

# The Domine Jesu of Mozart's Requiem: Theory and Practice of its Completion<sup>1</sup>

The quality of Franz Xaver Süssmayr's completion of Mozart's unfinished Requiem has been the subject of fierce debate for two centuries now. After its initial positive reception, its flaws gradually surfaced, and in recent decades several alternative completions have been made. None of these, however, have so far succeeded in winning general acclaim. In this situation, unless one were to decide the work should not be performed at all, the only option is to continue striving for the most convincing blend with what Mozart left us. This article, part of a forthcoming PhD thesis on Mozart's two great unfinished sacred works, the Mass in C minor K. 427 and the Requiem K. 626, examines the Requiem's Domine Jesu movement. It analyzes the piece at length, discusses existing completions (in this case orchestrations), and offers alternative solutions.

## I. The Süssmayr Version of Mozart's Requiem and its Alternatives

For every conductor who wants to perform Mozart's Requiem – and, year after year, interest in this work seems insatiable – the question is: which version to choose? The fact is that there are six or seven of them. As is generally known, Mozart's Requiem was left unfinished at his untimely death on 5 December 1791. Only the Introitus was complete; the rest was either not yet orchestrated (the Kyrie, the Sequentia, the Offertorium), or not yet written down at all (the Lacrimosa from bar 9, and everything from the Sanctus onwards). Of the latter movements there were not even any vocal or orchestral bass parts, the ones Mozart usually wrote out in full to start with. His widow Constanze, who wanted to have the Requiem finished in order to fulfil the commission and collect the rest of the fee, first asked the talented (according to Mozart) 26-year old Joseph Eybler to take on the task. Working in Mozart's score, Eybler made an attempt, mainly adding string parts to the first five movements of the Sequentia, but eventually gave up. Constanze then turned to Mozart's assistant during the last half year of his life, the 25-year old Franz Xaver Süssmayr, who accepted the assignment. Since Eybler had used Mozart's score, Süssmayr had to write out a new one. Constanze later remembered having given him several *Zettelchen* (scribblings) she had found among Mozart's personal effects that were connected to the Requiem. Since they have never come to light, we have no idea what they contained. Süssmayr himself later claimed to have spoken many times with Mozart about the completion of the work. By spring 1792 he had finished the task, thereby not only solving a problem for Constanze but also salvaging the work for posterity.<sup>2</sup> Shortly thereafter the work was to be performed frequently, with great success, and in time it became extremely well known and beloved. Today, most conductors, of both 'traditional'

1 This article is an adaptation and combination of several chapters from my forthcoming PhD thesis, entitled *Mozart's Requiem and Great Mass. History, Theory and Practice of their Completion*. I thank Ian Gaukroger for patiently polishing my English.

2 The Kyrie fugue, immediately following Mozart's finished Introitus, had been orchestrated by unknown members of the circle around Mozart in the days immediately after his death, for a performance of the first two movements at the exequies on 10 December 1791. Freystädler and Süssmayr were not involved, as we know from the 2007 critical notes to the score in the *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe* (NMA). Süssmayr left the Kyrie as it was, took over some of Eybler's work on the Sequentia, but mostly reworked it entirely, and finished the remaining movements.

and 'historically informed' performance styles (the latter including John Eliot Gardiner, Philippe Herreweghe, William Christie, and Frans Brüggen), still use Süssmayr's completion.

Nevertheless, the quality of Süssmayr's work has been the subject of fierce debate ever since the early nineteenth century. It started with the famous *Requiem-Streit*, notably flaring up when Gottfried Weber labelled the entire work 'a forgery' in 1825. But even once the authenticity of the work had been agreed upon, widespread awareness remained, among connoisseurs at least, of the flaws in Süssmayr's work.<sup>3</sup> Brahms's opinion was that 'diese Reliquie ist verunsiert durch sehr schwache und linkische, von Einem oder Zweiem ausgeführte Versuchen, die Partitur auszufüllen.' Yet, as far as we know, it took until well into the twentieth century before any new attempts at completion were made. Most of their authors have summed up the shortcomings of Süssmayr's completion in detail, some in the prefaces and critical notes to their editions, and one of them even in a monograph. Especially targeted for criticism have been the Tuba mirum, with its overly extended trombone solo; the Sanctus, with its all too simplistic texture, conspicuous series of parallel fifths in bar 4, and extremely short Hosanna fugue; and the Benedictus, with its excessive length, the curious trombones in the background to the vocal soloists, and the eccentric B♭ major reprise of the D-major Hosanna fugue.

