

LEONE M. JENNARELLI*MozartCircle, Varese, Italia**ORCID: 0000-0001-8065-0289, smartcgart@porticodoro.com*

The Letter of von Heufeld to Leopold Mozart: a New Proposal (The Context)

Usually omitted, neglected and unexamined by scholars and biographers of Mozart, nonetheless, the letter of von Heufeld to Leopold Mozart (23 January 1778), when analyzed in its proper context, proves to be a fundamental document to cast some light on famous Mozartian questions and to comprehend better certain key passages of Mozart's life from 1778 to 1791, shedding light on him both as a person and as an artist. In fact, a few of such events were directly determined by the contents of that letter and others unfolded around the very arrival of the letter of von Heufeld in Mannheim. The letter of von Heufeld originated from a series of requests received by Leopold Mozart from his famous son: 1) a letter of recommendation for the Queen of France, the sister of the Austrian Emperor; 2) news about a possibility of a good position at the German National Theatre in Vienna. The clash with Vogler in Mannheim, the attitude of Mozart towards the other composers of his time (Stamitz and Paisiello) and his progressive interest in forms of self-funded promotion on various projects are also analyzed.

Keywords: Wolfgang Mozart's letters, von Heufeld, Vogler, German Opera.

ЛЕОНЕ М. ДЖЕННАРЕЛЛИ*Моцартовский кружок, Варезе, Италия**ORCID: 0000-0001-8065-0289, smartcgart@porticodoro.com*

Письмо фон Хейфельда Леопольду Моцарту: новое прочтение (контекст)

Письмо фон Хейфельда Леопольду Моцарту (23 января 1778) – забытое, не исследованное учёными и биографами Моцарта, но, тем не менее, анализируемое в надлежащем контексте – является фундаментальным документом для освещения и лучшего понимания некоторых ключевых моментов жизни Моцарта с 1778 по 1791 год, проливающим свет на него как на человека и художника. Фактически некоторые из событий были непосредственно предопределены содержанием этого письма, а другие развернулись вокруг получения письма фон Хейфельда в Мангейме. Письмо фон Хейфельда возникло из ряда запросов, полученных Леопольдом Моцартом от его знаменитого сына: 1) о рекомендательном письме для королевы Франции, сестры австрийского императора; 2) новости о возможном получении хорошей должности в Немецком национальном театре Вены. Также анализируется конфликт с Фоглером в Мангейме, отношение Моцарта к другим композиторам его времени (таким как Стамиц, Паизиелло) и его растущий интерес к формам самофинансируемого продвижения различных проектов.

Ключевые слова: письма Вольфганга Моцарта, фон Хейфельд, Фоглер, немецкая опера.

The letter of von Heufeld to Leopold Mozart (23 January 1778) has been up to the present day largely neglected and even omitted in Mozart's biographies and in other works on Mozart's life¹. In reality, a close analysis of its context (and already without a close analysis of its contents) reveals how this document represents

a fundamental dividing line in Mozart's life, also on a stylistic level, between Mozart's youth and Mozart's maturity and how it actually answers a series of well known Mozartian open questions. As Mozart foresaw (February 1778), this letter will become, to him, only a "cause of annoyance" and for many years.

1.1. The Mannheim Clash of Teachers

The direct context of the letter of von Heufeld to Leopold Mozart (Vienna, 23 January 1778) is that of Wolfgang in serious difficulty, while attempting to obtain a solid position at the Mannheim Court and of Leopold trying to wisely direct, at a distance, the steps of Wolfgang in his quest for a profitable career in one of the most important European centres of music. The events in Mannheim are known in their general facts. Nonetheless, the extremely picturesque and bizarre description of such events left by Wolfgang (especially his clash with Vogler, Vice-Kapellmeister of Mannheim and founder of its local School of Music) has long obfuscated and is still obfuscating the real substance of his confrontation with Vogler, a substance which has remained so far untreated and practically intact. After all, scholars seem still more attracted by the uncanniest details of Mozart's accounts, thereby causing a sort of *distraction*.

