

Vienna / To / Messrs. Breitkopf &amp; Härtel, / Leipzig

Most highly honoured sirs,

Vienna, 17<sup>th</sup> Nov., 1799

I give you my most courteous thanks for the trouble you took with your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> Nov.,<sup>3</sup> [5] under other circumstances, however, you would have had to allow me to express regret that pressure of work did not allow you to answer my question of 28<sup>th</sup> August.<sup>4</sup> You were first of all so kind as once again to ask me urgently about the dedication of the glass harmonica quintet,<sup>5</sup> as if I could have been ungrateful and neglectful in such a matter – [10] At no point was I either of these in any situation, my expressions of thanks and my answers always followed on the heels of your letters. I answered you on 11<sup>th</sup> Nov.,<sup>6</sup> and could not possibly have done so earlier, because I did not receive your letter of the 26<sup>th</sup> Oct.,<sup>7</sup> where you wrote to me about this for the first time, until the 9<sup>th</sup>, after my letter of this last date<sup>8</sup> had gone. [15] The letter of the 26<sup>th</sup> Oct. mentioned above was the first time that you asked me for the originals of the *sonatas* intended to constitute your 6<sup>th</sup> volume.<sup>9</sup> I received this letter, as I said, on the 9<sup>th</sup>; the first and next post-coach left on the 11<sup>th</sup>, on the 11<sup>th</sup> I sent what I had. Now, in your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> Nov., you inform me that these things are coming too late “because Volume 6 will soon be printed” [20] and you complain that I had not answered earlier or sent them off earlier. Please do the sums yourselves: on 6<sup>th</sup> November, when you complain about me, it was of course physically impossible, at least without courier, for you to have received an answer to your letter of 26<sup>th</sup> October. I cannot find an explanation of such an error. [25] How could you write the following on a day when it was not possible for you to have received an answer?: We could not wait any longer, volume 6 will soon be printed. Forgive me, but I cannot attach any other significance to these formulations than that you thought about it immediately after sending off your letter of 26<sup>th</sup> Oct., considered my originals superfluous, and let the printing start at once. [30] I am only writing this to you because it is so pleasing to know that his just cause receives further recognition in this. Besides that, my mind has been set at rest and I am convinced that, in keeping with your sense of fairness, you will pay me just as well for the *sonatas* as you did for the two songs the *Veilchen*<sup>10</sup> and the *Trennungslied*,<sup>11</sup> although both, [35] as I heard for the first time in your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> Nov., had already been printed before they arrived. I also think and hope that you will still be able to use the *sonatas* in question for correction in comparison, which was of course your main aim, in which case you cannot refuse me a certain payment. Regarding the songs, I cannot share your opinion that I am mistaken. [40] To save you the trouble of searching, I allow myself the honour of setting the true circumstances before your eyes at the earliest point possible: first of all, for the songs which I sent you on 25<sup>th</sup> March, and in which, as you inform me, you found

---

<sup>1</sup> BD: Nissen's handwriting, Constanze's signature. Nissen: cf. note No. 1224.

<sup>2</sup> BD: Founded as “Breitkopf” in 1719. On 1<sup>st</sup> November, 1795, Christoph Gottlob Breitkopf concluded a contract of partnership with Gottfried Christoph Härtel (1763-1827). This was followed in 1796 by a secret contract of sale in which the entire Breitkopf business was made over to Gottfried Christoph Härtel. The latter was also declared universal heir by Breitkopf shortly before his death in 1800.

<sup>3</sup> BD: No. 1261a (lost).

<sup>4</sup> BD: Cf. No. 1256/72-76.

<sup>5</sup> BD: KV 617; cf. No. 1264/36-40.

<sup>6</sup> BD: No. 1264.

<sup>7</sup> BD: No. 1260a (lost).

<sup>8</sup> BD: No. 1264/13.

<sup>9</sup> No. 1263.

<sup>10</sup> BD: KV 476 (cf. note on No. 0870/2).

<sup>11</sup> BD: KV 519. Constanze sent the originals of both on 24<sup>th</sup> May, 1799, cf. No. 1243/120-122.

your expectations greatly disappointed, but all of which, to my great joy, I found in volume 5. At that time<sup>12</sup> you wrote to me as follows: [45]

“While doing everything possible to take your interests into account, of the 16 numbers listed in your invoice we can at most use only 10 to 12, for which we will happily pay you the sum of 2 ducats per piece as previously agreed, and therefore remit to you 24 ducats”.

