living". Moreover, he knew Salzburg was not a very large community and he could reasonably assume members of the Mölk and Mozart families had been acquainted. Against the possibility that Schlichtegroll "knew" of the connection between Mölk and Nannerl and actively counted on it, however, is the fact that nowhere in the 25 May letter was Mozart's sister mentioned by name, even in the postscript questions specifically addressed to her.

How did Schlichtegroll's first list of questions reach Nannerl? Is it possible she received it from some other source and only then approached Mölk with the request that he act as her intermediary, wanting to confirm Schlichtegroll's bona fides before furnishing him with material on her brother? The idea cannot be ruled out, but there is nothing in the documentary record to lend it support.

From the record, we know the following things:

- that Schlichtegroll wrote to Mölk, as he had to Retzer, for information about the deceased Mozart;
- that there is a list of 12 questions concerning Mozart from Schlichtegroll which formed the basis for Nannerl's article; and
- that in her letter to Breitkopf & Härtel of 24 November 1799, Nannerl said she had sent her article to Schlichtegroll "at the request of a friend of the family".

Taken all together, these separate pieces of information point to Mölk as the person who received the first list of questions from Schlichtegroll and who took the initiative and made the decision to turn to his family friend, the sister of the dead composer, for help in responding. In the absence of Schlichtegroll's first letter to Mölk, it is not possible to say that Schlichtegroll did not mention Nannerl by name and suggest Mölk pass the questionnaire on to her. But as discussed above, the possibility is not supported by the wording of the text in Schlichtegroll's second letter to Mölk. He was "surprised by your kind, unsolicited enclosure" (as he said to Mölk) because, in all likelihood, he had not expected it.

One could reason that Schlichtegroll would deliberately have sought a tie with Nannerl because any biographer would naturally have wanted access to Mo-

zart's surviving family. But Friedrich Schlichtegroll was not a biographer, nor did he style himself as such. He was a young academic with a quasi-journalistic sideline as obituary publisher. He may not even have claimed that he was the author of the obituaries appearing in his publication. At any rate, the title-page of "Der Nekrolog" with Mozart's obituary said it contained "reports of the lives of noteworthy persons [...] collected ["Gesammelt"] by Friedrich Schlichtegroll". Moreover, on the basis of the two available obituaries both published in the same volume of "Der Nekrolog" – Mozart's and Born's – it appears that Schlichtegroll's interests were essentially those which could be satisfied by informed colleagues and acquaintances of the deceased. Nor did any of the 12 questions contained in the first list require surviving members of Mozart's family to provide usable answers.

One last comment regarding the context of the correspondence and the questionnaire as seen from Gotha: at the same time Schlichtegroll was looking for anything of a biographical nature he could find on Mozart, he was also involved in collecting obituary material on several other people and getting the next volume ready for printing. At least one of these other persons – Ignaz von Born – appears to have been more highly regarded by Schlichtegroll than Mozart was. An obituary on the recently deceased young composer was neither the only thing on the mind of "Der Nekrolog's" publisher nor necessarily even the most important of his concerns when he first wrote to Mölk and Retzer to see what he could turn up.

A review of the correspondence involving Schlichtegroll and Mozart's sister makes it clear that the Reverend Albert von Mölk played a larger role than he has been credited with heretofore. If he had elected to answer Schlichtegroll's first letter and its questions out of his own knowledge and that of other local acquaintances of the Mozart family – as Schlichtegroll may have expected of him (and of Retzer in Vienna) – then there may never have been an article compiled by Nannerl, nor a letter of reminiscences by Schachtner. But before we examine Mölk's role in the proceedings, we need to look at the letter – it exists only in a draft – that Nannerl wrote in response to Schlichtegroll's second letter to Mölk and Mölk's second letter to her.

3. Nannerl's letter to Mölk: the preliminary draft

Whereas Schlichtegroll in his letter to Mölk was careful to address him as "Your Reverence", to Mozart's sister the Reverend von Mölk was just "you" ("Sie"). They were virtually the same age and probably had been acquainted from childhood. In preparing herself to respond to Mölk's second letter forwarding Schlichtegroll's further questions, Nannerl had three things on her mind: she was an-

noyed with Mölk; she now had Schachtner's letter in hand and was sending it to him; and she was pulling her thoughts together regarding the questions asked⁹.

Although Nannerl's letter in its final form has not been preserved, there is no doubt she completed it and sent it to Mölk. While the Reverend is not likely to have sent the entire finished letter on to Schlichtegroll, portions of the draft text, as well as virtually all of Schachtner's letter, are identifiable in the obituary of Wolfgang Mozart published in "Der Nekrolog".

The translation gives the text of Nannerl's draft and accompanying footnotes as published in Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1213, p. 200 ff. Italics in the text below reflect the use of italics in the printed version. The draft is undated.

[2] It was a real pleasure for me that Herr Professor Schlichtengroll [sic] was happy to receive the contribution I supplied. However, I should fairly scold you that, without writing to me beforehand, you [...] my written article¹⁰

[5] What the Herr Professor still wishes to learn from me about my late brother is something I can provide him here to some degree, but of course, because I was a child myself in those days, it was not possible for me in answering these questions to remember exactly how it was. So I turned to Herr Schachtner who used to come to our house every day and who was a close observer of all my brother's little goings-on¹¹

[10] From his letter which I enclose for you and which you can pass on to the Herr Professor, you will see that he has given good answers to all the questions about my brother as a child and remembers all the goings-on perfectly. As I read through his letter, I was able to recall all these anecdotes once again quite well myself. So you can send this letter [i. e. Schachtner's] to Herr Professor.

[16] It is certainly easy to understand that a great genius, who is preoccupied with the abundance of his own ideas, and who soars from earth to heaven with amazing speed, is extremely reluctant to lower himself to noticing and dealing with mundane affairs. For a genius in fact it is only proper to strive for adequate means and it would be a too humiliating business for him if he allowed himself to stoop to the trouble of excessive wealth.

[24] Because he was born a great genius¹²,

[25] Now I only want to add a few comments to these questions.

[26] How did he behave towards adults¹³.

⁹ Note that, in starting with an outline or draft, Nannerl was following family practice. For example: a letter Leopold Mozart wrote to his wife from Rome in April 1770 was preserved in both its draft and final states in Nissen's collection of family letters (see Bauer-Deutsch I, No. 177, p. 337; Bauer-Deutsch [Eibl] V, p. 248). Also, in Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1124, p. 107, is the draft of a 1790 letter from Mozart evidently intended for the then Archduke Francis of Austria.

¹⁰ This sentence is left unfinished and has been crossed out.

¹¹ The last phrase from "and who ..." has been crossed out and the sentence left unfinished.

¹² Sentence left unfinished.

¹³ In the margin at this point: "When the lad in his sixth year performed for Emperor Francis for the first time in 1762, so". Sentence left unfinished.

[27] When he performed for Emperor Francis in 1762 in his sixth year, and seated himself at the piano, he said to the Emperor standing beside him, *isn't Herr Wagenseil here? he should come [,] he understands*. So the Emperor had Wagenseil take his place at the piano. *Then the lad said to Wagenseil I'm playing a concerto of yours, you have to turn the pages for me.*

[32] Praise from grown-ups never made him conceited, for he always played with more zeal and interest when he knew that he was playing for connoisseurs. Even as a child, he would play nothing but trifles if he was playing for people who did not understand anything about music.

[36] What languages he understood.

[37] He spoke French and Italian. As far as I know, he also studied English when he was in Vienna.

[39] Because he wasn't at all a lover of writing, for I received no more letters from him after 1788, so I cannot say which language he enjoyed writing and which language he enjoyed speaking.

[42] Without his parents' permission, he did not dare to eat or accept the slightest thing if someone wanted to give him something.

[44] *daily routine.*

[45] From the time he was a child, he most loved to play [the piano] and compose at night and in the morning.

[47] When he sat himself at the piano around 9 in the evening, you could not get him away from the piano before midnight. I think he would have played all night long. In the morning from 6 to 9, he mostly wrote [composed] in bed and only then did he get up and would not compose anything for the rest of the day unless he had to compose something in a hurry. 8 at night he always played piano or he composed. As for practicing the piano once he had passed his 7th year, I don't know anything at all for his practicing consisted of always having to perform, of having things put before him which he had to sight-read, and that was his practicing.

[56] As concerns his faults, I can only charge him with a single one, which consists of this, that he had a heart that was too soft, he did not know how to handle money. Whoever flattered him could get everything from him. As long as he was with his father he provided him with all the necessities. Because he was always preoccupied [i. e. with his own thoughts] he never gave a thought about how he ought to handle money, and that was the reason too why his father, who could not go with him to Paris because of his position, sent his mother with him, because he well knew he was not able to handle himself.