Both Mozart and Vogler were pupils of Padre Martini in Bologna. And this was already a motive of contrast between the two also on a methodological and theoretical level. Vogler was an unorthodox pupil of Padre Martini: dissatisfied with his methods, he left Bologna and Martini's teachings, with their roots well grounded in Fux, and chose, instead, to become the loyal follower of the more experimentalism-driven and more *revolutionary* Padre Vallotti in Padua². Thus the flamboyant passage in Mozart's letter on Padre Martini and Padre Vallotti about Vogler and the Elector of Mannheim³, acquires a totally new profundity, like Vogler's attack against J. C. Bach (another pupil of Martini and mentor/friend of Mozart) in the same letter. In his letter 10 December 1777 Mozart will give an explanation to his father for his exaggerated expressions on Mannheim events: his writing childish nonsense and jokes and his lack of seriousness were necessary to edulcorate the activity of his adversaries in Mannheim, especially Vogler; in fact, Leopold was thinking and definitively convincing himself that, in reality, Cannabich, Wendling, Ramm and the other so called *Mannheim friends* were actually Wolfgang's adversaries acting against Wolfgang and ruining his life, and, since Wolfgang did not think likewise, he advised Leopold not to bother too much with this issue, because, *after all*, it is not just always possible for a man to do all what he proposes... To put it shortly, through his bizarre accounts Mozart is desperately trying to cover up before his father Leopold the not

very clear and not too loyal behaviour and the quite obscure manoeuvres of his *Mannheim friends*.

The famous *ballet* between Mozart and Vogler on "*who must pay the visit first*" (the letter written in Mannheim on 17 January 1778, mentioning Vogler "*overcoming his pride*") may ultimately conceal another subtle reference to the presumed superiority of the *School of Padre Martini* to that of *Padre Vallotti*. It is a fact that throughout his life Mozart tried to support whenever possible the other pupils of Padre Martini (among them J. C. Bach and Myslivecek), and this is one of the reasons why he selected the music by Sarti (another pupil of Padre Martini) for the banquet scene in his *Don Giovanni* in 1787⁴. At this point, the attempt of Leopold Mozart to receive support and recommendations in Mannheim for his son directly from Padre Martini (!?) from Bologna (such attempts will go on in vain until winter 1778) clearly appears, just from the beginning, an ill-fated plan destined to fail. Vogler, the *dominus* of music in Mannheim, is a fervid adversary of Padre Martini and of his system and method of teaching. Even the choice of the old opera singer Raaff, the Mannheim correspondent of Padre Martini, to present himself as a supporter of Mozart before the Elector seems an error: he is old, he is weak, sings well only from time to time and, despite many words, he appears *de facto* not actively involved in backing Mozart and his *Mannheim scheme*. If the account of Mozart on the enquiries of the Prince Elector in Bologna and Padua on the qualities of Vogler as a composer is entirely reliable and not a manipulation (see: note 3), this presents another fundamental point to consider: in conclusion, the Prince of Mannheim decided to follow the advice of Padre Vallotti and *not* that of Padre Martini. Therefore how could Padre Martini have ever possibly helped Mozart before the court of a Prince, who had already chosen Padre Vallotti, instead of Padre Martini? Thus the Mannheim confrontation of Mozart vs. Vogler, once purified from its ridiculous facts, seems rather to present a war between their mentors, Martini and Vallotti, and certainly this is essentially what it was in the head of Mozart⁵. Nevertheless, there remains the strong perception that Mozart was seriously misguided by Cannabich, Wendling, Holzbauer and his other friends from Mannheim, especially with regard to Vogler. If they were really and completely honest with Mozart and not driven by other interests, they evidently tried, *not too honestly, indeed*, to use Mozart by setting him against Vogler in order to get rid of Vogler⁶.