At this moment, there are (at least) six alternatives to 'Süssmayr'.<sup>4</sup> They are:

- 1941 Marius Flothuis, unpublished, but recorded by Jos van Veldhoven (The Netherlands Bach Society) in 2001<sup>5</sup>
- 1971/80 Franz Beyer, published by Kunzelmann; recorded by Neville Marriner, Nikolaus Harnoncourt (twice), and Sigiswald Kuijken
- 1988 Richard Maunder, published by Oxford University Press; recorded by Christopher Hogwood<sup>6</sup>
- 1991/93 Duncan Druce, published by Novello; recorded by Roger Norrington
- 1992 Harold Robbins Landon, published by Breitkopf & Härtel; recorded by Roy Goodman and Georg Solti
- 1993/96 Robert Levin, published by Carus; recorded by Martin Pearlman, Bernard Labadie, and David Runnicles

Flothuis's version, probably little known outside the Netherlands, is one by a 27-year old composer and musicologist, made for the 'modern' Concertgebouw Orchestra (1941) on

- 3 Simon Keefe, in a recent article in *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, entitled "'Die Ochsen am Berge": Franz Xaver Süssmayr and the Orchestration of Mozart's Requiem, K. 626' (Keefe 2008a) rightfully defends Süssmayr's work against any exaggerated, pedantic, biased, or poorly substantiated criticism. He argues in favour of viewing the 'alleged' weaknesses in a more historically informed perspective. However, he hardly goes into detail about the nature of the reported flaws, and even goes as far as to suggest that they exist primarily in the eyes of prejudiced people with a personal interest in debunking Süssmayr (the twentieth-century 'completers' in the first place). No wonder he received some strong responses from some of these (and other Mozart scholars) in the 'Colloquy' section of the next issue of *JAMS* (61/2). Keefe's reply, no less fierce, gives one the impression that a new *Requiem-Streit* is about to flame up, almost two centuries after the first one.
- 4 Matthias Korten (1999) discusses a version by Hans-Josef Irmén from 1977 in addition to the ones I discuss here.
- 5 I am grateful to Jan Hemmer, librarian of The Netherlands Bach Society, who was so kind as to lend me a copy of Flothuis's score for the purpose of this study.
- 6 In the same year Richard Maunder published a book on his work: *Mozart's Requiem: On Preparing a New Edition*.

the occasion of the 150th anniversary of Mozart's death to meet at least two very different needs: (a) to repair what Flothuis and the conductor Eduard van Beinum then considered the most obvious flaws, such as the overly long trombone solo in the *Tuba mirum*, some excessive use of trumpets, timpani, and trombones (e.g. in the background to the vocal soloists), and the odd reprise of the Hosanna fugue in the 'wrong key' (Flothuis recapitulates it in the home key); (b) adapting the trombone parts for the instruments of the Concertgebouw Orchestra anno 1941. Of course, the latter need had become non-existent by 2001, the year of the recording (on period instruments), and these adaptations were no longer used then, as Flothuis himself explains in the notes he fortunately still was able to write for the project (Flothuis died on 13 November 2001).<sup>7</sup>

Beyer criticizes Süssmayr's orchestration harshly. His re-orchestration is much more sweeping than that of Flothuis. But, like Flothuis, he leaves Süssmayr's compositional work (*Lacrimosa*, *Sanctus* etc.) mainly as it is.

Maunder's is the most radically different version. Not only does he re-orchestrate most movements, he also recomposes the continuation (from bar 9 onwards) of the *Lacrimosa*, adds an Amen fugue based on Mozart's sketch found in the early 1960's,<sup>8</sup> and deletes the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* completely. In the *Agnus Dei*, however, the only Süssmayr movement he considers worth retaining, he limits himself to some compositional repairs.

Druce makes radical changes as well, but does not excise any movements. Apart from his new orchestration, he recomposes the *Lacrimosa* (from bar 9), the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* partially, and the *Benedictus* almost completely, with a return of the Hosanna in D major (like Flothuis). He also offers new Amen and Hosanna fugues, both of them of considerable length.

Landon's work is of an entirely different category. Basically he tries to rehabilitate Eybler's work on the *Sequentia*, which he esteems 'incomparably better' than Süssmayr's.<sup>9</sup> Everything left open by Eybler is filled in with Süssmayr's solutions, supplemented now and then with a few notes by the editor. Thus from the *Lacrimosa* onwards Robbins Landon follows Süssmayr exactly, meaning that for this article on the *Domine Jesu* his version may be disregarded.