[65] As concerns his noteworthy traits, as a child, he never wondered when his father told him to do something, he always willingly played if someone came to hear him. As a child and for as long as he was under his father's control, he was so compliant that he understood his father's every nod and did his bidding immediately.

[70] Certainly if I had known you [Mölk] weren't going to have a written copy of my article made, then I would have¹⁴

[72] I would certainly appreciate very much getting my article sent back. I would have made this request when I sent it to you but it never occurred to me at all that you would send it to the Herr Professor in the original just as I wrote it. Well, then, along with this letter of Herr Schachtner's, I am only forwarding some comments¹⁵

[77] What you [Mölk] write there, that I should also tell about my late brother's weak points. Only I think I have done enough in my enclosed comments.

[80] From experience, we know that strangers are more aware of a person's weaknesses than his nearest relatives, for a child will certainly put on more in front of his father than in front of strangers, especially in front of such a father as we had who was a pretty good physiognomist, so I can tell less about him than you and other people in Salzburg.

[86] Concerning his noteworthy traits, he was as a child never hesitant when his father told him to do something. When he had to perform the whole day through he would play for each separate person without complaining. As a child and as long as he was under his father's control, he was so compliant that he understood every nod and did his bidding immediately. Without his parents' permission, he dared neither eat nor accept the slightest thing if someone wanted to give him something. From the time he was a child, he most loved to play [the piano] at night. When he sat himself at the piano around 9 in the evening, you could not get him away from the piano before midnight, and then you had to force him to stop, otherwise he would have improvised the whole night through.

[96] In the morning from 6 or 7 to 10, he composed and usually in bed. Whereupon he did not compose anything more the rest of the day unless he had to finish something. He¹⁶

[99] As for practicing the piano, once he had passed his 7th year, I don't know anything at all. Because he constantly had to improvise in front of people, play concertos and sight-read, these things were all his practicing.

[102] His faults were that he did not know how to handle money. Because under his father's supervision he was provided by him with all the necessities, so he never had to worry about anything himself. And he would not have been able to anyways, because his mind was always preoccupied with music and other subjects, and this was also the reason that his father, who could not go with him to Paris because of his situation, sent his mother with him, because he well knew that he was not able to handle himself, also he had a soft, kindly heart. Whoever

¹⁴ Sentence left unfinished.

¹⁵ No period here; sentence left unfinished?

¹⁶ Sentence left unfinished.

knew his soft heart, and this was easy to know, could get everything from him. How he [...] in his way of thinking¹⁷
[113] after he was in Vienna, changed, I do not know. You can ask about this in Vienna.

As Nannerl began to draft a letter to Mölk, she focused first on the fact that he had mailed her article to Schlichtegroll in the original, without having a copy made. Although she was pleased, she said, to hear “that Herr Professor Schlichtegroll was happy to receive the contribution I supplied [...] I should fairly scold you that, without writing to me beforehand, you [...] my written article”. Words failed her and she left the sentence unfinished, going on to speak of Schachtner’s letter. Then she began to formulate her own answers to the second set of Schlichtegroll questions. After sketching them out, she came back to the theme begun and broken off in the first paragraph and made two more starts without finishing them:

“[70] Certainly if I had known you weren’t going to have a written copy of my article made, then I would have [...]

[72] I would certainly appreciate very much getting my article sent back. I would have made this request when I sent it to you but it never occurred to me at all that you would send it to the Herr Professor in the original just as I wrote it. Well, then, along with this letter of Herr Schachtner’s, I am only forwarding some comments”.

Judging from these fragments in Nannerl’s draft, this apparently is how the exchange of letters had unfolded:

- a. Mölk in Salzburg had sent a letter to Mozart’s sister in St. Gilgen which included the first list of questions he had received from Schlichtegroll.
 - The commentary in Bauer-Deutsch (Eibl) VI, p. 434, does not say in whose hand the extant list of questions is written. Had Schlichtegroll written them on a separate sheet of paper which Mölk then forwarded intact as an enclosure to his letter to Nannerl? Or did Mölk copy them out for sending to Nannerl (as he probably did with the second list)?
- b. Nannerl then compiled her article and sent it to Mölk, apparently expecting him to make a copy for Schlichtegroll and return the original to her, but not making that explicit.
- c. After receiving Nannerl’s article, it appears that Mölk made some corrections and additions of his own and sent it on to Schlichtegroll, “without writing to me beforehand”, as Nannerl complained, and without having had a copy made.

¹⁷ Sentence unfinished; continuation on next line?

- d. Until Mölk's next letter with Schlichtegroll's additional questions arrived, Nannerl was unaware that her original article had been sent to Gotha. Moreover, she did not know that it contained corrections and additions and, at this point, she probably still did not know. Mölk probably did not mention it (nor is it touched on in her draft).

But her concern was not just with Mölk's failure to return her original paper. In his second letter, he appears to have been urging her, in formulating replies to the new set of questions, to be more frank, more forthcoming regarding Wolfgang's "faults" ([56] "Fehler"), regarding "(her) brother's weak side" ([77] "die schwache Seite meines Bruders"). She made a couple of half-hearted attempts to follow this suggestion (see paragraphs 16, 24, and 56 in the translation above) and then she rebelled. We learn first (at [77]) that Mölk's second letter had called on her to tell about Mozart's "weak points". Then we read her reaction: "Only I think I have done enough in my enclosed comments".

What had she done? To start with, she initially drafted a long paragraph – [16] above – which is interesting, first, because it does not respond to anything Schlichtegroll asked for, and second, because it is obviously a defense against an implicit accusation (from Mölk?). To paraphrase her words: "A great genius should not be faulted for neglecting mundane affairs, indeed it would be wrong for him to think only of money". Then later, still feeling under pressure from Mölk to speak of Wolfgang's "faults" and wanting to answer Schlichtegroll's inquiry as to why the mother accompanied the son to Paris, she folded all this into one paragraph ([56], eventually rewritten in [102]) saying, as far as she was concerned, there was only one fault she could charge her brother with: he was soft-hearted and as a result couldn't handle his finances. With that, she said, "I think I have done enough".

The second piece of business was to explain why she had asked Schachtner for a letter in connection with the new set of questions and to tell Mölk he could send the enclosed letter to Schlichtegroll.

Nannerl had waited to hear from Schachtner before starting her draft. Because the new questions were aimed primarily at Wolfgang's "early years" when she was "a child (herself)", she had asked the old family friend and frequent visitor to answer those related to Mozart's childhood. For Nannerl, Schachtner's letter essentially took care of Schlichtegroll's request. "Now", she wrote, "I only want to add a few comments".

Nannerl skipped Schlichtegroll's first question about Wolfgang's "favorite playtime activities", probably regarding Schachtner's write-up as a sufficient response. She then went to the second question (starting at [26] above) about her brother's behavior towards admiring adults and provided something Schachtner did not: the anecdote about six-year-old Wolfgang Mozart's cheek in demanding of the emperor that court-composer Wagenseil be sent for to turn pages for him

while he played. Then she jumped over the question about what subject he most liked to learn – it had been covered by Schachtner – and went to the one of languages Wolfgang knew [36]. Next, in response to Schlichtegroll’s interest in his daily routine, some lines [47] about the nocturnally active young man who “would have played all night” and who mostly composed in bed in the morning. Then came the paragraph on “faults” [56] just discussed, *not* included among Schlichtegroll’s questions! Schlichtegroll, however, did list his interest in any noteworthy traits of her brother, and Nannerl drafted the two sentences at [65] on young Wolfgang’s unhesitating obedience to his father’s every wish. With that, her initial draft of “a few comments” was over and she began the letter anew, fleshing out her initial expression of irritation with Mölk.

The remainder of Nannerl’s draft, beginning at [80] to the end, consists of re-writing and reordering the thoughts initially jotted down. We can confidently assume that the final version of this letter substantially reflected this second rewrite, for there are words and passages in this second half of the draft that show up verbatim in the published obituary. To give an example: Nannerl’s first notes under “daily routine” that show up at paragraphs [45] and [47] reappear in modified form in the passage beginning toward the end of the paragraph marked [86] and ending before [99]; it is this redrafted version which appears line-for-line and word-for-word in the penultimate paragraph of Mozart’s obituary in “Der Nekrolog”. Other parts of the draft must have been included in the final version as well, for Nannerl’s terminology is evident elsewhere in Mozart’s obituary (the anecdote about the emperor, Wagenseil, and the cheeky young pianist, for example).