1.2. The “Kind Austrians” Satire in Mannheim and Mozart in Politics

Another point of the Mannheim events of 1777–1778, which has usually been omitted or neglected, is the political context around Mozart in this period. Mozart would lament in his letter (Mannheim, 28 February 1778) against the sudden death of the Elector of Bavaria in December 1777 and against the devil who has trotted out the accursed physician of the Elector of Bavaria, that Doctor Sanftl, who caused his death and, at the end, the *War of the Bavarian Succession* and the swap agreement between Karl Theodor Elector of Mannheim, legitimate heir of the Elector of Bavaria, and Joseph II, Emperor of Austria. The transaction agreement, which was strongly opposed by the Germans and by Prussia, in particular, implied that Karl Theodor was supposed to receive (at least partially) the Austrian Netherlands, if he agreed to renounce (at least partially) the acquisition of Bavaria, in order to give it to Joseph II instead. Mozart feels that the difficult political situation of the Elector of Mannheim is one of the reasons why his *Mannheim Scheme* is bound to fail miserably. From the letter of 7 February 1778 we also learn that in Mannheim there was a German satire against the agreement of Joseph II, created in Munich, which already became popular. The satire, titled *The Kind Austrians* (and transcribed fully by Wolfgang), openly accuses the Austrians to aspire to extend their dominions over the traditional German territories of Bavaria, under the false pretext of defending Bavaria from Prussia: “so Bavaria must be calm, because the Austrian Joseph II comes to defend her... but what he claims to defend, he will appropriate at the end.” And we discover in a letter from Paris (20 July 1778) that Wolfgang is sad and depressed upon hearing that the Austrian Emperor was defeated by the King of Prussia. Even more patent is his letter openly stating his opposition to the King of Prussia, written while in company of his *German friends* (Paris, 31 July 1778: “I dare not say such a thing in this house”). This means that Wolfgang felt much closer to the Austrian Empire than to the German territories... and he was probably also perceived this way by the German Elector of Mannheim and by the other German Mannheim-based musicians: just another *Kind Austrian*. So the difficulty for the German Elector in keeping him in his own service as a musician and composer may well be a consequence, especially with an Austrian Emperor being an apparent ally in an agreement, but an unreliable sovereign, even to the

point of being too strongly interested in occupying *his own* German Bavaria to expand Austria towards the Rhineland... In conclusion, such political aspects of the vicissitudes of Mozart in this period may have characterized the composer’s relationship with Mannheim and Munich. The strange request of Wendling from 10 December 1777 (see note 1) of receiving a recommendation for the Austrian Marie Antoinette (the sister of Joseph II) from Vienna through the friends of Leopold in Vienna may have had also some particular political nuance. Most likely, even the choice of Piccinni by Baron Grimm (Mozart’s treacherous patron in Paris; see Paris, 11 September 1778), as opposed to Gluck, may have carried some special political nuance in opposition to Austria, since Gluck was the champion of the Viennese Imperial Court as revealed by von Heufeld in his letter. In any case, Leopold had told Wolfgang for a lengthy period of time prior to that to avoid both Gluck and Piccinni, as dangerous and jealous people. Nonetheless, the negative answer of von Heufeld in his recommendation to Marie Antoinette and his words on the “*dangers for morality*” would determine a violent and complicated personal attack against Wendling and his friend Ramm and would lead Mozart to leave them progressively and to cultivate to a much greater extent a friendship with another family from Mannheim – namely, the Webers.

1.3. Mozart’s Attitude to Criticism and Cases of Contrary Behaviour

In his usual style of flamboyant criticism, Mozart rejects the entire letter of von Heufeld as being “*merely a cause for annoyance.*” Nevertheless, an informed reader about Mozart knows that such outbursts (sometimes dictated by purely professional rivalry or impulse) often end in a type of behaviour on the part of Mozart which usually forms a sharp contrast with what he had previously written. Unfortunately many positions declared by Mozart in his writings have been presumed and interpreted by critics and scholars (and especially in the 19th and 20th centuries), as *normative passages*, thereby presenting numerous problems and much confusion to music history. In particular, there have occurred four major cases of Mozart’s ambiguous behaviour, which require careful evaluation.

Carl Stamitz. Mozart labels him as a “*wretched scribbler, gambler, swiller and adulterer,*” while Leopold Mozart evaluates him as a bombastic and overestimated composer. Nonetheless Leopold wants his son to meet him in person during his

sojourn in Paris, and Wolfgang would dub him “a real composer” and then will turn to his clarinet concertos (most of which were composed in 1770s and 1780s) as reference for his own Clarinet Concerto K. 622 and his symphonies as a source of musical formulas, the most famous of them being the beginning of his Jupiter Symphony⁷.

Example 1

a) C. Stamitz (1777) Symphony Op. 13 No. 1 in E-flat major (1st movement)
Allegro con spirito

b) W. A. Mozart (1788) Symphony No. 41 in C major K. 551 *Jupiter* (1st movement)
Allegro vivace

c) P. Wranitzky (1790?) Symphony Op. 25 in D major *La Chasse* (1st movement)
Allegro maestoso

With elements from Stamitz & Mozart. Date of composition is uncertain and might even be 1788 or before.