Finally, Levin's endeavour is another new orchestration of the movements for which Mozart wrote the vocal and orchestral bass parts. As to the Süssmayr movements, Levin attempts to improve rather than recompose them. Like Druce, however, he writes fairly extended Amen and Hosanna fugues, the latter returning in the home key following the *Benedictus*. Levin is the only one to use A-clarinets for the D-major *Sanctus* and Hosanna, a difficult key for the basset horns (in F). But here he forces the players to change instrument no fewer than four times in succession, with hardly any break. In such cases Mozart always leaves ample time for the player to warm up the other instrument (e.g. in *Die Zauberflöte*).<sup>10</sup>

As may be expected, each of these alternative versions offers interesting and convincing ideas, but they have problematic aspects as well. Of course opinions differ widely, and none of the alternatives so far has been able to win general acclaim and to supersede Süssmayr's version. Given this situation, unless one were to decide the work should not be performed at all, there is room for new alternatives, for new solutions that possibly correspond more closely with what Mozart left us.

7 See Wennekes 1997 and Flothuis's notes accompanying the compact disc recorded by The Netherlands Bach Society under Jos van Veldhoven (2001).

8 See e.g. Wolff 1991, p. 36, or Wolff 1994, pp. 32-33.

9 See Landon's afterword to his edition, p. 182.

10 In the Foreword to his edition (p. XXVI), Levin says that the clarinet pauses for changing instruments in *Così fan tutte* are relatively short. In fact they last ca. 2.5 minutes.

This article analyzes the existing versions and offers alternative solutions for one movement of the work, the Domine Jesu (Audio Example). As stated above, this is one of the movements that Mozart composed in full but left unorchestrated. To start with, I present an analysis of the piece as Mozart left it, concentrating mainly on its text and overall musical form. In doing so, I refer to Mozart's incomplete score and Süßmayr's additions, for which I recommend the reader to use the *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe*.<sup>11</sup> I then discuss the choice of instruments.<sup>12</sup> Subsequently, I go through the movement section by section, first analyzing the music in greater detail, then discussing the various options for orchestration.

## II. The Domine Jesu: Analysis

*Domine Jesu Christe, Rex gloriae, libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum de poenis inferni, et de profundo lacu:*

*libera eas de ore leonis, ne absorbeat eas tartarus, ne cadant in obscurum:*

*sed signifer sanctus Michael repraesentet eas in lucem sanctam:*

*Quam olim Abrahae promisisti et semini ejus.*

*Lord Jesus Christ, King of Glory, deliver the souls of all the faithful departed from the pains of hell and from the bottomless pit:*

*release them from the lion's jaw, lest Tartarus swallow them, lest they fall into darkness;*

*Let the standard bearer, Holy Michael, guide them into the Holy light;*

*which once you promised to Abraham and his descendants.*

In contrast to the preceding *Sequentia*, in which the speaker is praying for his or her own personal salvation on the day of final judgement, the *Offertorium* is a supplication for the salvation of others, namely those who have left us already. Hence it strikes a milder, more altruistic tone. Also, it is the community speaking, not so much the individual. All this is noticeable in Mozart's setting, which is both rounder and more compact compared to the broadly presented extreme contrasts of the *Sequentia*. Being a more compressed statement, the *Domine Jesu* seems even more intense and urgent. From its very opening theme in the main key of G minor onwards, it quickly alternates between various textures, roaming through many keys and moods in quick succession, before finally broaching its last and most intense part: a fugue on 'Quam olim', arguably the emotional climax of the whole *Requiem*. This fugue is repeated in its entirety after the ensuing *Hostias*, forming the second part of the *Offertorium*.

Mozart must have been particularly impressed by the G-minor *Domine Jesu* from Michael Haydn's 1771 *Requiem* in C minor,<sup>13</sup> because the similarities between Haydn's setting and his own, of twenty years later, are many. In his book on Mozart's *Requiem*, Richard Maunder mentions those at 'Rex gloriae' (ascending leap, descending steps), 'de profundo lacu' (unexpected and exceptionally chromatic modulation downwards), 'ne absorbeat' (choral fugato over restless string figures), and 'Quam olim Abrahae' (choral

11 NMA II/5/Abt. 2/1 ('Mozarts Fragment'), and II/5/Abt. 2/2 ('Mozarts Fragment mit den Ergänzungen von Eybler und Süßmayr'). For study purposes, the NMA is available at <http://dme.mozarteum.at/DME/nma/start.php?l=>

12 In the English language, a translation of the German 'Besetzung' (Dutch 'bezetting') is somewhat problematic. 'Instrumentation' seems to be used mostly, but the continental Germanic languages use that term more or less as an equivalent for 'orchestration'. To avoid misunderstandings, I use 'choice of instruments'.

