

THE CASE OF THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL MEETING: WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART AND JOSEPH MARTIN KRAUS IN VIENNA

BERTIL VAN BOER



One of the joys of compiling a thematic catalogue is that a number of small mysteries crop up as one evaluates biographical and source material for the composer concerned. The journey often requires delving into the private life and works in intimate detail, and brings to light important information that in turn raises questions about the various influences or connections affecting the composer or style. But when this information is lacunar or based primarily upon circumstantial evidence, it provides only plausible suppositions that, while not entirely provable as incontrovertible fact, nonetheless dare the scholar to prove otherwise. Such is the circumstantial case for the meeting of two of the more remarkable composers of the second half of the eighteenth century, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Joseph Martin Kraus, who share nearly identical life spans and dates.¹

To call Kraus the ‘Swedish Mozart’ solely on this basis, as has occasionally been done,² is invidious, for it *de facto* subjects the Swedish composer to a comparison that is unequal, at least in terms of current historical reputation. Conversely, to call Mozart the ‘Austrian Kraus’ would brook even more difficulty for the same reasons, even though both composers were noted for their originality of style and the progressive nature of their works. It would seem on face value that the two composers, one well known as a major figure of the period and the second considered more regional, might have little in common apart from the obvious chronological similarity, but the linkage of these two men is not entirely serendipitous. Indeed, there are particular parallels that transcend that of chronology, all of which point to their being considered among the leaders in music of this period. First, there is their development as composers. Both showed considerable talent in musical composition during childhood; their earliest compositions date from this time, with substantial works being written during their teenage years. Both were adept at writing in the various styles of the period, and both were well travelled internationally. Although their education differed – Mozart was essentially home-educated and achieved a professional career early on in his life, while Kraus was university-educated (in philosophy and law) and became Kapellmeister at the Swedish court only after considerable

1 Mozart was born in Salzburg in January of 1756, while Kraus was born in Miltenburg am Main, southeast of Frankfurt, in June of the same year. The former died in Vienna in December 1791; the latter lived a year longer, dying in Stockholm in December 1792. The plethora of Mozart biographies, from Niemetschek’s in 1798 to those of the present day, are too numerous to list here; one can gain a sample listing in H. C. Robbins Landon, *A Mozart Compendium* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991), 429–434. For Kraus, the situation is quite different. The principal sources for biographical information are Fredrik Silverstolpe, *Biographie af Kraus* (Stockholm: J. Hörberg, 1833) and *Några Återblickar på rygtets, snillets och konsternas värld* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1841); Karl Friedrich Schreiber, *Biographie über dem Odenwälder Komponisten Joseph Martin Kraus* (Buchen: Bezirksmuseum, 1928); Irmgard Leux-Henschen, *Joseph Martin Kraus in seinen Briefen* (Stockholm: Reimers, 1978); Friedrich W. Riedel, *Das Himmlische lebt in seinen Tönen* (Mannheim: Palatium, 1992); and Hans Åstrand, *Joseph Martin Kraus: Den stora undantaget* (Stockholm: Kungliga Musikaliska Akademien, 1993). The last two are popular, non-scholarly handbooks. Kraus’s works have been catalogued in the present author’s *Joseph Martin Kraus. A Systematic-Thematic Catalogue of His Musical Works* (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon, 1998).

2 See, for example, Gottfried Schweizer, ‘Ein Altersgenosse Mozarts, J. M. Kraus’, *Acta Mozartiana* 3/3 (1956), 17–19.



difficulty – they have much in common in terms of their creative process.³ Both were well known for the ability to craft new works of some substance quickly and without a laborious compositional process, and both achieved some reputation for innovative orchestration, clever use of counterpoint and forward-looking stylistic features. Both have been seen as being a qualitative step above their contemporaries and, tellingly, this comparison is not solely a musicological phenomenon of modern times but rather was first proposed by a well known contemporary, Joseph Haydn, who said to Swedish diplomat (and Kraus biographer) Fredrik Samuel Silverstolpe in 1797, ‘Kraus was the first great composer of genius that I ever knew; . . . pity about him and Mozart, both were so young [when they died].’⁴ This composer equated his two late colleagues as geniuses of the first rank, raising them to a position he did not feel he himself or others had attained.⁵ This alone makes it worth examining whether these two figures had more in common than a number of superficial parallels. Indeed, his comment raises the question of some sort of biographical confluence, if motive and opportunity can be seen to have existed.