Paisiello. On 16 January 1782 Mozart defines his music as “*miserably written out*.” Nonetheless, it has been long demonstrated how much of Paisiello’s music subsequently influenced Mozart’s compositions, as early as in works by Abert, but also in the most recent research works⁸. Fragments of *Il Barbiere di Siviglia* and *Il Re Teodoro* were restyled *à la Mozart* and included in *Le Nozze di Figaro*, etc. Moreover, in 1784 Mozart received Paisiello, the *miserable one*, in Vienna with great joy and enthusiasm, by offering him to use his own carriage, by continuously praising him publicly and even by playing for him (with Haydn, Dittersdorf and Vanhal) at the famous quartet party at Storace’s, which *de facto* presented a kind of welcome party for Paisiello (a detail often omitted by scholars).

Clementi. Clementi is a particular case, because his reaction to this ambiguous behaviour of Mozart was subtly made public by Clementi himself. Accused of being an *Italian charlatan* and a *pianist mechanicus* by Mozart, in 1804 Clementi re-published one of his sonatas, by adding that Mozart had heard it and perfectly knew it, because he was present at the original concert. Clementi’s friend L. Berger will further explain in his essay that the theme of that sonata ended up in the *The Magic Flute* by Mozart, as the key element of its overture⁹.

Vogler. The case of Vogler is quite complicated, since it has been long obfuscated by the ridiculous

accounts given by Mozart in his own letters and, as we have seen, at a certain point, Mozart’s words became *normative*. But had Mozart really rejected Vogler and his music and his theories?

Professor Edward Green has already recently demonstrated how both Mozart and his father, notwithstanding Wolfgang’s insults towards Vogler (but with Leopold behaving more cautiously, having been, unlike his son, an admirer of Vogler’s work: see his partially theoretical letter from 11 June 1778 to Wolfgang), studied the books and manuals written by Vogler, and how Mozart throughout the 1780s subsequently remodelled his own style in composing, enriching it with a thoroughly studied application of the principles of chromaticism and chromatic completion (see: [9, p. 350]). Green has also emphasized well how Vogler’s theorized treatment of chromaticism in music, subsequently *decanted* by Mozart through his own work and personal research, may have been later picked up not only by Joseph Haydn (who started using such techniques after his personal encounters with Mozart in 1780s) but also Mozart’s own pupils, in particular Süssmayr and Attwood (see: [10]). See also the curious habit of Mozart, at a certain point in 1778, to cite the theory manual of Vogler in a group with the *Violinschule* of his father and with his own music. So, as in the case of Stamitz, Paisiello and Clementi, with Vogler Mozart likewise behaved himself in the identical way: *what Mozart had at first harshly criticized, he later applied to his own music*. Moreover, the dramatic “new style,” easily identified in many numbers of Mozart’s music for *Thamos* (which are well related to certain pages of *Idomeneo*), requires a more adequate approach by Mozart scholars. Put aside for a moment the main influence coming from Benda, suggested by Abert, they should start inquiring why certain orchestral sections written by Mozart in 1779 and 1780¹⁰ bear such strong similarities to the orchestral works by Vogler, such as, for instance, the latter’s *Hamlet*, written in 1778 in a fundamentally Mannheim style (coincidentally, while Mozart was staying in Mannheim), for which Vogler wrote also a famous guide to composing music for dramas, with his point of departure being the intensely dramatic texts of Shakespeare’s plays (see: [8, p. xli]). Leopold’s interest in and enthusiasm for Vogler’s interpretation of musical theory make clear why such composers as Schumann, Carl Maria von Weber (who, incidentally, was a relative of Costanze Weber from Mannheim,



Mozart's wife), Meyerbeer, and other 19th century composers considered Vogler as an important musician, composer, music theorist, mentor, artist manager and teacher¹¹. Mozart himself (Mannheim, 17 January 1778), after his bizarre encounter with Vogler, curiously writes the following words: "Vogler has invited me to a musical party. *So after all I must stand highly in his favour*" (so where is the theoretical confrontation here?). Nevertheless, as far as we know, the confrontation which occurred in Mannheim between the two composers was subsequently never resolved in any reconciliation, and Mozart continued to consider Vogler and his pupils as his worst adversaries (Vienna, 22 December 1781).