13 Michael Haydn's C-minor *Requiem* was written for the funeral of Salzburg's Archbishop von Schrattenbach, the predecessor of Mozart's well-known later employer Colloredo. Mozart (at fifteen, almost sixteen) and his father, both members of the court orchestra, probably played the violin on this occasion (January 1772).

fugue with similar subject).<sup>14</sup> There are even more, as we shall find out.

Mozart's *Domine Jesu* was analyzed by Hermann Abert in the early 1920s and by August Gerstmeier in the late 1990s.<sup>15</sup> Both authors see it as a three-part form, but in different ways. They agree on the beginning of the second part: the Ab-major second appearance of the main subject at 'libera'. Abert, however, takes 'Quam olim' as the third part, ignoring the new start at 'sed signifer'. Gerstmeier, on the other hand, does recognize this new start, taking the return of the *Eingangsmotiv* as his criterion. He labels his 'drei Einheiten' 'A, B, C+D', the third part consisting of both the 'sed signifer' section ('C') and the 'Quam olim' fugue ('D'). I concur with his reading, but I think there is more to be said. Gerstmeier's parts A, B and C have many characteristics of a sonata exposition, development, and recapitulation respectively, something found frequently in Mozart's vocal music, his church music in particular. I prefer, therefore, to speak of a fusion of sonata form and fugue, something that had been developed in church music for some decades (certainly by Mozart's time), traces of which can be found as early as in Michael Haydn's *Domine Jesu* setting. In his book *Mozart in Salzburg* (2006, pp. 60-62), Manfred Hermann Schmid analyzes the Kyrie of Michael Haydn's 1777 *Hieronymusmesse*, calling it a 'Musterbeispiel des Ausgleichs von Sonatensatz und Fuge'.<sup>16</sup> Another impressive early example of a similar hybrid is the Gloria of Mozart's own *Missa Longa*, K. 262 (1775), also mentioned by Schmid. Its 'Qui tollis' section even contains very expressive unexpected cadences similar to the ones in the Requiem's *Domine Jesu*. However, the main inspiration for Mozart's *Domine Jesu* seems to have been the parallel movement from Michael Haydn's 1771 Requiem.

Table 1 gives a formal overview of Mozart's *Domine Jesu*, which I now invite the reader to study with the score of Mozart's fragment, and possibly with a recording as well.<sup>17</sup>

Table 1

Formal overview of the *Domine Jesu*.

Text	Bars	Sections	Keys	Cadences
'Domine... defunctorum'	1-7/3	Theme 1 (+ short transition)	g	half
'de poenis... lacu:'	7/3-15/1	Theme 2 (+ short transition)	B <sup>b</sup> - c - A <sup>b</sup> - c	perfect authentic
'libera... leonis'	15/1-20	Development: a (theme 1, sequence)	A <sup>b</sup> - b <sup>b</sup> / b <sup>b</sup> - c	half
'ne absorbeat... obscurum:'	21-32/1	Development: b (fugato for choir)	c - F - d - g	half
'sed signifer... sanctam:'	32/3-43/3	'Recapitulation': theme 1 (fugato for soloists)	g - c - f - B <sup>b</sup> - g	half
'Quam olim... et semini ejus,'	44-53/2	Fugue exposition (incl. modulating episode)	g - d - g - d - B <sup>b</sup>	–
'quam... ejus,'	53-58/2	Fugue development: a (theme in various keys)	B <sup>b</sup> - c - d	–
'quam... ejus,'	58-67/1	Fugue development: b (fauxbourdon, dominant pedal, climax and first cadence)	g	perfect authentic
'et semini ejus,'	67-71/1	Conclusion: a (circle of fifths and second cadence)	g	perfect authentic
'quam... promisisti,'	71-75/1	Conclusion: b (lamento bass and third cadence)	g	perfect authentic
'et semini ejus.'	75/2-78	Conclusion: c (final cadence)	g	plagal

14 Maunder 1988, pp. 82-88.

15 Abert 1923-24, pp. 874-877, or 2007, pp. 1328-1330. Gerstmeier 1997, pp. 105-114.

16 'A model example of an equipoise between sonata movement and fugue.'