With respect to motive, it is necessary to discover whether the two composers knew or knew about each other. More precisely, given that an opportunity for a meeting might have existed – about which more shortly – would either have been inclined to seek out the other? For Mozart, the biographical documentation on this subject is mute, but there does exist evidence on Kraus’s part, in the form of both correspondence and music.

From November 1782 until December 1786 Kraus embarked upon a grand tour of Europe at the expense of Swedish King Gustav III in order to further his own education, observe the latest trends in music and theatre, and meet with as many leading figures in the eighteenth-century musical world as possible. As a result, the route of his journey, which took him through Germany to Vienna, and subsequently to Italy and France, allowed him to come into contact with most leading composers of the day, including Gluck, Haydn (as noted above), Salieri, Vanhal, Reichardt, Padre Martini, Cambini, Sacchini, Piccinni and numerous others. In other words, one of his principal motives for undertaking the tour in the first place was to make the acquaintance of composers and learn from their music.⁶ While Mozart’s name is clearly missing from this list

3 See the present author’s ‘A Rediscovered Sacred Work by J. M. Kraus: Some Observations on his Creative Process’, *Svensk Tidskrift för Musikforskning* 65 (1983), 117–118; Erich Hertzmann, ‘Mozart’s Creative Process’, in *The Creative World of Mozart*, ed. Paul Henry Lang (New York: Norton, 1963), 17–20.

4 Silverstolpe, *Några Återblickar*, 52; Schreiber, *Kraus*, 69–70; Leux-Henschen, *Briefe*, 110.

5 One might notice that Haydn does *not* mention Pleyel or Vanhal or Dittersdorf, or anyone else he clearly knew and liked in Vienna, even given that Silverstolpe’s introduction of the subject and questions regarding his memory of Kraus’s visit to Haydn were leading ones. The latter could well have said, for instance, something to the effect that he entertained great hopes for both Kraus and Pleyel, but didn’t. The equation of Kraus and Mozart clearly stands out in Haydn’s mind as *pares genii*. Of particular note is a letter written by Silverstolpe to his brother from Vienna dated 27 December 1797, in which he states: ‘An diesem Ort wird er viel höher eingeschätzt als in Schweden. Haydn, Albrechtsberger und andere erwähnen seiner als eines der grössten Genies, die es je gegeben hat, und sie citieren gewisse ihnen bekannte Piëcen als classische Arbeiten, die nicht übertroffen werden können.’ (In this place [Kraus] is much more highly treasured than in Sweden. Haydn, Albrechtsberger and others consider him as one of the greatest geniuses that has ever existed, and they cite certain pieces known to them as classic works that are without peer.) See Carl-Gabriel Stellan Mörner, *Johann Wikmanson und die Brüder Silverstolpe* (Stockholm: Ivar Högström, 1952), 324.

6 This is exemplified both in the Haydn reminiscences noted above and in a letter to Silverstolpe from Albrechtsberger dated 11 December 1804, in which Albrechtsberger commented that he gave Kraus the second part of his overture to the oratorio *Die Pilger auf Golgotha*. See Schreiber, *Kraus*, 116; Silverstolpe, *Några Återblickar*, 47–48; Stellan Mörner, *Wikmanson*, 399 (where the appropriate portion of the letter is quoted in toto). Kraus reworked this later as the second part of an Overture in D minor, performed about 1790 in Good Friday services in Stockholm. Kraus himself wrote in a letter to his parents dated 14 June 1781: ‘. . . das was mir mehr Wert ist als 600 [Dukaten] ist die Gnade, dass ich zukünftiges Jahr auf des Königs Kosten eine kurze [!] Reise durch Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien machen muss – nicht um Musik zu studieren wie der König sagte, sondern blos die neuere Einrichtung der Theater zu beschauen.’ (. . . that which is of more value than 600 [ducats, namely Kraus’s new salary as Vice-Kapellmeister] is the favour that in the forthcoming year I have to undertake a short trip subsidized by the King through Germany, France, and Italy – not to study music, as the King said, but rather simply to observe the latest trends in the theatre.) See Leux-Henschen, *Briefe*, 237.



of notables, it is not necessarily an indication that no meeting took place, as the biographers of Kraus, such as Karl Schrieber and Irmgard Leux-Henschen, state in their studies.⁷ Indeed, there exists some evidence that Kraus was familiar with his colleague and his music.