1.4. Mozart Reconsidering the Inequitable Logic of von Heufeld

The case of Mozart's reaction against the letter of von Heufeld is in no way different from the other cases examined so far. Notwithstanding Mozart's outburst against von Heufeld's advice on independently promoting new opera productions (Mannheim, 4 February 1778: "*taking a chance and at my own risk*"), to acquire conspicuousness before Emperor Joseph II and his undoubtedly hostile court, in which Gluck and Salieri ruled supreme, signs of second thoughts seem apparent in the autumn of 1778. After his failure in Paris and the loss of his mother in the summer of 1778, Wolfgang came to Mannheim, once again. Fascinated by the works of Benda, *Medea* and *Ariadne*, Mozart decides and accepts the offer to set to music *Semiramis*, a duo-drama by the Mannheim-based intellectual von Gemmingen (who had already written a letter of introduction for Wolfgang for his trip to Paris)¹², following the request of the theatre manager Dalberg, "*without a fee*" (i.e. "*at my own risk*") (but initially, presumably, for 25 louis d'or: letters Mannheim, 12 November, 24 November and 3 December 1778). Nonetheless, it seems that Dalberg acts in an excessively bold manner by asking Mozart also to set (in addition to *Semiramis*) an entire opera, *Cora*, to music practically "*without a fee*," and Mozart ultimately rejects the *Cora* project (24 November 1778). During his new sojourn in Mannheim, Wolfgang will finally realize how his adversaries and rivals widely spread the rumour that his opera *La Finta Giardiniera* was a disaster (the 1775 premiere was actually a success confirmed by various sources) and hissed off the boards in Munich: such broadly disseminated and

uncontrolled rumours, most likely, present another clue to understanding the irresolute behaviour of the great patrons, like the Electors, and theatre managers (and also Mysliveček?) in assigning an opera commission to Mozart during this period. Notwithstanding his agreement with Dalberg and Gemmingen to complete *Semiramis* when back in Salzburg, with some sources claiming that Mozart actually completed this work, even up to this day it is not possible to identify this duo-drama correctly. The only extant work by Mozart almost of this kind is *Zaide*, which actually Wolfgang would subsequently take along with him, together with his opera *Idomeneo*, to Vienna in 1781, in order to get, finally, some recognition from van Swieten and Count Rosenberg... notwithstanding the hostile environment of the imperial court. So eventually Wolfgang would resign to the rather inequitable logic of the letter of von Heufeld, which implies: "*If he needs to do it, he will do it also for nothing.*" And the troubles of *Le Nozze di Figaro*, an opera, the support of which, in reality, was privately guaranteed by the money of Mozart's patron, the Viennese banker von Wetzlar (who was willing even to completely bypass the Vienna imperial court and present it on stage in other European cities), and other sad self-funded ventures of Wolfgang, such as the concerts for the coronation of Leopold II, are the evidence of how much that terrible logic of von Heufeld's letter made its effect on Mozart: in the attempt (a vain one) to conquer the imperial interest and bypass or ascend the claustrophobic and paranoid hierarchy of the official positions of the imperial court¹³, Wolfgang would subsequently create his own personal drama of his life story. Following the disaster of Paris in 1778, among his numerous friends from Mannheim only the Cannabichs and the Webers would remain steadily and actively in contact with Wolfgang, despite the first disapproval of Leopold, who considered the former as cheats and scammers and the latter as cynic exploiters of Wolfgang. The other friends, who had maintained their ambiguous behaviour in Paris, would be overwhelmed by the tempestuous epistolary exchange between the father and the son against them (once again, ignited by those words of von Heufeld, written in January of that year, concerning the dangers for morality: see note 1), and would appear, in the end, to maintain a certain distance from Mozart during the following years. In 1782 Mozart would marry a girl from Mannheim, Constanze Weber.

2. Conclusions

Thus, the time has come to remove the *status of normative exactness* to everything left written by Mozart. Only in this way it is possible to start comprehending through which paths he, in reality, absorbed the musical experience and the musical theory of his contemporaries surrounding him, and how this was important for him and his artistic processes. Secondly, the analysis of the direct context of this letter by von Heufeld reveals how such letter lies at the very epicentre of a fundamental series of events, which essentially were directly

caused by von Heufeld's letter itself (Mozart's broken relationship with the immoral Wendling and the others from his circle, his friendship with the Webers, the increasing devastating attitude of accepting underpaid commissions for works, etc.) or which flourished around it. The immediate negative reaction of Wolfgang to this letter is comprehensible, because it asserted, without doubt, that Mozart, in January 1778, was not as highly considered as he thought, and that he was not an established first-rate composer, but merely a musician who was still gaining fame through his past formidable reputation as a child prodigy.