4. Albert von Mölk and the addendum in his handwriting

Of the four participants in the exchange of correspondence, the Reverend von Mölk is the least known. But, as fate would have it, it is something that has come down to posterity in his handwriting that is the best known. Are they his words, or was he merely the transcriber?

When the mail from St. Gilgen brought him Nannerl’s article responding to Schlichtegroll’s first list of questions, it appears Mölk did two things with it: he went through the compilation, making additions and changes from the first page on; and at the end of it, he wrote in an addendum of three paragraphs.

Many of the additions and changes were essentially editorial in nature. For example, at the beginning, where Mozart’s sister had simply written “No. 1” to indicate she was providing an answer to Schlichtegroll’s first question, Mölk gave the work a title, “Data zur Biographie des Verstorbenen Tonn=künstlers Wolfgang Mozart” [“Data for the biography of the deceased composer Wolfgang Mozart”], reflecting almost verbatim the subject line at the head of Schlichtegroll’s questionnaire. Or at that point where Nannerl had simply written “At

the start of 1762, the father [Leopold Mozart] became Vice-Kapellmeister”, Mölk added “at the court of the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg”.

In her article, Nannerl had provided an answer of sorts – some detailed, some sketchy – to every question on Schlichtegroll’s list except one: she did not answer “when did he marry and with whom?”. To questions aimed at Mozart in his Vienna years (i. e. after March 1781), Nannerl provided relatively little information, not necessarily because she was reluctant to but because, as she put it in one passage, “I cannot turn up anything which would enable me to write something comprehensive”. Moreover, she had never visited her brother once he moved to Vienna and had seen him for the last time in October 1783 in Salzburg. With a brief answer to Schlichtegroll’s last question as to Wolfgang’s interests for things other than music, Nannerl put her pen down and mailed her work to Mölk.

The addendum added in Mölk’s handwriting went beyond editorial considerations and made judgments about the Mozart family, especially Wolfgang. It is given here in translation with two commentator’s footnotes that appear with the printed German version (Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1212, p. 199).

[395] Addendum¹⁸

[396] The daughter Maria Anna Mozart has for some years been married to a governmental councillor and magistrate, who endowed her with children from two marriages, and with whom she has also had some more. Now she is living in the very same place where her late mother was born, quietly and unpretentiously fulfilling all the pleasant duties of mother and wife.

[402] In the last years of her unmarried state, which she spent in the home of her father, she gave lessons in piano playing to several young women of Salzburg; and even to the present, one can single out the students of Nannette Mozart from all the others by the care, precision, and correct fingering in their playing.

[407] Continuation

[408] In their time the two Mozart parents were the handsomest married couple in Salzburg; in her younger years the daughter also was regarded as a regular beauty. But the son Wolfgang was small, frail, pale in complexion, and completely lacking in all pretensions of face and form. Apart from his music he was and remained almost always a child; and this is a major trait on the dark side of his character; he would always have need of a father, a mother, or some other supervisor; he was unable to handle money, married a girl not suited for him against the will of his father, and that’s why there was such domestic disorder when he died and afterwards¹⁹.

¹⁸ From here on, no longer in the handwriting of Maria Anna, but in that of the person making the additions and corrections.

¹⁹ From “married a girl” to the end crossed out.

This is what has been preserved, in Albert von Mölk's hand, at the end of Nannerl's article and this is what Friedrich Schlichtegroll had received on 25 May 1792, a few hours before he wrote back, expressing his pleasant surprise and his thanks. Substantial portions of this addendum, in particular most of the last paragraph, were destined to reappear in the following quotation from Mozart's obituary when "Der Nekrolog" was published. It has been printed and reprinted so often it has become part of the Mozart biographical canon. This is how the words of the addendum were reflected on the next-to-last page of Mozart's obituary:

Just as this rare individual early became a man in his art, so on the other hand he remained in virtually all others respects – this must in all impartiality be said of him – eternally a child. He never learned to discipline himself, and he had no feeling for domestic order, for the proper use of money, for moderation and the judicious choice of pleasures. He was constantly in need of a father figure, a guardian, who would look after the mundane matters attendant to his well-being, for his own spirit was constantly preoccupied with a host of completely different ideas and thus lost all sensibility for other serious considerations. His father was very much aware of this weakness, this lack of self-discipline, in him and, for this reason, provided the son with his mother as traveling companion to Paris when his own duties chained him to Salzburg.

Comment: These four sentences constitute one illustration of how, in preparing an obituary, Schlichtegroll would choose among source materials supplied by his correspondents, editing and rewriting them to weave together a text.

- a. The first sentence takes the addendum's phrase "almost always a child" and makes out of it the man-child paradox. (There is, by the way, a precedent of sorts for a man-child figure of speech – of quite a different nature, to be sure – in the body of Nannerl's article. In recounting Wolfgang's encounter in Florence with the young English violin virtuoso Thomas Linley – both lads were then 14 years old – Nannerl picked up on something her father had written in a letter from Rome in April 1770 [Bauer-Deutsch I, No. 177, p. 337] to say that "This lad from England and the young Mozart took turns playing [their instruments] not as youths but as adults".)
- b. The second sentence is a composite assembled variously from the addendum ("no feeling for domestic order") and from Nannerl's comment on the young Mozart in her second letter ("not able to handle himself").
- c. The third sentence again conflates something from the addendum ("he would always have need of a father, a mother, or some other supervisor") with Nannerl's second letter ("because under his father's supervision he was provided by him with all the necessities, so he never had to worry about anything himself. And he would not have been able to anyways, because his mind was always preoccupied with music").
- d. And the fourth sentence is Schlichtegroll's slight rewrite of the answer to his question about Wolfgang's mother accompanying him on the trip to Paris.

Note that in preparing the obituary's text, Schlichtegroll did not use the addendum's phrase about "the dark side of (Wolfgang's) character". Nor did he follow the addendum's lead when speaking of Mozart's marriage. Instead Schlichtegroll's text at this point read, "In Vienna, (Mozart) married Constanza Weber and found in her a good mother to their two children and a worthy spouse ...".

5. Who is the author of the addendum to Nannerl's article?

Given the use made of the addendum's words in Schlichtegroll's published text and the significance attributed to them ever since as evidence of Nannerl's (and her father's) view of Mozart's character and a description of what he was really like, it would be good to know whose mind conceived them and whose opinion they represented.

The addendum appears at the end of a compilation of answers in Nannerl's handwriting. Clearly however it is not in Nannerl's handwriting; it almost certainly is in Mölk's hand. Who composed the words found in these three paragraphs?

- Were they written by Mozart's sister, perhaps as a kind of summing up, an afterthought, after she had finished answering the questions asked? Did she want Mölk's opinion whether they were appropriate, with the further request that, if he thought they were, then he should add them to the article before he mailed it to Schlichtegroll? Is this the reason why the addendum is in his handwriting and not hers?
- Or is his handwriting one further indication that Mölk himself was responsible for the addendum as he was for the other changes and additions to Nannerl's article? But if so, why would he add such material to answers compiled by Mozart's sister? What would give him the right to add his words to her manuscript?

Although there probably is no definitive answer to the question posed, various possibilities can be examined in light of the documentary record and an order of probability suggested.

First possibility: Mozart's sister is the author of the addendum in Mölk's handwriting at the end of her article. Writing to Breitkopf & Härtel in 1799, Nannerl said on 4 August: "I submitted an article which the Herr Professor used pretty much as it was [...]. If you would like me to send you my article [...] then be so kind as to let me know". Later, on 24 November, she wrote that she was sending "the article just as I drew it from letters my father wrote to Salzburg during his trips, and sent to a friend of the family at his request, who then passed it along to Hr. Prof. Schlichtegroll". The wording in these letters can be read as Nannerl's straightforward assertion of her own authorship of the entire article, including Mölk's handwritten additions. Note that in forwarding the article to Breitkopf & Härtel, she did not choose to distinguish between what was in her

handwriting and what was obviously in another hand. Instead she referred to the article, which contained the addendum, as a whole.

Furthermore, apart from Nannerl's unqualified assertion of her own authorship of the entire article, including the additions in another hand, consideration must be given to the text of the addendum itself. Is it likely that Mölk would have added his own views as to the character of Mozart? Furthermore, nothing gave Mölk the right to add his own words to Nannerl's manuscript. And finally, the responses to Schlichtegroll's postscript questions found in Nannerl's draft perpetuate very similar views of Mozart as an eternal child who needed a supervising parent, could not handle money, and so on. Moreover, they coincide with the family's known enmity towards Mozart's wife.