[50] I then consented to this price, as I wrote in my letter of 1<sup>st</sup> May,<sup>13</sup> on the grounds you had given, so of course only on these grounds, for whose admissibility I trusted you, as is fair. Later, I asked you in vain for a list of the usable ones, to compare with my account above. Only now, from the volume itself, [55] do I see that you have included not only the 16 mentioned, but also (not counting the *Veilchen* and the *Trennungslied*) 2 others as well, namely: *Es war einmal, ihr Leute*<sup>14</sup> or, as you call it, *Arete*, and *Dans un bois solitaire*, a total of 18. If I now, furthermore, present an account according to my catalogue of 25<sup>th</sup> March, in which I had counted five songs as only 2 numbers under No. 5. and No. 18., [60] there are still 15 left over, for only 12 of which have I been paid. Regarding some pieces, I had written that I would not ask anything for them “if these pieces, as I believe, are in the *Kinderbibliothek*,<sup>15</sup> which I would ask you to investigate.”<sup>16</sup> Regarding this investigation, whose results were a precondition, I have heard nothing. [65] I therefore cannot understand how you could instead say, in your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> November, you had paid me somewhat more than my due. Secondly, concerning the songs sent much later, namely towards the end of May<sup>17</sup> and which therefore cannot possibly be included in the separate preceding invoice of 25<sup>th</sup> March, I would ask you to look through the very precise account I present below. [70] Both consignments are obviously independent of each other and each exists in its own right, as you in fact admit, since on 6<sup>th</sup> Nov. you now accord me payment for two of the songs<sup>18</sup> sent in May: why not the third one<sup>19</sup> as well? I cannot see even an ostensible reason for that. – On the *Requiem* I have only the following to say: I do not see what I would have to fear, [75] as you claim, from an announcement of yours in reply to any announcement I might make. I would have them print the truth, as would you: one truth can surely stand beside another. Otherwise I cannot of course dissuade you from the opinion you have suddenly formed about my copy. I had it performed,<sup>20</sup> and people of the *metier* found no fault with it. [80] Supposing, furthermore, that individual passages in your copies were different or even better, does that prove their authenticity? They may be better, but are they by Mozart? And that is the decisive point. In the meantime, I have become very curious about the corrections which you wish to mark on my copy when you send it back. This will put me or others in a position to judge what cannot be by Mozart, [85] and I will be very deeply obliged and grateful to you for this favour, which you offer me yourselves. I hasten to recompense you for this in advance by telling you, as has just occurred to me, that you would perhaps not do badly to enter into correspondence with music director Süssmayer<sup>21</sup> here, since he has without any doubt the

---

<sup>12</sup> BD: Probably the last letter of 18<sup>th</sup> April, 1799 = No. 1240a (lost).

<sup>13</sup> BD: No. 1241 (lost).

<sup>14</sup> BD: KV KV 529; cf. note on No. 107/13. Published by B & H with a new text and title by Daniel Jäger.

<sup>15</sup> = "Children's Library"; cf. No. 1236/34.

<sup>16</sup> BD: Constanze maintains this for the second time (cf. No. 1253/96-97); there was in fact no mention of this "investigation" in No. 1236/33-36, 77-97. The text of her own copy probably differed from the text sent.

<sup>17</sup> BD: No. 1243/28.

<sup>18</sup> BD: KV 476, 519.

<sup>19</sup> BD: KV 579.

<sup>20</sup> BD: Benefit performance for Constanze directed by van Swieten, but on 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 1793. This preceded the performance by Count [Graf] Walsegg (from copies in his own hand) by one year, but he apparently knew nothing of it.

<sup>21</sup> BD: B & H finally did so on 24<sup>th</sup> January, 1800, requesting information on his and Mozart's contributions to the *Requiem*. Süssmayer replied saying that he had done the greater part of the work, but that it was unworthy of

most authentic copy, [90] if, as I believe, he has one. In the meantime I feel sorry for you: unless you are indeed wrong, you have been misled, as I must believe, by your trust in me or in my copy, into wishing to give your edition the highest sanction in the eyes of the public by saying in your advertisement that it was prepared from my manuscript. [95] I must furthermore feel sorry in the case in question when I hear that my copy, which you requested to compare with your copies, later found to be accurate, was of little or no help at all to you in this process.<sup>22</sup> I believed, and had to believe, in the accuracy of my copy; whatever the case, I am above blame. Several weeks ago, I requested Volume 5 in vain from Herr Wapler<sup>23</sup> after you had been so very kind as to send it a long time ago following your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> Nov. Yesterday, when I sent him your letter, he once again denied having received a copy for me: I have had to borrow one for a few days. You can imagine how unpleasant this is for me, and you will surely make an emphatically clear arrangement once and for all. [105] I thank you for the project offering the *concerto opus 1* for sale, which now unfortunately comes too late. I can in no way think badly of you, as businessmen, for having made some use of the copper plates.<sup>24</sup> But that way, of course, my copies would not have been easy to sell. If only you had been so kind as to have informed me of this earlier! [110] In your letter of 22<sup>nd</sup> Dec., 1798,<sup>25</sup> you say only that for certain reasons you would not be keen to buy the plates: I deduced too much from that, but that is no-one's fault but mine.