NOTES

¹ This letter is omitted in Anderson, is heavily cut and briefly treated in Abert, and is usually neglected in other major works. Only Deutsch puts it in some context of evidence, but without giving any evaluation. Sadie gives some brief allusion to second thoughts that this letter may have ignited in Mozart (see: [14, p. 516]). For the text in English translation (see: [3, p. 169]). The letter of von Heufeld was sent by Leopold from Salzburg to Wolfgang in Mannheim on 29 January 1778 with a supplementary letter penned by Leopold himself, who added further stress on some of the moral advice in von Heufeld's letter against the *bad companies*, i.e. *the dangers for morality*. Wolfgang's direct reply to this epistle is his letter written in Mannheim on 4 February 1778. The letter from von Heufeld was caused by two requests by Mozart to his father: 1. Wendling wanted a recommendation for the Queen of France, Marie Antoinette, the sister of Austrian Emperor Joseph II, from Vienna, through Leopold (Mannheim, 10 December 1777); 2. Mozart wanted some news about the National German Theatre in Vienna and how to find a position there at any cost, but through receiving a commission of some kind (Mannheim, 11 January 1778). About the negative answer of von Heufeld on the recommendation for the Queen of France (and, perhaps, the malicious request of Wendling), one must consider that Gluck was a personal protégé of Marie Antoinette since 1774...

² Vallotti's revolutionary studies were the results of many years of theoretical research in music and harmony carried on by his predecessor and teacher Padre Calegari and by his colleague Tartini. For a detailed treatment (see: [7, p. 13 and ff.]).

³ Mannheim, 13 November 1777: "*When the Elector happened to be in Bologna, he asked Padre Vallotti about him and received this reply: 'Oh, Your Highness, he is a great man!'. He also asked Padre Martini, who informed him: 'Your Highness, he is good; and gradually, as he becomes older, surer of himself and more solid, he will*

improve and will become good. But he will have to change considerably". The account of Wolfgang on Vogler contains also a few manipulations through patently falsified facts.

⁴ On the basis of Da Ponte, in fact, the choice of Martín y Soler as the other composer selected for the banquet in *Don Giovanni* seems to be a debt of gratitude of Mozart towards Martín y Soler, who had secretly backed the production of his *Le Nozze di Figaro* in 1785/1786. The absence of music from the *La Grotta di Trofonio* by Salieri (1785) is a clear evidence of the accurate and calculated choice by Mozart. Mozart kept the Martinian Sarti in high esteem.

⁵ Instead for the relationship of respect between Martini and Vallotti (see: [7, p. 13 and ff.]).

⁶ Certainly their invitation to Mozart, he naïvely accepted, to laugh at old Raaff's impoverished singing abilities (Raaff, the supposed supporter of Mozart and champion of Padre Martini in Mannheim) was not of great help (Mannheim, 14 November 1777). The ambiguity of Raaff, as a supporter (he, apparently, had never received any letter of recommendation from Bologna), is well described by Wolfgang (Paris, 18 July 1778). Here also we can read of Mozart's illusions about the Elector as someone who would highly consider the advice of Padre Martini.

⁷ K. 622 was originally written for basset clarinet and presented a completion of an unfinished work for basset horn (K. 584b/621b: ca. 1789/1791). Mozart's enthusiasm for clarinets, stemming from his Mannheim musical experience, caused him even to think of asking Colloredo to establish clarinets in a Salzburg wind band on a permanent basis (Mannheim, 3 December 1778).

⁸ See: [1] and [11, p. 128].

⁹ In 1804 Clementi re-published his Sonata Op. 24 No. 2 by adding this note: "*This Sonata <...> was played by the author before His Imperial Majesty Joseph II in 1781, Mozart being present*". Ludwig Berger, in his 1829 essay on Clementi, clearly wrote that the beginning of



this Sonata was inspirational to Mozart for his *The Magic Flute*.