The addendum may well be in Mölk's handwriting because these sentences were contained in Nannerl's letter forwarding her article to him, or even in a second enclosure to that letter. She may have asked Mölk to transcribe them to the article before sending it with his letter of transmission to Schlichtegroll, or he may have decided to do so himself. At the very least, Nannerl's later references to her article including the addendum as "my article" and "just as I drew it from letters my father wrote" are sufficient to establish her endorsement – and almost certainly her authorship – of those passages not in her own handwriting.

Second possibility: Albert von Mölk is the author of the words of the addendum in his handwriting at the end of Nannerl's article. Evidence for this can be found in the addendum itself as viewed within the context of the pages that preceded it in Nannerl's article. Confronted with Schlichtegroll's first list of questions, Nannerl systematically set about answering each of them in turn. Each of the answers in her handwriting was keyed by number to the question with the same number in Schlichtegroll's list. There were 11 numbered questions in the list and there were 11 numbered answers in Nannerl's handwriting. (Because the list used the number 6 for two different questions, Mölk undertook to supplement Nannerl's written answer number 6 in such a way as to make it refer to both questions.) At the end of Nannerl's handwritten answer number 11, the addendum – so labeled – begins in Mölk's handwriting. As we have seen, it has two parts. The first contains two paragraphs, both of them entirely devoted to saying who "Maria Anna Mozart" is – with whom she is married, where she lives, and that she was a successful piano teacher before marrying. The second part, a "continuation", consists of three sentences: the first speaks of the Mozart parents and Nannerl as handsome people, the second says Wolfgang, by contrast, was rather homely, and the third speaks of Mozart's character in deprecating terms and notes he married an unsuitable woman.

Also relevant to this alternative are the questions concerning Mozart in Schlichtegroll's words. There are 18 in all, 12 in the first questionnaire, six in the postscript to the letter to Mölk. None of these 18 questions refers to or asks to be informed about "weak points" or "faults" or "the dark side of his character". All

such references are found in relation either to something appearing in Mölk's handwriting (in the addendum) or to something Mölk wrote to Nannerl (reflected in her draft, lines 77 and 80).

An analysis of the body of Nannerl's article shows that she very seldom used the word "child" (Kind) in speaking of her brother, preferring to refer to him from Leopold's perspective as the "son" (in the text before the addendum, "das Kind" is used four times, "der Sohn" 59 times). In Nannerl's handwriting, "das Kind" never appears in any context other than a reference to chronological age. The only time "das Kind" is used to characterize Mozart's supposedly immature personality is in Mölk's handwriting in the addendum.

A final point of interest in this citation of the evidence: The time period covered by her formulations in the article, and in the draft letter as well, is expressly limited by Nannerl herself to Mozart's youth and adolescence, that is, the years before Mozart moved permanently to Vienna. All comments regarding Mozart's character which appear in Nannerl's handwriting are made within the context of this time period.

Taking all these factual aspects into consideration, a discussion of their relevance to this alternative can begin by asking why there is an addendum to Nannerl's article in the first place?

What need did Nannerl have for an addendum? Schlichtegroll's first questionnaire contained 11 numbered questions and Nannerl supplied 11 numbered answers in her own handwriting. To judge from her draft letter, this is what she sent to Mölk expecting a copy to be made and forwarded to Schlichtegroll. If she had wanted to add a brief biographical sketch of herself and say some additional things about her parents and herself and, deprecatingly, about her brother, why would she write them out in the formulations found here in her forwarding letter (or in another enclosure) and ask Mölk to add them to her article?

By contrast, once he had received and read her compilation, Mölk could have seen that some remarks at the end were needed.

- Schlichtegroll had sent his initial letter and list of questions to Mölk in the hope he could provide some useful information for a projected obituary of Mozart. He had written to Retzer in Vienna for the same purpose and probably at the same time. The language of his second letter to Mölk suggests Schlichtegroll did not mention Nannerl in his first and had not expected anything from her. If this accurately reflects the situation, then Mölk, in forwarding the article he had undertaken of his own accord to get from Nannerl, owed Schlichtegroll some introduction to its author.
- In any event, it is obvious that the first part of the addendum (paragraphs 396 and 402 in the citation above) is not in answer to any question Schlichtegroll asked in his first questionnaire. Nor does it read as though Mozart's sister, then age 42 and for some eight years the Baroness von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg, had written it about herself. If these are indeed her own words, it would

appear to be the sole time in the entire body of Mozart family letters that she referred to herself as “Nannette”.

Third possibility: The addendum may be the work of both Mölk and Mozart’s sister. Perhaps Mölk prepared the two-paragraph introduction to the article’s author, for reasons just given, while Nannerl, having had some last-minute thoughts, had written them in her forwarding letter to Mölk, asking him to append them at the end. Mölk labeled them “Continuation” and copied them down after his “Addendum” about the author of the article.

What does the continuation say and how likely is it that this is something Nannerl would have written? The first two sentences are: “In their time the two Mozart parents were the handsomest married couple in Salzburg; in her younger years the daughter also was regarded as a regular beauty. But the son Wolfgang was small, frail, pale in complexion, and completely lacking in all pretensions of face and form”.

There is no obvious reason why Nannerl could not herself have written the sentences about her parents and her brother, although the comment about the parents sounds rather more like something someone external to the family might write. But would she have extolled herself “as a regular beauty in her younger years?”

The last sentence reads as follows: “Apart from his music he was and remained almost always a child; and this is a major trait on the dark side of his character; he would always have need of a father, a mother, or some other supervisor; he was unable to handle money, married a girl not suited for him against the will of his father, and that’s why there was such domestic disorder when he died and afterwards”. As noted above, neither in her article responding to the first list of questions nor in her draft letter responding to the second does the word “child” in Nannerl’s handwriting ever appear in any sense other than a chronological one. Moreover, a phrase such as “a major trait on the dark side of his character” (“ein HauptZug seines Charakters auf der schattigten Seite”) seems foreign to her vocabulary. It is more reflective of Mölk’s documented interest in Mozart’s “weak points”: in forwarding Schlichtegroll’s second list, he had urged Nannerl explicitly to address herself to them.

An argument advanced in support of Nannerl’s authorship of the addendum, or at least this part of it, is that the answers she drafted to the second set of questions perpetuate views similar to those expressed here: Mozart an eternal child who needed a supervising parent and who could not handle his finances. And they coincide, it is suggested, with the family’s known enmity towards Mozart’s wife.

Some comments: In response to Mölk’s interest in “faults”, what Nannerl wrote in her draft was: “As concerns his faults, I can only charge him with a single one, which consists of this, that he had a heart that was too soft, he did not know how to handle money”. And in responding to Schlichtegroll’s specific

question, she wrote that his mother went with Mozart to Paris “because he [the father] well knew that he [the son] was not able to handle himself”. But neither in her draft nor in her article did she suggest this signified that “apart from his music he was and remained almost always a child”.

In this connection, some additional detail to the previously mentioned point that Nannerl herself expressly delimited the time period covered by her comments in the article to the years before Mozart moved to Vienna:

- To Schlichtegroll’s question number 5 as to when and why Mozart happened to leave Salzburg and what happened to him after that, Nannerl responded with answer number 5 saying, in effect, that’s something you’ll have inquire about in Vienna.
- There are only two exceptions to this: she did give (in answer number 6) the date, time, and cause of Mozart’s death (and said a second time that any further information would have to be found in Vienna) and she did say (in answer number 7) he moved to Vienna when he was 24 and remained there the next ten years.

In her draft letter, the span of time covered by her answers is similarly circumscribed. She repeatedly qualifies her remarks with phrases such as “so war er als Kinde” [65], “er war als Kinde” [67], “so lange er unter der aufsicht seines Vatters ware” [67–68], “denn ein Kind wird vor seinen Vatter” [81–82], “so ware er als Kinde” [86], etc. The context of her remarks is Mozart’s behavior and reactions in his youth, adolescence, and early manhood, as long as he was living at home with the family. Writing in the summer of 1792, Nannerl must have been aware that she had seen her brother only three months out of the eleven years since March 1781, when she and her father returned from Munich to Salzburg while Wolfgang hurried to Vienna at the Archbishop’s command. It had been almost nine years since their last meeting when he and Constanze paid a short visit to Salzburg in the fall of 1783. Her last letter from him had come four years before. The draft letter ends with these two sentences: “I do not know how he may have changed once he was in Vienna. That you can ask about in Vienna”.

As for the addendum’s references to Mozart’s marrying an unsuitable woman and to domestic disorder in the Mozart apartment after the composer died, these are matters Nannerl had expressly declined to comment on in formulating her answers for the article, nor are they touched on in the draft. Whatever the facts concerning Nannerl’s “known enmity” toward Mozart’s wife, they find no documentary support in anything that appeared in her handwriting in the article and the draft letter.