It is all the more difficult for me to judge how many originals you have, and for which you owe me something, until you send me the promised pieces next time, [115], since there is at least one contradiction resulting from haste in your letter of 6<sup>th</sup> November, when you say in one place that you still wish to keep the *V'amo*,<sup>26</sup> and in another that you will send it to me. I will satisfy in part your enquiries regarding Mozart monuments and regarding the original portrait, and will be glad to continue to look for letters and all kinds of materials. [120] You are so definite, however, when you say that yet more people have many letters from M. I expect a suitable advertisement about it and I will immediately set about having one drawn up. I have no more letters to him. – Please accept my thanks for the promise of postage-free and generous sending-on of the package from Hamburg.<sup>27</sup> [125] I regret causing you trouble, but would ask you to give your representative instructions to deliver it to me on his own initiative. I must furthermore thank you for the information about the piece of music which I thought was a *sonata* for four hands.<sup>28</sup> And now nothing else remains for me to do, other than to express to you my joy over how you set out Volume 5, over the preface and the use made of the notes, [130] which I was so happy to send to you, on the individual songs. Such additions do honour to the authors and publishers! But I must make this one remark about No. 30, namely that *Was frag ich viel etc.*<sup>29</sup> bears the attributions *M. M.* and *M. W.*, and I have not the least recollection of lending you even a copy of it.

You end your letter with the harsh reproach that I cause difficulties in all matters. [135] This letter and the invoice, at least, provide no evidence of this: everything is documented from your own letters and with the truth: truth is no chicanery.

---

the great man. The complete text is in BD VI, pp. 504-505 and largely agrees with Constanze's account in No. 1350.

<sup>22</sup> BD: B & H's comments are nothing other than business manoeuvres. Their edition was based on Constanze's copy, as she affirms in No. 1304/11-12.

<sup>23</sup> BD: Christian Friedrich Wappler, publisher in Vienna. Freemason. Publications included a book on mineralogy and the text of Handel's *Messiah*. Correspondent for Breitkopf & Härtel. Cf. note on No. 1228/48, 85.

<sup>24</sup> BD: In 1230/19-22, Constanze offered B & H the plates for KV 503 kept by Thonus. They bought them at the beginning of 1799.

<sup>25</sup> BD: No. 1231a (lost).

<sup>26</sup> BD: KV 348 (382g).

<sup>27</sup> BD: Cf. Nos. 1258/74-76; 1259/56-65; 1277/5-6.

<sup>28</sup> BD: Cf. No. 1258/95-96 and the incipit at the end of that letter.

<sup>29</sup> BD: KV 349 (367a); cf. No. 1243/126.

As far as our accounts are concerned, they are to the best of my knowledge as below.

When I receive the 42 florins from Herr Wapler as per payment order, [140] this settles completely not only the invoice for 16 florins I made out to you on 18<sup>th</sup> Oct., but also for the *overture* and *fugue*,<sup>30</sup> and the *Veilchen* and the *Trennungslied*, as well as the songs for the opening and closing of the Lodge.<sup>31</sup>

This is what you definitely owe me:

Postage for my letter of	18 <sup>th</sup> Oct. <sup>32</sup>	49 <sup>kr</sup> .
[145] _____	28 <sup>th</sup> <sup>33</sup>	12.
(I do not need to count my letter of	9 <sup>th</sup> Nov.) <sup>34</sup>	
_____ your letter of	26 <sup>th</sup> Oct.	22.
_____ my _____	11 <sup>th</sup> Nov. by letter-post	49.
_____	by post-coach <sup>35</sup>	12.
[150] _____	13 <sup>th</sup> <sup>36</sup>	12.
_____ Your letter of _____	6 <sup>th</sup>	1. 24.
_____ my letter of today at least _____		12
		4 fl. 12 <sup>kr</sup>

On top of that come (see page 5.<sup>37</sup>)

[155] On top of that come the following as yet undetermined items, regarding which I trust your fairness and equity completely:

1. Concerning the consignment of 25<sup>th</sup> March: how much less<sup>38</sup> you paid for the songs back then than is due for the songs used by you -----

2. on 3<sup>rd</sup> *Junius* you wrote.<sup>39</sup>

[160] “the original manuscript of the two well-known songs |: the *Veilchen* and the *Trennungslied* :| No. 1

the song for the *mandoline* No. 2<sup>40</sup> and *un moto di gioja*<sup>41</sup> No. 3.

appeal to us greatly. When, then, were the latter two composed? [165] Do you not have the original manuscript of them?<sup>42</sup> We are only waiting for the trio *Caro mio*<sup>43</sup> before sending you the remittance at once.”