¹⁰ Notwithstanding the numerous problems of *Thamos*, it is known how only two choruses were written probably between 1773 and 1774 and were still not brought to their final form. After some slight retouching in 1776, only in 1779/1780 Mozart did entirely rework and complete the numbers of *Thamos*, by adding the famous new orchestral parts and another chorus, probably for a performance with the company of Schikaneder in Salzburg.

¹¹ After 1865, newspapers even saluted the now Abbé Liszt as the new Vogler in Music, as in “*Dwight’s*

Journal of Music” (Boston, 8 December 1866: Vogler is called a “*predecessor of striking similarity*”).

¹² Gemmingen, in 1782, will reach Vienna from Mannheim, and it is highly probable that, in his quality of Grand Master of the Viennese lodge “*Zur Wohltätigkeit*,” convinced Mozart to become a freemason in autumn 1784.

¹³ Wolfgang to his wife, Frankfurt 3 October 1790: “*I fear <...> that I am in for a restless life*”. While Wolfgang and Leopold are often accused of exaggeration on “*cabals*,” unfortunately the themes of “*cabals*” and “*intrigue paranoia*” in the letters of Salieri and Casti are still not sufficiently put in evidence and studied (see: [5], [13] and [12, p. 87]).



REFERENCES



1. Abert Hermann. *W. A. Mozart*. Translated by Stewart Spencer and edited by Cliff Eisen. Yale University Press, 2007. 1515 p.
2. Anderson Emily. *The Letters of Mozart and his Family*. Revised by Stanley Sadie and Fiona Smart. London and Basingstoke, 1985. 1038 p.
3. Deutsch Otto Erich. *Mozart a Documentary Biography*. Translated by Eric Blom, Peter Branscombe and Jeremy Noble. Stanford, 1966. 692 p.
4. Einstein Alfred. *Mozart. His Character. His Work*. Translated by Arthur Mendel and Nathan Broder. Oxford University Press – New York, 1945. 492 p.
5. Eisen Cliff. *New Mozart Documents. A Supplement to O. E. Deutsch’s Documentary Biography*. London and Basingstoke, 1991. 192 p.
6. Eisen Cliff. *Mozart: A Life in Letters*. London, 2006. 688 p.
7. Grave Floyd K. and Grave Margaret G. *In Praise of Harmony. The Teachings of Abbé Georg Joseph Vogler*. University of Nebraska Press, 1987. 338 p.
8. Grave Floyd K. (Edited by). *Ballet Music from the Mannheim Court. Part I. Christian Cannabich. Georg Joseph Vogler*. Madison, 1996. 144 p.
9. Green Edward Noel. *Chromatic Completion in the Late Vocal Music of Haydn and Mozart: A Technical, Philosophic, and Historical Study*. A Dissertation for the Department of Music New York University, May 2008. 615 p.
10. Green Edward Noel. A New Look at the Ployer/Attwood Notebooks, or, Mozart: a Teacher of Chromatic Completion. *Problemy muzykal’noj nauki/Music Scholarship: Russian Journal of Academic Studies*. 2013. No. 1 (12), pp. 141–145.
11. Hertz Daniel. *Mozart’s Operas*. University of California Press, 1990. 363 p.
12. Nicastro Guido. “*Sogni e favole io fingo*.” *Gli inganni e i disinganni del teatro tra Settecento e Novecento*. Università degli Studi di Catania. Soveria Mannelli, 2004. 259 p.
13. Rice John. *Antonio Salieri and Viennese Opera*. The University of Chicago Press, 1998. 648 p.
14. Sadie Stanley. *Mozart: the Early Years 1756–1781*. Oxford University Press, 2006. 644 p.

About the author:

Leone M. Jennarelli, Dr., University Degree Cum Laude in Ancient History, Ancient Literature & Computational Sciences (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano), Manager of “MozartCircle” (mozartcircle.porticodoro.com) (21100, Varese, Italia), **ORCID: 0000-0001-8065-0289**, smartcgart@porticodoro.com

Об авторе:

Леоне М. Дженнарелли, доктор (университетская степень Cum Laude) древней истории, древней литературы и вычислительных наук (Католический университет Святого Сердца, Милан), руководитель «Моцартовского кружка» (mozartcircle.porticodoro.com) (21100, Варезе, Италия), **ORCID: 0000-0001-8065-0289**, smartcgart@porticodoro.com