Summing up: The evidence from the documentary record does not make it possible to say definitively who wrote the addendum, but the propositions can be ranked in order of probability. For reasons of style, content, and logic, it is least likely that the addendum was written half by Mölk and half by Nannerl. As between the first and second possibilities, the weight of evidence appears to

favor the second: both the circumstance of an addendum obviously tacked on to a completed set of answers and written in another hand as well as the nature of the text itself suggest the greater probability is that Mlk composed and wrote the lines of the addendum as he was making the other additions and changes to Nannerl's article that are evident from its beginning.

But if that is so, then certain questions are raised:

- Does it really seem likely that Mlk would freely add his own (deprecating) views as to the character of Mozart?
- What would Mlk's motive be for adding his own words to a manuscript prepared by Nannerl? Why would he do this without consulting the author of the article he was transmitting? Why would he do it without identifying his own contributions as separate from those of the author of the document?

Mlk and his family had known the Mozart family well for years. He had even had occasion to squire Leopold and Wolfgang around Rome in 1770. Under the circumstances, there is no obvious reason why Mlk would or should feel any compunction about adding his views about the family to Nannerl's answers, especially given that he was responding to Schlichtegroll's invitation to him for information about Mozart. And having expressed his own views of Herr Vize-Kapellmeister und Frau Mozart ("the handsomest married couple in Salzburg") and Nannerl ("a regular beauty"), why shouldn't Mlk give his view of Wolfgang?

Questions of this nature must be posed and answers suggested in terms of the 18th century social situation reflected in the correspondence, taking into account such things as: the position Canon and Consistorial Councillor von Mlk enjoyed as a senior church official in Salzburg society, the view he took of his role in responding to Schlichtegroll's questions, and his view of the Mozart family, then (1792) entirely absent from the Salzburg scene.

From Mlk's point of view, not only was there probably no particular reason why he should not add some remarks of his own to what Mozart's sister had written, but he may well have viewed his "motive" as essentially benign, made with the intent of being helpful to all concerned: he wanted to make sure Schlichtegroll appreciated who had gone to all the work of putting together a detailed response to his questions, and he wanted to fill out the picture of the family in general and of the deceased composer in particular, supplying something he may have felt missing from Nannerl's answers and balancing out her generally rosy picture of her brother.

In short, those words affecting the person and personality of Mozart of which history has made so much probably were, from Mlk's point of view, essentially reflections of Salzburg opinion about a young man who had never hidden his contempt for Salzburg society, with their formulation filtered, to be sure, through the judgmental outlook of a servant of the Church. Salzburg society had prob-

ably often heard Leopold Mozart voice paternal exasperation with a son who, in his view, could not handle his finances. And as for “domestic disorder when Mozart died”, that probably was common gossip in Salzburg (as we know from Nannerl’s 4 August 1799 letter to Breitkopf & Härtel where she says she 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”).

Given what Mölk may have regarded as commonplace observations, it probably never occurred to him to run them by Nannerl before sending them on. Nor do we know what Mölk wrote in his letter forwarding Nannerl’s article, we only know there was one. Perhaps he did identify his own contributions as separate from hers. But whether he did or not, Schlichtegroll probably would have had no difficulty recognizing that the changes, additions, and addendum were in the same handwriting – i. e. Mölk’s – as the forwarding letter.

One final point: Just when Nannerl first read the changes and additions made in Mölk’s hand in her article is not known. We know from her draft letter that Mölk sent her personal manuscript to Schlichtegroll instead of sending him a copy and returning the original to her. Mölk may have seen no reason to mention his earlier changes and additions when he sent her the second list of questions; the complaints in her draft letter are directed only at the failure to have the article copied. It is likely that Nannerl only saw her original manuscript again, and the entries in Mölk’s handwriting, in the spring of 1793, after the second volume of the second edition of “Der Nekrolog” had been published. Was she outraged at what she saw? Did she write yet another complaining letter to Mölk? Or was her reaction primarily one of resignation, given that the obituary was already in print and there was nothing she could do about it?

Thus we come to the question, whether Nannerl’s references to the article in her letters to Breitkopf & Härtel written in 1799, some six years later, are sufficient to establish her endorsement – and almost certainly her authorship – of those passages that are not in her own handwriting. By this time, the Mozart obituary in Schlichtegroll’s “Nekrolog” series had been widely distributed, Franz Xaver Niemetschek had borrowed liberally from it for his 1798 biography, and Rochlitz had begun his work molding the Mozart legend. In the face of all this, Mozart’s sister may have seen no purpose in drawing attention to the presence of an addendum not of her own authorship, assuming, that is, she thought of it at all.

Given the passage of years and all that had happened by the time Nannerl wrote to Breitkopf & Härtel in 1799, it is open to question whether the language Nannerl used in referring to the article should be taken as evidence sufficiently compelling to establish her authorship of those passages not in her own handwriting. Whether her formulations in the letters to Breitkopf & Härtel indicate that, at a minimum, she endorsed the views in those passages is possible

but it cannot be proved from the record. Perhaps “acquiescence” or “indifference” would better characterize her state of mind in 1799.

6. Conclusions and consequences: the persistence of myth

Based on the foregoing evidence and analysis, the following statements are proposed as reasonable approximations of the historical circumstances:

- a. The correspondence was initiated by Schlichtegroll when he first wrote Mölk for information about Mozart, in the hope that, as a long-term resident of Salzburg, Mölk would be able to provide biographical information and sending along a list of questions to be answered. Schlichtegroll probably did not ask Mölk to contact Nannerl on his behalf, nor did he expect to receive answers to his questions from the composer’s sister.
- b. Nannerl’s involvement resulted from Mölk’s decision to send her Schlichtegroll’s first list of questions. There is no evidence of direct written contact between Schlichtegroll and Nannerl at any time in the correspondence. The fact that the second set of questions went to Nannerl by way of Mölk is documented.
- c. After Nannerl sent her article with answers to the first list of questions to Mölk, she did not see it again, in either original or copy, until it was returned to her at her request probably several months later.
- d. As preserved, Nannerl’s article contains changes and additions made in the handwriting of some other person. These changes and additions almost certainly were made by Mölk as he reviewed the article before sending it to Schlichtegroll. It probably was Mölk who wrote the words that appear at the end of Nannerl’s article. Nannerl neither saw nor endorsed them before they reached Schlichtegroll.
- e. For Schlichtegroll, Nannerl’s contribution was “unsolicited” and constituted a “pleasant surprise”. He probably recognized that the manuscript contained changes, additions, and an addendum in Mölk’s hand. He would not have known they had not been discussed with Nannerl.
- f. Both sets of Schlichtegroll’s questions tend to solicit factual answers. None of them pointedly inquires after Mozart’s “faults” or “weak points” or “dark sides of his character”. It was Mölk who wrote Nannerl suggesting she should “tell about (her) late brother’s weak points”, a suggestion she responded to reluctantly and then only to say that “he did not know how to handle money”.

With these conclusions in mind, let us consider their application to a sample of writings on Mozart which touch on the correspondence examined in this paper. Our sample is international, with authors from both sides of the Atlantic, and spans the 1940s to the present. The extracts are arranged chronologically by original year of publication.

1946: Alfred Einstein²⁰

“We must accept the fact that Mozart was ‘a man with a man’s contradictions’ and that with all his keenness of observation of men and circumstances, and all his insight into the essence of characters and affairs, he never learned how to deal with the world. Schlichtegroll’s necrology states that fact categorically [...]”. [There follows the canonical Schlichtegroll quotation taken largely from the addendum.]

Comment: For Einstein, it was “fact” that Mozart “never learned how to deal with the world”. This trait, Einstein said, had been “stated categorically” by Schlichtegroll in “Der Nekrolog”. But Schlichtegroll was not in a position “categorically” to state anything about Mozart: he had never met or talked to the composer or sat with him in the circle of his friends; he did not know Mozart’s mother or father, nor did he even have a personal acquaintance of the sister whose written materials made up so large a portion of the Mozart obituary. For Schlichtegroll was essentially a rewrite man, not different from the writer of obits for The “New York Times” or any other large metropolitan daily.

1977: Wolfgang Hildesheimer²¹

“Nannerl, too, saw Constanze as far below the family’s station; in this she was in agreement with her father”. [...] “His biographers have had a harder time making their peace with this puzzle [from previous paragraph: Mozart’s image is set up in such a way that its peculiar manner and effect resists definition] than did his contemporaries. For the latter he was either strange or commonplace or incomprehensible, but they soon adopted the phrase coined by his pale sister, Nannerl, apparently for all time: except in his music, he remained a child all his life. Of course, for the last seven years of his life (a fifth of it) she had not seen him. Her statement haunts the entire literature, condescendingly friendly, insinuating as a gentle poison; it will always be associated with him”.