The primary documentation suggesting that Kraus at least knew about Mozart's work comes in a letter to his sister Marianne from Paris on 26 December 1785, in which he writes: 'Kennst du Mozarts *Entführung aus dem Serail*? Er arbeitet nun an seinem *Figaro*, eine Operette in 4 Aufzügen, worauf ich mich herzlich freue.'⁸ It is implicit in the first question that he *was* familiar with the music of the first opera; recommending it to his sister clearly implies that he thought highly of it. With respect to *Figaro*, however, it is clear from other evidence that both Da Ponte and Mozart strove to keep the composition of this work a secret, given its political implications.⁹ Although rumours began to circulate in the autumn of 1785 that he was working on the piece, the first documented mention of it seems to have been only on 2 November 1785 in a private letter from Leopold Mozart to his daughter.¹⁰ Details apparently remained within Mozart's inner circle until after the successful premiere of *Der Schauspieldirektor* in early 1786, however, and Mozart's own catalogue notes a (final) completion date of 29 April 1786. The obvious question is how Kraus, sitting in Paris, could know that Mozart was at work on *Figaro*, describe the layout of the opera and, most importantly, make the comment that he would particularly 'look forward to' it unless he had some direct connection that kept him in touch with what was happening on the musical front in Vienna, especially with respect to this composer and his music. That this may reflect more than simple hearsay subsequently became apparent when Kraus returned to Stockholm after his four-year grand tour in late 1786.

At this point Kraus became, in the words of his student Per Frigel, a 'passionate Mozartean', conducting a symphony at a public concert in 1789¹¹ and in early 1792 composing a song, 'Öfver Mozarts död', to a text by Carl Michael Bellman, written deliberately in that composer's style only a few weeks after his

⁷ Schrieber, *Kraus*, 63; Leux-Henschen, *Briefe*, 112.

⁸ 'Do you know Mozart's *Entführung aus dem Serail*? He is now working on his *Figaro*, an opera in four acts, to which I am much looking forward.' Quoted in Leux-Henschen, *Briefe*, 310; English version in Cliff Eisen, *New Mozart Documents: A Supplement to O. E. Deutsch's Documentary Biography* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 42.

⁹ See Lorenzo Da Ponte, *Memoirs of Lorenzo Da Ponte* (London: Lippincott, 1929), 150. Da Ponte's memoirs are, of course, notoriously unreliable, for, if taken literally, this would mean that composition had begun six weeks earlier than the April 1786 completion date, sometime in February of that year. But Joseph II's ban on the Beaumarchais play occurred a year earlier on 31 January 1785. This was duly announced in the *Wienerblättchen* on 4 February along with the notice that the original performers, Emmanuel Schikaneder's company, would not be presenting the work. See Otto Erich Deutsch, *Mozart: Die Dokumente seines Lebens* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1961), 235. If one stretches the imagination, one might interpret Da Ponte's statement that he and Mozart began the work shortly after its prohibition to be off by a year. See Tim Carter, *W. A. Mozart: Le nozze di Figaro* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 35–36, and the further bibliographic references therein.

¹⁰ See the letter written from Salzburg in Emily Anderson, *The Letters of Mozart and His Family* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1966), 893; see also Carter, '*Figaro*', 9. In this letter Leopold notes that his son was 'feverishly' at work on the opera, having procrastinated for an undefined period of time; this would confirm the statement by Kraus that Mozart was working on the music in December. Daniel Hertz notes in his essay on the genesis of the work ('Constructing *Le Nozze di Figaro*', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 112/1 (1987), 77–98) that these rumours had travelled as far as Paris, though his source is the selfsame Kraus letter.