17 Any recording can serve here, especially when listened to with Mozart's incomplete score at hand.

As may be clear from this overview, I see the opening of the movement as a compact sonata form: a concise exposition with two contrasting themes – the second of these moving away from the home key – followed by a development that ultimately returns to the home key for a recapitulation.<sup>18</sup> As usual, the second theme starts in the relative major and ends with a full cadence, but its harmony is very unstable (as in Haydn), and the cadence is, surprisingly enough, in the subdominant key of C minor (Haydn lands in D minor). Thus, in spite of the perfect authentic cadence that ends it, this theme already has a restless, developmental character, obviously hinting at the fears expressed in the text (as with Haydn again). The development section ‘proper’, on a text that depicts further horrors that may await the deceased (‘libera eas...’), consists of a short development of theme 1 (as in Haydn), followed by a modulating choral fugato (once again parallel with Haydn) over restless string figures, discharging itself into a half-cadence in the home key, following convention. (Haydn writes a similar half-cadence, but in the relative major.) A G-minor ‘recapitulation’ of theme 1 follows, but this time the theme’s first motif is worked out as a (second) fugato, now for the quartet of soloists, starting with the soprano. (Haydn has a soprano solo here, but with a new theme in the relative major, later modulating back to the home key.) The solo fugato makes a short harmonic excursion – ‘all follow the standard bearer’, the music seems to say – before returning to G minor for the final bars of theme 1 (bars 4-7), which *are* restated literally. Thus, it is both recapitulation *and* further development. The second theme (‘de poenis’), however, does not return at all;<sup>19</sup> it is ‘replaced’ by the ‘Quam olim’ fugue, the older style appropriately illustrating the word ‘olim’.

This fugue is a complete musical form in itself, with its own exposition, development, and concluding sections. (Indeed, the movement features *two* formal development sections.) It becomes the dramatic apotheosis and climax of the whole movement. Its concluding sections gradually return to a more homophonic texture, thereby enclosing the ‘strict-style’ sections in more ‘modern’ sounding ones. All in all, the form of the movement is a hybrid, one of Mozart’s most brilliant fusions of contemporary sonata and old fugal form, one leading into the other, to heightened dramatic effect. Thus, it points forward to the way Beethoven was to use fugal techniques for building great dramatic climaxes. No wonder this composer lost his temper when Gottfried (‘Giffried’) Weber proclaimed the work to be a forgery.<sup>20</sup>

### III. The Choice of Instruments

In orchestrating the *Domine Jesu* one first has to decide what instruments to use. In Mozart’s autograph score, 78 bars on thirteen pages of oblong twelve-stave music manuscript paper (the maximum size available in Vienna at that time),<sup>21</sup> we see the following:

- Staves 1 and 2: ‘Violini’ with treble clefs, key signature (two flats) and time signature (common time). In bars 43/3-46/1 (beginning of the ‘Quam olim’ fugue), Mozart wrote a fragment for violin I, in bars 67-71 for violin I and II, and from bar 71 to the end for violin I.

18 Good examples of compact vocal sonata *expositions* are Mozart’s arias ‘Der Hölle Rache’ and ‘Ach, ich fühl’ s’, nos. 14 and 17 from *Die Zauberflöte*. Apart from their quite different tempi and moods, they have several features in common with the *Domine Jesu*: the minor key, a first theme ending with a half-cadence, and a quick modulation to the relative major, the key of the second theme. In both cases this theme ends with a full cadence in the relative key, the normal procedure.

19 In Haydn, the first theme does not return, but the second one does, partly, in the soprano solo’s transition back to the home key.

20 See for instance Wolff 1991, pp. 14-21, or 1994, pp. 7-14.

21 A facsimile edition of the original manuscript was published in 1990 by Bärenreiter.

- Stave 3: ‘Viole’, with alto clef, key signature and time signature
- Staves 4-7: empty
- Staves 8-11: ‘Canto, Alto, Tenore, Basso’; the complete, 78-bar vocal setting, ‘Tutti’ and ‘Solo’ alternately. Normally these are also the staves used for the alto, tenor and bass trombones, whose traditional role is to double the three lowest choir voices (apart from incidental special features, such as the ‘announcements’ in the first movements of both the Mass in C minor and the Requiem).
- Stave 12: ‘Bassi’, i.e. the complete orchestral bass part, with clear indications ‘Violoncelli’ and ‘Bassi’ (meaning all bass instruments). Remarkably, in bars 21-28 (the choral fugato on ‘ne absorbeat’) Mozart gives figures for the organ. Not only is this proof that Mozart actually intended ‘Organo e Bassi’ (as he writes elsewhere), we are also informed quite precisely as to what harmonies Mozart had in mind for this passage. It will appear to be of crucial importance for the orchestration.