Comment: Nannerl may or may not have seen “Constanze as far below the family’s station”, but it probably was not she who wrote that Wolfgang “married a girl not suited for him against the will of his father”; that probably was M \ddot{o} lk. When it came to questions about Mozart’s marriage, Nannerl elected to pass. Hildesheimer’s use of the addendum here where Schlichtegroll himself deliberately did not is an example of prose probably written by M \ddot{o} lk making itself felt even without having appeared in “Der Nekrolog”.

It is certainly true that, as Hildesheimer writes, Mozart’s biographers have “adopted the phrase [...] apparently for all time: except in his music, he remained a child all his life”; whether “his pale sister, Nannerl” coined it is highly ques-

²⁰ Mozart: His character, his work (translation by Arthur Mendel and Nathan Broder), New York 1945, p. 40.

²¹ Mozart, Frankfurt 1977; the following extracts are from the edition translated by Marion Faber (London 1985, pp. 63 and 275).

tionable. And Hildesheimer is surely right when he says the statement “haunts the entire literature [...] it will always be associated with” Nannerl’s brother; but it is probably not her statement.

1985: Gernot Gruber²²

“Why the first author of an obituary notice about Mozart, Friedrich Schlichtegroll, chose to address himself via a middleman to Nannerl and not to Constanze – who never forgave him for this faux pas – is something we do not know – perhaps he simply fell unawares into the dissension between the two women. In any event, Nannerl responded energetically and forwarded a great deal of material to Schlichtegroll, which she supplemented with the recollections of Andreas Schachtner, a Salzburg musician and old friend of the Mozart family. Her factual account is limited to the period when Mozart lived in Salzburg. What she adds at the end consists of self-praise and a short but sharp polemic. This is leveled subliminally against her brother – who never became a ‘man’ – and overtly against Constanze: ‘he was unable to handle money, married a girl not suited for him against the will of his father, and that’s why there was such domestic disorder when he died and afterwards’. This is the voice of one deeply hurt, one not able to ascend to the level of artistic accomplishment of her brother to begin with and who then more and more lost touch with him as a person; after their father died, there was hardly even an exchange of letters between the two siblings. We do not know to what extent Nannerl’s characterization is exaggerated on the negative side; but the consequences for the emerging perception of Mozart are obvious”.

Comment: The analysis of the correspondence suggests that Schlichtegroll did not of his own accord “choose to address himself via a middleman to Nannerl”. He wrote to Mölk in Salzburg, as he had to Retzer in Vienna, looking for information about Mozart; as we have seen, it was probably Mölk’s own doing to get in touch with Nannerl in St. Gilgen and send her Schlichtegroll’s initial list of questions.

The “self-praise and a short but sharp polemic added at the end” probably were written by Mölk, without Nannerl’s knowledge or approval at the time. If this is true, then it tends to make the remainder of Gruber’s paragraph interesting but irrelevant. If she did not write it, she cannot have leveled it, overtly or subliminally, against anyone; if she did not say it, it cannot be her voice that is “deeply hurt”. In fact, reading through the two manuscripts that we do have in Nannerl’s hand as she replied to Schlichtegroll’s questions, Nannerl’s lack of negative feeling towards her brother is striking. And if it existed, she was not about to parade it before strangers. Or as she put it in the initial stage of her draft: “[56] As concerns his faults, I can only charge him with a single one,

²² Mozart und die Nachwelt, Salzburg 1985, pp. 28 f.

which consists of this, that he had a heart that was too soft, he did not know how to handle money”.

1988: H. C. Robbins Landon²³

“But Constanze was not without enemies, even at this period. Leopold Mozart and Maria Anna (Nannerl), Wolfgang’s sister, had not liked her, as can be surmised from the following remarks made in a letter written by Maria Anna in 1792 for the future biography of Friedrich Schlichtegroll: [...]”. [There follows most of the canonical quotation.]

Comment: It is true, as Landon puts it, that “the following remarks” come in part from “a letter written by Maria Anna in 1792” – the draft reply to the second list of questions. But mostly, and most importantly, they come from the addendum probably written by the anonymous Albert von Mölk. As to Leopold Mozart’s “dislike” for Constanze or her own, Nannerl’s handwritten contributions to the Schlichtegroll correspondence do not document it.

1991: Maynard Solomon²⁴

“The gathering and publication of information about Mozart’s life was still in its very earliest stages when editor Friedrich Rochlitz set out to fill the pages of the first volume of Breitkopf & Härtel’s “Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung” [...], founded in 1798. Friedrich Schlichtegroll had published a professional and reliable obituary of Mozart in his *Nekrolog* (1793), utilizing materials provided by Mozart’s sister from the family archives, along with her own and court-trumpeter Johann Andreas Schachtner’s reminiscences of Mozart’s childhood. [...] Nannerl Mozart and Schlichtegroll promoted the view that Mozart was a child in all things; Mozart’s sister wrote: ‘Apart from his music he was almost always a child, and thus he remained; and this is a main feature of his character on the dark side’. Schlichtegroll cited Nannerl Mozart’s formulation in his ‘*Nekrolog*’ for 1793, from whence it made its way into many influential contemporary writings about Mozart”.

Comment: Solomon is more than generous in characterizing Schlichtegroll’s cut-and-paste job as “a professional and reliable obituary of Mozart”. And as suggested from the foregoing analysis, it was not only the materials provided by Mozart’s sister, “along with her own and Schachtner’s reminiscences”, that were used by Schlichtegroll; it was also the paragraphs of the addendum, probably penned by Mölk. And it was specifically words from those paragraphs that “promoted the view that Mozart was a child in all things”. This was not a view found expressed in Nannerl’s handwriting, nor was the formulation that Schlichtegroll cited in “*Der Nekrolog*” necessarily hers.

²³ 1791: *Mozart’s Last Year*, New York 1988, p. 190.

²⁴ “The Rochlitz Anecdotes: Issues of Authenticity in Early Mozart Biography”, in: *Mozart Studies*, ed. Cliff Eisen (Oxford 1991), pp. 1–59, here pp. 1 and 24.

ANNEX
The Chronology of a Correspondence

1. An initial view

Mozart died on 5 December 1791. Some time later, probably early in 1792, an exchange of letters began in connection with a planned obituary of the composer. The correspondence ultimately involved Friedrich Schlichtegroll, Albert von Mölk, Mozart's sister Baroness Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg, and Johann Andreas Schachtner. (The correspondence Schlichtegroll had with Joseph von Retzer in Vienna, also in connection with a Mozart obituary, does not figure in this analysis.)

An initial view of its chronology is reflected in the numbers given to the letters in Bauer-Deutsch IV published in 1963. Both the letters that had been preserved and those presumed to have existed but missing ("verschollen") were listed. Albert von Mölk is absent; his involvement was not yet recognized. The numbering in Volume IV (pp. 179 ff.) is the following:

- a. 1208. Breitkopf & Härtel an Maria Anna Reichsfreiin [Baroness] von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg. Leipzig, etwa April 1792 [perhaps in April 1792]. Verschollen.
- b. 1209. Maria Anna Reichsfreiin von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg an Johann Andreas Schachtner, Salzburg. St. Gilgen, vor [before] dem 24. April 1792. Verschollen.
- c. 1210. Johann Andreas Schachtner an Maria Anna Reichsfreiin von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg, St. Gilgen. Salzburg, den 24. April 1792.
- d. 1211. Fragenprogramm [list of questions] Friedrich Schlichtegrolls für Maria Anna Reichsfreiin von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg (über [by way of] Breitkopf & Härtel), St. Gilgen. Gotha, etwa April 1792.
- e. 1212. Maria Anna Reichsfreiin von Berchtold zu Sonnenburgs Aufzeichnungen [written compilation] für Friedrich Schlichtegroll (über Breitkopf & Härtel), Gotha. St. Gilgen, etwa April 1792.
- f. 1213. Maria Anna Reichsfreiin von Berchtold zu Sonnenburgs Notizen [notes] für Breitkopf & Härtel, Leipzig. St. Gilgen, 1792.

In all, six letters were postulated: two missing letters (1208 and 1209) and four letters or parts of letters for which some text was extant. When Volume IV was prepared, it was assumed Schlichtegroll in Gotha had addressed himself expressly to Nannerl in St. Gilgen with the Leipzig publishers, Breitkopf & Härtel, as intermediary. Only one of the four existing letters had a date on it: 1210, the one from Schachtner to Nannerl, dated "Salzburg den 24^e April 1792".