You have already paid me the remittance for No. 1: on 6<sup>th</sup> *November*.

You sent No. 2 back to me, unexpectedly in view of the statements above.

You have already paid me the remittance for No. 1: on 6<sup>th</sup> *November*.

[170] Entirely unknown to you #,

[IN THE MARGIN:

# you received it along with No. 1,]

and you placed it in Volume 5, therefore at the accepted

<sup>30</sup> BD: KV 399 (385i); cf. No. 1259/8 ff.

<sup>31</sup> BD: KV 483, 484; cf. No. 1260/54-55.

<sup>32</sup> BD: No. 1260.

<sup>33</sup> BD: No. 1261.

<sup>34</sup> BD: No. 1263.

<sup>35</sup> BD: No. 1264.

<sup>36</sup> BD: No. 1266.

<sup>37</sup> BD: Nissen is referring to the next page of the manuscript = lines 155-185.

<sup>38</sup> BD: Cf. Lines 60-61.

<sup>39</sup> BD: No. 1244b (lost).

<sup>40</sup> BD: KV 349 (367a).

<sup>41</sup> BD: KV 579.

<sup>42</sup> BD: Constanze did not have it.

<sup>43</sup> BD: KV App. 5 (571a).

price 2 ducats<sup>44</sup> or \_\_\_\_\_ 9 fl.

You paid me for the *trio*<sup>45</sup> along with the *canons*.

[175] 3. For the little book of *capricci*,<sup>46</sup> about which you wrote to me on 19<sup>th</sup> Febr., saying you would show your gratitude for it, *N.B.* if you use it, as is probable, for the biography or otherwise. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Anecdotes<sup>47</sup> in your musical journal:

pag. 289, 290, 291, 3 full columns,

[180] — 854, 855, 856, I count as only one column;

making 4 columns altogether or quarter of a sheet \_\_\_\_\_

5. the anecdotes of whose receipt you informed me on 6<sup>th</sup> *November* \_\_\_\_\_

6. Remittance for the clavier pieces<sup>48</sup> sent by me on 11<sup>th</sup> *Nov.* \_\_\_\_\_

7. Charge for the originals which are still in your hands, if you

[185] use them \_\_\_\_\_

8. Ten copies of the *Requiem*

9. The promised copies of the complete works.

Furthermore the payment order to Herrn *Empeytaz*,<sup>49</sup> from whom I have heard nothing more, from which I conclude that you are not in a position to enquire of him, [190] for which reason I most obediently ask you to return the order to me, besides the originals you still have from me, according to your letters partly usable for you, partly unusable.

As far as I know, this must be everything that I still have to receive from you, along with my copy of the *Requiem* and along with the portrait in wax,<sup>50</sup> [195] and with this our entire account, as far as I know, would now be closed if, contrary to my hope and expectation, you do not accept the offer<sup>51</sup> made in my letter of 9<sup>th</sup> *November*.

I have the honour to be, with the uttermost respect,

my most honoured sirs,

[200] your most obedient servant

Constance Mozart

Another part of the history of my copy of the *Requiem* is that *Baron Swieten*, that is, a knowledgeable music-lover rightly valued by yourselves, had it performed here in 1792. *Salieri*<sup>52</sup> was also at the rehearsals – [205] no-one found any fault with it.

ON THE ENVELOPE:

Because the post for Leipzig did not leave on the 17<sup>th</sup>, this letter did not leave until the 20<sup>th</sup> *Nov.*

---

<sup>44</sup> BD: 2 ducats = 4.5 florins.

<sup>45</sup> BD: Cf. lines 165-166.

<sup>46</sup> BD: KV 32a.

<sup>47</sup> BD: In the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* of 6<sup>th</sup> February and 11<sup>th</sup> September, 1799.

<sup>48</sup> BD: Cf. No. 1264/16-20.

<sup>49</sup> BD: Cf. No. 1248/50-54.

<sup>50</sup> BD: Constanze is mistaken; she wanted to send it, but never did (cf. No. 1283/88-89).

<sup>51</sup> BD: No. 1263/9-10. Generally offering the same items as to André, but at a higher price.

<sup>52</sup> BD: Antonio Salieri (1750-1825), composer, succeeded Bonno as court music director in Vienna in 1788. In 1807 he wrote a reference for Franz Xaver Wolfgang Mozart, stating that he had a rare talent and would certainly be as great a success as his father. He was succeeded in 1825 by Joseph Eybler.