The four empty staves 4-7 leave room for all the other instruments Mozart used in the Introitus: two *Corni di Bassetto*, two *Fagotti*, two *Clarini*, each pair on one staff (staves 4, 5, and 6), and timpani (stave 7). Yet it is unlikely that Mozart intended to use *clarini* and timpani in this movement. There are several reasons for this. The first is a practical one: the fact that the trumpets and timpani are in D creates the availability of D overtones in the *clarini*, while the timpani are only able to play D and A.<sup>22</sup> This severely limits their usefulness in a movement in the subdominant key of G minor. A second, even more important argument is the nature of the music Mozart composed here. As mentioned before, the Domine Jesu music is of a restrained urgency. Trumpets and drums could easily disturb this affect. None of the existing completions use *clarini* and timpani.

The only instruments to add, except for the strings and trombones, are woodwinds. With one staff for each of them, ample space would also be available for independent voices in each of these instruments, fitting well with the many polyphonic passages in the movement. The Süssmayr manuscript, however, reveals an interesting fact: Süssmayr uses the lowest two of the four free staves for the trombones, necessary if their parts differ from the choral parts. And Süssmayr indeed often gives them rhythmically different (simplified) versions of the choral parts. This is an option to bear in mind.

#### IV. Orchestration

I will now discuss each fragment, first analyzing its musical content more in detail (and in relation to the text), then examining the various existing orchestrations and my own solutions.

##### Bars 1-7: ‘Domine Jesu Christe, Rex gloriae, libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum’ (Theme 1)

As demonstrated, Mozart sets the first sentence up to ‘de profundo lacu’ as a single section, a compact (sonata) exposition. The section ‘Domine ... defunctorum’ forms a first theme, ending in a half-cadence at bar 7/1. Its syntax is unusually asymmetrical, a two-bar unit being followed by a one-bar unit, and the harmonic rhythm accelerating from one to four chords in a bar. The first motif (*piano*) is based on chordal arpeggiation ( $\hat{1}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{3}$ ) per half-note, with eighths in the bass; the second motif (bar 3, *forte*) is a descending tetrachord from  $\hat{8}$  to  $\hat{5}$  per quarter note, closely related to the motif  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  heard so often in the Introitus as an inversion of what could be called the ‘Requiem motif’:  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}$ , the opening theme

22 The possibility of Mozart asking for a quick retuning, after the Lacrimosa, of the A-timpano to G, and another one back to A before the Sanctus, can be ruled out. In his masses, (church performance, all ceremonial movements in the tonic key, the key of the trumpets), Mozart never asks for retunings. In his operas (stage noise, many keys) he does, but he gives the player ample time for it.

of the whole work.<sup>23</sup> The bass significantly has scales and broken chords in sixteenths.

In his contribution to *Mozart Studien* (publ. 1997), August Gerstmeier shows how out of the ordinary this three-bar setting of the invocation is.<sup>24</sup> The text is in two fragments of unequal length ('Domine Jesu Christe, Rex gloriae'). By respecting its irregularity, Mozart actually puts it to musical advantage, unlike many of his contemporaries (among whom Michael Haydn), who in various ways 'equalize' it to fit it into two or four bars. Mozart's surprisingly irregular opening is followed by a more regular four-bar continuation, in which the descending tetrachord is continued downwards and elaborated more polyphonically in eighth notes, reminding us even more of the inverted 'Requiem motif'. The harmony first calms down in bars 4-5, then accelerates again, with, in the bass, a descending tetrachord from  $\hat{1}$  to  $\hat{5}$  (the well-known diatonic 'lamento' bass figure) towards the half-cadence in bar 7.