¹¹ See Patrik Vretblad, *Konsertlifvet i Stockholm under 1700 talet* (Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt, 1918), 236. The concert took place on Wednesday, 8 April. The programme does not identify the work, and Gösta Morin did not care to speculate which of the symphonies was performed, though he noted that in 1794 the provincial city of Linköping did purchase 425 and that Mozart's music was performed no less than thirty-five times during the 1790s, including eleven symphonies, five piano concertos, several overtures and an otherwise unidentifiable concerto for 'viola inglese' (on 7 June 1798). See Gösta Morin, 'Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart und Schweden', in *Kongressbericht der Internationalen Musikwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft 1956* (Graz: Akademische Druckerei, 1958), 417–418.



death.¹² An even more crucial piece of musical evidence that Kraus knew Mozart's music can be found in the former's adaptation of a movement from the opera *Idomeneo* for a political occasion in March of 1789, a month prior to the performance of the aforementioned Mozart symphony.

This event was a parliament called by Gustav III to ratify sweeping authoritarian powers and consolidate his rule through the Act of Union and Security. This was centred around Gustav's ongoing war with Russia and the need to suppress rising opposition among the clergy and noble estates.¹³ As part of his political strategy he entered the Riddarhus Church for the blessing of the parliament accompanied by a march by Kraus, providing the spectacle of a powerful, popular and unassailable monarch. Kraus's music was calculated to underline the spectacle, as well as provide symbolic (and theatrical) authority for the act.¹⁴ The point at which this music occurs in Mozart's opera, the middle of the first act, has special significance: Idomeneo, absent for a decade at the Trojan War, disembarks on Cretan soil a conquering hero, an analogy to Gustav, who had just returned home from crushing the Anjala League conspiracy and blunting a Danish–Norwegian invasion.¹⁵ The use of this march clearly shows Kraus's awareness of the opera and its content, but it raises the question of how he got his hands on a work that, by all accounts, existed in only two sources at that time: the authentic score and parts at the Electoral opera house in Munich (where it had premiered in 1781) and an autograph copy that Mozart himself owned and intended, if possible, to present in Vienna.¹⁶

12 This work contains musical allusions to its honoree, in terms of both thematic material and key, E flat major. See Richard Engländer, 'Bellman och Mozarts död', *Uppsala Nya Tidning* (12 June 1941); Carl-Gabriel Stellan Mörner, 'Två visböcker från 1700-talet med musik av J. Wikmanson und J. M. Kraus', *Ord och Bild* 56 (1947), 286–287; and Morin, 'Mozart', 417. Volker Bungardt noted that Bellman's poem was published in the newspaper *Stockholms Posten* on 5 January 1792, one month after the Viennese composer's death, a date that also appears on Kraus's autograph. See *Joseph Martin Kraus: Ein Meister des klassischen Klavierliedes* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1973), 98.

13 A good description of the politics can be found in H. Arnold Barton, *Scandinavia in the Revolutionary Era* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 189–197.

14 The parallels between the original march and its adaptation have been discussed in the present author's *Dramatic Cohesion in the Music of Joseph Martin Kraus* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1989), 326–336, and Gunnar Larsson, 'Kraus's Music for the Parliament of 1789', in *Gustav III and the Swedish Stage* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1993), 125–130, an English translation of 'Die Musik von Kraus zum Reichstag 1789', in *Kraus und das Gustavianische Stockholm* (Stockholm: Kungliga Musikaliska Akademien, 1984), 73–77.

15 Barton, *Scandinavia*, 191–192. Gustav himself saw the classical allusion, writing to Baron Evert Taube a year after the parliament that he saw himself as the Agamemnon of his army against the lawless anti-royalist 'Trojans'. This indicates that the King, at least, may well have been in the know and appreciated the musical-dramatic reference, however anonymous it may have been to the general public at large.