- With this as a fixed point, the initial chronology began with a missing letter (1208) from Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig to Nannerl given (on page 179) the date of “etwa April 1792”.
- It was this supposed letter that theoretically led Nannerl to write missing letter 1209 to Schachtner to which the date of “vor dem 24. April 1792” was given.
- Then came Schachtner’s letter (1210) of “24 April 1792” and after that, the list of Schlichtegroll’s questions (1211) to Nannerl “(über Breitkopf & Härtel)” with the suggested dating of “etwa April 1792”.
- Nannerl’s detailed answers (1212) are identified as returning to Schlichtegroll via Breitkopf & Härtel, also “etwa April 1792”.
- Finally came letter 1213, consisting of Nannerl’s “Notizen” (notes, or in other words, a draft) for her response to a second set of questions from Schlichtegroll; it is dated simply 1792.

In 1971, several years after Volume IV was published, ISM issued the second volume of commentary (Bauer-Deutsch [Eibl] VI) covering the Mozart family letters and writings from 1780 to 1857 contained in Volumes III and IV. By this time, the assumption that Breitkopf & Härtel had served as Schlichtegroll’s intermediary was no longer tenable.

In Volume IV, there were two letters written by Mozart’s sister in 1799 to Breitkopf & Härtel. At this point, some eight years after Mozart died, she had become interested in the financial possibilities of assisting the music publishing house in connection with its project of bringing out Mozart’s collected works and, in association with that, a biography. In Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1250, pp. 259 (4 August 1799), Nannerl mentioned she had submitted an article to Schlichtegroll for his “Nekrolog” “at the request of a friend” and offered “to send (her) article” to Breitkopf & Härtel, if desired. By November, the matter had been arranged and in her letter of 24 November 1799 Nannerl informed Breitkopf & Härtel (letter No. 1268) she was forwarding the article she originally had “sent to a friend of the family at his request, who then passed it along to Hr. Prof. Schlichtegroll”.

Obviously, the intermediary passing Schlichtegroll’s questions to Nannerl and her answers back to him was not Breitkopf & Härtel, but “a friend of the family”. Moreover, reason for believing the family friend was Albert von Mölk in Salzburg had surfaced. The participants in the Schlichtegroll correspondence had to be corrected and a revised chronology put forward.

2. A revision

On page 432 of Bauer-Deutsch (Eibl) VI, the chronology now was given as follows:

- a. 1208. Albert von Mölk an Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg, St. Gilgen (verschollen) – Salzburg, etwa März 1792

zusammen mit dem [together with]

1211. Fragenprogramm Friedrich Schlichtegrolls für Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg – Gotha, etwa März 1792.

b. 1212. Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburgs Aufzeichnungen für Friedrich Schlichtegroll (über Albert von Mölk) – St. Gilgen, etwa April 1792.

Als Nummer

1212a. wäre hier einzuschalten der (verschollene) Brief Mölks an Nannerl mit weiteren Fragen Schlichtegrolls (etwa April 1792).

[as Number 1212a, Mölk's (missing) letter to Nannerl with further questions from Schlichtegroll (perhaps in April 1792) should come here.]

c. 1209. Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg an Johann Andreas Schachtner (verschollen) – St. Gilgen, vor 24. 4. 1792.

d. 1210. Johann Andreas Schachtner an Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg – Salzburg, 24. 4. 1792.

e. 1213. Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg an Albert von Mölk (vermutlich nur Konzept) [presumably only a draft] – St. Gilgen, 1792.

To summarize: as Volume VI went to press for publication in 1971, Albert von Mölk had been identified as Nannerl's vis-à-vis and the fact that he had sent her a second set of questions noted.

- Missing letter 1208 is now attributed to Mölk in Salzburg and, to allow for the additional time of yet another correspondent, the presumed date is moved back a month to "perhaps in March 1792". Schlichtegroll's initial set of questions (1211, "Fragenprogramm") is now grouped with 1208 and also given the earlier March date.
- Nannerl's response (1212) is now shown going to Schlichtegroll "by way of Albert von Mölk", with the date – "perhaps in April 1792" – unchanged.
- A new number – 1212a – is proposed to cover the missing Mölk letter forwarding additional questions from Schlichtegroll and is likewise set in the April time period.
- There follows, as before, Nannerl's missing letter (1209) to Schachtner ("sometime before 24 April 1792") and Schachtner's "24 April 1792" response (1210).
- Finally, Nannerl's draft (1213) of a reply to Mölk, with the date of "1792" still wide open.

Then, in the period between Volume VI going to press for 1971 publication and the printing of the MJB 1971/72 (in the spring of 1972), concrete new evidence came to light: the autograph of a letter that Schlichtegroll had written to Mölk, acknowledging receipt of his letter with Nannerl's first response enclosed and asking additional questions. It had been reposing in a collection of miscellaneous materials gathered together by Georg Nikolaus Nissen, Constanze Mozart's sec-

ond husband, while preparing the biography of Wolfgang Mozart he began but did not live to finish.

Animated apparently by a charge that these materials were carelessly left lying around the library of the Mozarteum (“unkatalogisiert und ziemlich [rather] diffus”), Rudolph Angermüller published an article²⁵, identifying the contents of this collection by their old and new catalog numbers and providing complete texts of some of the writings, notes, and letters present. One of these was the Schlichtegroll letter to Mölk, which, Angermüller commented, “has not been published before so far as I know”.

With the text of Schlichtegroll’s letter in hand, it is possible to compare the additional questions he hoped “the accommodating Frau Professor” (i. e. Mozart’s sister) would answer with the questions as formulated in Nannerl’s draft letter (1213) and in Schachtner’s reply (1210). Here, Schlichtegroll’s postscript questions are given verbatim but listed one after another to facilitate comparison with succeeding paragraphs:

- In his early years, apart from his involvement with music, what were his favorite playtime activities?
- As a child, how did he behave towards adults and the admiration they showed?
- What subject did he most like to learn?
- What languages did he understand and which ones did he like to speak and write and did so best?
- Noteworthy traits, sayings, daily routines
- Also I would like to have the circumstance more clearly explained: how did it happen that the last time he took his aging mother with him to Paris?

In view of the nature of Schlichtegroll’s letter to him, Mölk probably did not send it to Nannerl, but rather copied out the questions in the postscript and forwarded them with a letter of his own. This letter (to which Nannerl refers in her draft) is missing. From the text of her draft, we can see that Nannerl was preparing her response to the following questions, which are either given or can be inferred:

- How did he behave toward adults? [26]
- What languages did he understand? [36]
- How did he spend his day (“tagesordnung”)? [44]
- What were his faults and why did his mother go with him to Paris instead of his father? [56]
- What noteworthy traits did he have as a child? [65]
- How has he changed in his personality (= way of thinking) since being in Vienna? [111]

²⁵ See above note 3.

Furthermore, Nannerl's draft tells Mölk that she "turned to Hr. Schachtner who used to come to our house every day" for answers to the questions about Mozart "in his early years". And what were the questions Herr Schachtner answered? As expressed by him in his text, they were:

- What were your late brother's favorite playtime activities besides his involvement with music? [10]
As a child, how did he behave towards adults when they admired his musical talent and artistry? [26]
- What subject did he most like to learn? [33]
- What did he have for characteristics, sayings, daily routine, traits, tendencies for good or bad? [43]

This review of the relationship of the three letters as reflected in their statement of the postscript questions leaves no doubt that Schlichtegroll's letter to Mölk preceded and prompted Nannerl's letter to Schachtner, which led in turn to his letter to her. Allowing for paraphrasing of a personal nature, the questions common to the three letters are essentially identical and all stem back to Schlichtegroll's postscript. Schachtner's letter does not reflect the request for more information on why his mother accompanied Mozart to Paris, but that obviously was something for Nannerl herself to answer (it goes back to something mentioned in her original article), and she did not need to bother Schachtner with it.

But note: the Schlichtegroll letter to Mölk is dated 25 May 1792. If it took, say, a good week to reach Salzburg, Mölk received it around the first of June. Let us assume that Mölk's letter forwarding the additional questions arrived at Nannerl's home in St. Gilgen some ten days later – say, around the 10th of June. She then had to decide to turn to Herr Schachtner for help and write to him in Salzburg; if we allow another ten days for this, we are now at 20 June 1792 or so. But as Schachtner points out in his reply to Nannerl, he was not at home when her letter arrived but was visiting his son "in the Hammerau", several kilometers west and north of Salzburg, on the other side of the Salzach river, and her letter only caught up with him there. He answered it once he had returned home and signed it: "Salzburg, den 24^e April 1792". As we have seen, this date influenced all the other suggested datings in the chronologies given above. The comparison of their contents makes clear, however, that the Schachtner letter dated 24 April 1792 could not possibly have been written before the Schlichtegroll letter dated 25 May 1792. One of the datings is wrong.