The orchestration of this first theme raises several interesting questions. To begin with, Süßmayr's string arrangement of bars 1 and 2 is viewed very differently by the various later editors. It is easy to see it as a 'filled-in' version of the theme, the first violins containing its main notes on each beat, each time prepared by two groups of sixteenths divided between (subsequently) second and first violins. The first question is whether this sixteenth-note filling is adequate. Maunder and Druce feel they go too far. Maunder even says it is 'wrong ... to anticipate the semiquaver movement of bar 3', choosing instead to double the choir in the strings.<sup>25</sup> Druce decides on eighth notes together with the bass figure, doing the same in each later appearance of this motif. Flothuis, Beyer, and Levin, on the other hand, agree with Süßmayr's sixteenths, and so do I. Their rustling sound seems perfectly adequate to express a mood of suppressed agitation. Furthermore, the arpeggios are diminutions of the larger-scale arpeggio of the theme itself, and they anticipate the sixteenths under the choral fugato that begins in bar 21. They sound excellent, good enough to be Mozart's own idea (although we will never know of course). The viola sounds fine in parallel thirds with the bass, a device known in German as *Austerzung* (of the bass, in this case). These thirds, however, do limit the number of possibilities for sixteenth-note arpeggios, since parallel octaves between the ornamental eighths and sixteenths would be audible to a sharp ear. This may have been the reason why Levin scored the viola in unison with the bass. His solution sounds acceptable too, since the harmony is already more than complete. The question 'Austerzung or unison?' returns in bars 14-16, where more complications arise. Levin's inversions of the arpeggios in violin I, bar 2, seem somewhat disturbing to me; I therefore adhere to Süßmayr's ascending ones.

As for the winds, Süßmayr omits them here, and most others agree. Beyer and Druce, however, do add woodwinds. This idea appeals to me too because it expresses, right from the start, the communal quality of this movement. For the woodwinds, the rhythm of the vocal parts has to be 'smoothed out': repetitions are replaced by longer notes, following Mozart's example in woodwind doublings. (Examples are easily found in the Mass in C minor, K. 427.) Unlike Beyer, Druce and I feel that the top line of the winds should follow the sopranos.

The 'Rex gloriae' of bar 3 is the obvious place for the orchestra to present itself at full strength. With its simple but effective VI-III-iv-i progression,<sup>26</sup> this is a bar where little can go wrong, and Süßmayr's version is followed by many others. He has the trombones double the choir, but, remarkably, in smoothed-out rhythm, which is conventional for

23 I use the Schenkerian caret ( ^ ) for indicating the position of the individual note in the scale.

24 Gerstmeier 1997, pp. 105-114. This analysis on pp. 106-109.

25 Maunder 1988, p. 180.

26 Capital Roman numerals stand for chords with a major third, small case Roman numerals for chords with a minor third.

woodwinds but not for trombones. His violins double the choir as well, though in parallel thirds, with low thirds on the offbeat eighths.<sup>27</sup> His basset horns, also in smoothed-out rhythm, do the same, but in parallel sixths, a chord position lower. His violas and bassoons move with the basses. Flothuis changed the basset horns to high parallel thirds in unison with the violins, thereby having the first basset horn play in its highest register, which is not only possible, but also musically logical.<sup>28</sup> His change in the first trombone, having it double the soprano rather than the alto, is understandable, but I do not know of a single example in which Mozart has just one trombone depart from its normal doubling role while the other two adhere to theirs.

Beyer has the woodwinds enunciate the rhythm of the text and gives the trombones a smoothed-out version, thereby reversing Mozart's habitual practice. He also gives the violins jabbing triple stops on each beat, thus creating an aggressive effect I would not associate with gloriousness. Druce's version is similar. Both Maunder and Levin try to maximize the contrast between this bar and the previous ones, all their strings playing in unison. I have avoided this, since there is no strong contrast in the text. Another probable intention of their versions is to have the bar sound like a premonition to the 'ne absorbeat' choral fugato. I prefer to reserve the string *unisono*, a very forceful device (not exactly suggesting 'gloriousness'), for places where the text really demands grimness (as well as the earlier *Confutatis* movement). Maunder's woodwind treatment in parallel thirds, each pair in its own register, is fine, and typically Mozartean. I opt for the same solution, and I also retain Süssmayr's strings.

The continuation of the theme, in bars 4-7, with its quasi-polyphonic choral setting, leaves little option but to double the choir in the strings, slightly smoothed-out in terms of rhythm.<sup>29</sup> All editors leave this fragment entirely to the strings, but I prefer to continue the woodwind doubling of bars 1 and 2, as an expression of the communal character. At the solo quartet recapitulation of the first theme, in bars 32-43, I leave out the winds for contrast, but let them rejoin the texture smoothly when all soloists come together, as a heightened recapitulatory effect. At the same time this is a satisfying way of 'inviting' the choir back in, for the big 'Quam olim' fugue.