16 Daniel Hertz, Foreword to Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *Idomeneo*, in *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* Serie 2 Gruppe 5 Band 11 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1972), xvii–xxi. This source-critical difficulty has given rise to some speculation on how Mozart's music may have come into Kraus's hands. Larsson has suggested an alternative, postulating that it was Gustav himself who picked out the march during that monarch's visit to the Bavarian Elector's court in December of 1783. This suggestion, however, rests upon pillars of evidence that are wobbly indeed. It presupposes that Gustav had time enough to peruse the Elector's musical library for suitable opera material regarding an event that lay some six years in the future, a long stretch of the imagination, even supposing that the King knew enough about music in general, which he did not. Larsson also supposes that *Idomeneo* was immediately accessible and acknowledged as an important work of recent times by all and sundry in Munich, or that it may even have been performed in Gustav's honour. In truth, it had faded from the repertory very quickly, was filed in the Electoral music library, and, whatever one might think of Mozart today, no one should be under the illusion that *Idomeneo* was considered by the multi-talented musical establishment of Munich, formerly of Mannheim, as without equal. In other words, for this alternative to be plausible during a visit of state, the King himself (or one of his retinue, among whom there were no musicians to speak of) would have had to have the intent and desire to delve into the court music library for a work which was of no great significance to the Bavarian repertory, come across it by accident or design, peruse the score, abstract from it a particular insignificant march, and then carry it about for another two months before Kraus would have had an opportunity to see it when he joined the Swedish entourage in Rome in January 1784. Thereafter it would have had to rest in the composer's own



All of this indicates that there was certainly motive enough for Kraus to have sought out Mozart, regardless of the current lack of definitive information. Given the latter's relative stature in Vienna, to have avoided him entirely would seem contradictory to the very purpose of Kraus's goals for his journey. And there is certainly enough evidence to suggest some sort of personal connection. If such motives existed in a court of law, the only missing element would be opportunity, some confluence of circumstances that would have that would have allowed the two men to meet either as individuals or in some social setting.

Here too circumstantial chronological evidence exists. First, there is the matter of time. Kraus arrived in Vienna on 1 April 1783 and departed in October of that same year. Mozart, newly married and enjoying the first success of *Entführung*, was in residence until July, when he took his new bride back to Salzburg to meet his family. Thus there was a span of about four months where, if nothing else, both were in the same city at the same time.¹⁷ There are two further bits of information that are pertinent to this window of opportunity. The first is the matter of lodging. Kraus stayed on the Kohlmarkt, across from St Michael's Church and the Hofreitschule, at No. 134 on the third floor, while during this period Mozart lived a few houses away at Kohlmarkt 1179.¹⁸ Moreover, both frequented the Prater (Kraus for the first time on 4 April 1783), where Viennese citizens met and socialized. Second, there is a Masonic connection. Recent scholarship by Manfred Schuler has shown that Kraus wrote an inscription in a book belonging to Johann Georg Kronauer, a member of the Masonic Lodge Zur gekrönten Hoffnung, to which Mozart belonged.¹⁹ Kraus also allowed his silhouette to be included among the 'membership' of the lodge. The Swedish ambassador Baron Lars von Engström, who was Kraus's host during his Viennese visit, became a member of the lodge in March of 1784; as did a close friend of Kraus, the Hungarian merchant Johann Samuel Liedemann, with whom Kraus became acquainted just a few days after his arrival in Vienna, according to the travel diary. Kraus was also friendly with Ignaz von Born, master mason at the lodge Zum wahren Eintracht, one also associated with Mozart. Because the entry in Kronauer's book implies Kraus was a member of the Swedish Noachite order

library (after having survived a two-year hiatus in Paris, where much of Kraus's own music was lost) for another half a decade before being resurrected for use. This theory is even more incredible than the relatively simple expedient of Kraus receiving it from Mozart himself, given the opportunities that will be addressed shortly. See also the present author's *Dramatic Cohesion*, 329–330.