It may not be possible to determine from documentary inspection which of the dates is in error. In a larger sense, it probably does not matter and a chronology constructed around either date is feasible. If Schachtner's date is correct and Schlichtegroll misdated his second letter to Mölk, then all the correspondence that necessarily had to take place before Nannerl wrote to Schachtner and he responded in April would have had to begin very soon after Mozart died, at

the latest some time in January 1792. On the other hand, if the date of Schlichtegroll's letter – 25 May – is correct, then Schachtner made a mistake. He may indeed have finished writing his letter on the 24th of a month, but that month would most likely have been June, or possibly July. In closing his letter to Nannerl, he apologizes for the “poor scrawl” of his handwriting but says he “is so worn-out [he] can't do better”; he was 61 years old at the time, and his memory for dates may have been playing tricks on him. Or he may simply have been rushed and distracted when he signed and dated his letter.

The discussion that follows proceeds on the assumption that the Schlichtegroll letter of 25 May 1792 was correctly dated and the Schachtner letter was in fact written and mailed towards the end of June 1792. That would mean Nannerl would have received it in St. Gilgen sometime in early July. This assumption enables us to suggest a dating for Nannerl's draft, for it is clear she did not begin to draft her letter to Mölk until after she had received Schachtner's letter. She wrote: “From his letter which I enclose for you and which you can pass on to the Hr. Prof., you will see that he has given good answers to all the questions about my brother as a child”.

3. A proposed reconstruction of the chronology

It is now possible to propose the steps leading to the close of the correspondence which culminated in the obituary of Mozart, along with nine others, published by Schlichtegroll in the volume of “Der Nekrolog” that probably appeared in the spring of 1793.

- a. In St. Gilgen, Nannerl puts her draft into final shape and mails it, together with Schachtner's letter, to Albert von Mölk in Salzburg. In the draft, this is what she says she is going to do, and we know that passages from her draft ultimately appeared in the Mozart obituary. What we do not know is when she did it; but assuming that she wanted to reply fairly promptly to Mölk, given that she had already waited to hear from Schachtner, let us say “early to mid-July 1792”.
- b. This means Mölk receives her mailing in mid- to late July 1792. He has to prepare an accompanying letter to Schlichtegroll, telling him that the accommodating “Frau Professor” insists on having her original article returned when he is done with it. Moreover, Mölk probably has to have portions of Nannerl's letter to him copied, for he is hardly likely to send her remonstrances to the professor in Germany. The enclosed Schachtner letter could have been sent along in the original, with the understanding that it, too, was to be returned. In short, the next letter in the correspondence is from Mölk in Salz-

burg to Schlichtegroll in Gotha, with enclosures from Nannerl and Schachtner, in – let us say – “early August 1792”²⁶.

This leaves two more letters to round out the correspondence:

- c. From Schlichtegroll to Mölk, returning Nannerl’s original article (as well as Schachtner’s letter and the supplementary materials?).
- d. From Mölk to Nannerl, forwarding same.

The evidence for their existence lies in the circumstance that Schlichtegroll appears to have been in correspondence only with Mölk and not with Nannerl, and the fact that Nannerl did at some point receive back the original of her article, just as she had demanded in her second letter. When this might have happened is hard to say. Let us assume that Schlichtegroll retained all the materials until the second volume of “Der Nekrolog’s” second issue was in print; that would mean the last letters could have been sent in the “spring of 1793”.

There is evidence, direct or indirect, to support the following reconstruction of the correspondence involving Schlichtegroll (in Gotha), Albert von Mölk and Johann Schachtner (in Salzburg), and Maria Anna von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg (in St. Gilgen am Wolfgangsee). The reconstruction is based on the assumption that the single valid documentary date is that of Schlichtegroll’s letter to Mölk, 25 May 1792. All the other datings (given below in quotation marks) are inferred, working backwards and forwards from 25 May 1792; they are all speculative, and become increasingly so the greater their distance in time from the root date.

1. Schlichtegroll to Mölk “mid- or late March 1792”

We do not know when or how Schlichtegroll heard of Mozart’s death on 5 December 1791, but there was repeated press coverage of the fact and its aftermath (memorial concerts, for example) in newspapers such as the Berlin “Musikalisches Wochenblatt” that might have reached him in Gotha. By mid- or late March 1792, he had decided to add an obituary of Mozart to those of other persons who had died the year before and had sent letters seeking information to at least two persons, one of them Albert von Mölk in Salzburg. The letter to Mölk included a list of questions.

²⁶ It should be noted that Mozart’s sister also included “eulogies, articles, poems, and excerpts from letters” in the materials which went via Mölk to Schlichtegroll, as mentioned in her August and November 1799 letters to Breitkopf & Härtel. Whether these writings and excerpts went with the first Nannerl letter or with the second is not clear. Because the first was so long whereas the second was relatively short and included Schachtner’s letter as one enclosure already, Nannerl may have elected to send the eulogies and other items with it as well, but that is only conjecture.

2. Mölk to Nannerl “early April 1792”

With Schlichtegroll’s letter in hand and the list of questions (1211) it contained, Mölk decided to write to Mozart’s sister living in St. Gilgen and ask her assistance in answering. He may have had the questions recopied (is this where the duplication in the number 6 being applied to two different questions crept in?) before sending them to Nannerl with his letter (missing letter 1208).

3. Nannerl to Mölk “early May 1792”

The dating assumes that the transit time of Mölk’s letter to St. Gilgen plus the time Nannerl required to read through old family letters and compile her comprehensive response (1212) took a month or so. Once completed, she sent her article with a letter to Mölk, expecting him to make a copy of the multi-page document for Schlichtegroll and return the original to her but failing to mention that.

4. Mölk to Schlichtegroll “mid-May 1792”

When Nannerl’s answers to Schlichtegroll’s list of questions arrived, Mölk made corrections and additions to her replies and entered a three-paragraph addendum in his own handwriting at the end of her article. He then wrote a letter to Schlichtegroll and forwarded Nannerl’s article as modified as an enclosure.

5. Schlichtegroll to Mölk 25 May 1792

Mölk’s letter with its “kind, unsolicited enclosure” arrived on this date in Gotha. Schlichtegroll was at pains to write back the same day and express his thanks to Mölk. In a postscript, he posed some more questions, chiefly about Mozart’s childhood, which he hoped the “Frau Professor” (he never mentioned Mozart’s sister by name) would kindly answer.

6. Mölk to Nannerl “around 1 June 1792”

When Schlichtegroll’s second letter came, Mölk copied out the second set of questions in the postscript and sent them to Nannerl with a letter (missing letter 1212a), giving her his own ideas as to how she should answer.

7. Nannerl to Schachtner “around 20 June 1792”

Nannerl decided to send those questions relating to Mozart’s childhood to old family friend Schachtner for him to answer.

8. Schachtner to Nannerl as dated: 24 April 1792 here: “end of June, early July 1792”

Schachtner was away from his home in Salzburg when Nannerl’s letter first arrived; after some delay, he wrote his reminiscences (1210) and sent them to Nannerl in St. Gilgen.

9. Nannerl to Mölk “early to mid-July 1792”

Once she had received Schachtner’s letter, Nannerl drafted a forwarding letter (1213) and complained to Mölk for not having had her article copied for Schlich-

tegröll and saying she wants it back. In addition, she supplied some comments of her own to the second set of questions, which Schachtner had largely answered. (With this letter, she may also have sent along other, unspecified materials for Schlichtegroll.)

10. Mölk to Schlichtegroll “early August 1792”

Mölk copied out Nannerl’s answers to the second list of questions and sent them, with Schachtner’s letter (and other materials?), to Gotha. In his letter, he almost certainly asked Schlichtegroll to return Nannerl’s article (and the rest of the materials?) when no longer needed.

11. Schlichtegroll to Mölk “Spring of 1793”

12. Mölk to Nannerl “Spring of 1793”

Everything was returned to Nannerl via Mölk around the time of publication of the volume of “Der Nekrolog” containing Mozart’s obituary. This timing is pure conjecture. The commentator to the collected Mozart letters does note (on page 433 of Volume VI), however, that a copy of “Der Nekrolog” exists with a dedication “to the noble sister of the most great composer”, signed by Schlichtegroll and dated 4 April 1793. Perhaps he waited to return her article and the other materials until he could send the new issue of “Der Nekrolog” along with them.