- 17 The documentary evidence is of course missing, though it must be said that Mozart's own letters (at least those that survive from this time) are lacunar and Kraus's otherwise detailed travel diary breaks off after 23 April, or less than a month after his arrival. Moreover, apart from a rather lengthy description of Maximilian Ulbrich's *Israeliten in der Wüste* performed at the Tonkünstler-Societät on 6 April, the remainder of the first days in Vienna are somewhat sketchy, including his first meeting on 14 April with Gluck. See 'Quellen zur Biographie von Joseph Martin Kraus: d) Fragment des Reisetagebuchs', trans. Hans Eppstein and Georg Helmut Fischer, *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Joseph Martin Kraus Gesellschaft* 9/10 (1989), 12–14, and the present author's 'The Travel Diary of Joseph Martin Kraus', *Journal of Musicology* 8 (1990), 282–289. That this visit with the elder composer was much more active and resulted in a considerable friendship can be seen in a letter to the assistant director of the Royal Opera, Cristoffer Zibet, the draft of which is found in the diary (see Leux-Henschen, *Briefe*, 251–252). Secondary evidence of this comes from the memoirs of Johann Friedrich Reichardt, who also visited Vienna during this time and is likewise not mentioned in Kraus's diary or letters. He noted in his own diaries published in the 1813 *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* that he, the 'sehr brav Kraus' and Gluck sought to hit the town to party, and only the feverish manoeuvring of Gluck's wife, fearing the worst for the elder composer, prevented this from happening (671). He goes on to say that the three did have some wonderful, if rather less effusive, interaction during several dinners.
- 18 Friedrich W. Riedel, 'Kraus in Wien 1783: Eindrücke und Begegnungen', in *Kraus und das Gustavianische Stockholm*, ed. Hans Åstrand and Gunnar Larsson (Stockholm: Kungliga Musikaliska Akademien, 1984), 13. The address today is Herrengasse 2–4. It is telling that Gluck lived next door to the north, at Michaelerplatz 3 on the first floor, and Kraus visited him only two weeks after his arrival. Today, Mozart's residence is Kohlmarkt 5. Mozart's address is taken from Deutsch, *Dokumente*, 190.
- 19 See Manfred Schuler, 'Joseph Martin Kraus ein Freimaurer?', in *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Joseph Martin Kraus Gesellschaft* 13/14 (1992/1993), 72–73. The inscription reads: 'Les objets, que nous voyons tous les jours/ne sont pas ceux, que nous connoissons les mieux.' It is signed and dated Vienna, 10 October.



of freemasonry, his participation as a guest in Vienna, where Mozart may have been in attendance, is extremely likely. Further, there is good evidence that the musical director of Zur gekrönten Hoffnung, Paul Wranitzky, became Kraus's composition pupil in 1784, making excellent progress in his studies, and in turn raising the level of music at the lodge.²⁰ Finally, both Mozart and Kraus dealt with Viennese publisher and copy-house owner Johann Traeg at about this time. Since this was a social as well as commercial meeting place at the Pilatus House near St Peter's, it was the ideal place for getting to know the chief musicians of the city, and, judging from the number of works he eventually included in his catalogue, Traeg was apparently particularly keen on being Kraus's Viennese distributor.

Given that the four months when their residence coincided in Vienna in 1783 were so replete with opportunities to meet, for the two to have avoided each other would be not only illogical, but hardly plausible or indeed possible. For either not to have known that a composer of some repute was housed in close proximity strains the bounds of credulity, and the possibilities of meeting, either by chance at a public place like the Prater, at court, at the Masonic lodge, or by design at a well-known copy-house/publisher, through mutual acquaintances, or as part of Kraus's own goal for his tour, are legion. Putting all of this together, it would seem that Kraus would have had to be completely impaired, isolated or subject to a deliberate act of God not to have run into Mozart even by accident at some time during the four months of their coexistence in Vienna in 1783. For Mozart simply not to have heard of Kraus would have been equally impossible, for the Swedish composer's visit was certainly no secret, especially since, as his correspondence and travel diary demonstrate, Kraus was quite gregarious in his various social and official activities.

Though the actual proof of a meeting remains elusive, only one conclusion can be drawn from such evidence: the two probably did meet on at least one occasion, even if neither spoke directly of it. There was both motive and opportunity during their lifetimes, and the knowledge and enthusiasm demonstrated by Kraus for Mozart's music clearly transcends the superficial. It is particularly telling that Kraus had inside information on the latter's latest operatic efforts, that he chose to adapt a work that was by any stretch of the imagination only available from the composer himself, and that he became one of Mozart's most ardent promoters in the far north. This preponderance of circumstantial evidence alone makes it hard to reach any other conclusion.

²⁰ See the entry by Johann Dlabacz in the *Allgemeines historisches Künstler Lexikon für Böhmen und zum Theil auch für Mähren und Schlesien* (Prague, 1815), volume 3, 415, and Schuler, 'Freimaurer', 75.