### Bar 7: Transition

The transition from V in G minor to I in its relative key, B $\flat$  major, the usual second-theme key, is a quick one, but well known from many other pieces: just two whole steps down in the bass (all that Mozart gives here): D-C- B $\flat$ , suggesting the chords D - F7/C - B $\flat$ .<sup>30</sup>

- 27 Maunder (1988, p. 181) sees parallel octaves between violin II and the bass in Süssmayr's version, something that, according to him, 'is bound to happen if the tenors are doubled by strings'. He must mean *d* to *c* and *b $\flat$*  to *a*. But in the bass these notes are just ornamental, part of descending arpeggios, the main notes being *b $\flat$*  and *g* against the tenor's *d* and *b $\flat$* ; so parallel thirds in reality. Maunder has a much too strict idea of forbidden parallels, as his chapter on Mozart's counterpoint shows. Maunder 1988, pp. 25-32.
- 28 The *d*<sup>3</sup> is the highest note Mozart generally writes for basset horn. Although he writes it only once in the *Introitus*, many examples can be found in his chamber music for basset horns. Since this note (and the *c*<sup>#3</sup>) are above the high register break, Mozart is careful not to write too fast or complex passages containing these notes, unless in solo pieces, such as the unfinished (abandoned?) version for basset horn in G of the *Clarinet Concerto*. Since Mozart probably did not know which players were going to perform the *Requiem*, he probably would have been careful here too.
- 29 Only Süssmayr's strange connection from the previous fragment, on beat 1 of bar 4 in the violins, and beat 1 and 2 of the violas, needs a repair, but this is easy.
- 30 I use chord symbols as well-known from jazz. The letter behind the slash indicates the bass note, a practice used when the bass note is not the root, or is a note foreign to the indicated chord.

Süssmayr's version presents not only a rhythmical problem – his syncopations are uncomfortably fast indeed – but a harmonic one too. He uses more chords than the listener can possibly digest (see his figures underneath): D - Dm - C - F7/C in half a bar. Yet the other extreme, just the simple chords, at each quarter note (Beyer), sounds a bit blunt to my ears. A bridge in eighth notes in the middle of eighth-note passages – the solution opted for by Maunder, Druce and Levin, more or less following the suggestion of Ernst Hess – sounds uninteresting to me.<sup>31</sup> Maunder's comparison with bar 10 of 'Der Hölle Rache' (*Die Zauberflöte*) does not hold, for we do not need legato here, and in his combination of legato and staccato I cannot recognize Mozart's style. For me, sixteenths form a welcome change and a natural connection with the opening bars. I think Beyer's alternative to Süssmayr's equally impractical syncopations in the parallel bar 9, works perfectly well. It is also a diminution of the orchestral bass line of bar 8. For bar 7, I have tried to think of something similar.

### Bars 7/3-14: 'de poenis inferni, et de profundo lacu:' (Theme 2)

A characteristic of the second theme is its ascending octave plus descending arpeggio (relating to the ascending arpeggios of theme 1) presented by the sopranos alone. The following long note and its repeat are accompanied by the choir, with the 'Requiem motif' as a bass line, broken by low Fs in the orchestral bass. After a sequence on the same words a tone higher in C minor (bars 10-11/1), a surprise follows at bar 11/2, on 'et de profundo lacu': an inversion of the octave motif, harmonized with an A<sup>b</sup> chord – foreign to B<sup>b</sup> major, but a perfect musical suggestion of a 'bottomless pit'. The music, continuing with stepwise progressions in all voices (the tenor having the 'Requiem motif' in retrograde), first seems to confirm A<sup>b</sup> major, but then modulates via a chromatic progression we have heard before in the final section of the Confutatis, leading to a completely unexpected cadence in C minor.<sup>32</sup> As mentioned earlier, this is strongly reminiscent of the parallel place in Michael Haydn's C-minor Requiem of 1771. We arrive here at the first perfect authentic cadence, and the next one does not occur until near the end of the movement.

Süssmayr's accompaniment is, again, a doubling of the choir by the strings alone, with syncopations at two speeds (eighths and sixteenths) for the longer notes. Like his eighth-note repetitions in bars 11-13,<sup>33</sup> it works very well. Neither Beyer's staccato nor Levin's alternating sixteenths in bars 8 and 10 seem an improvement. Maunder and Druce again eliminate the sixteenths, which robs the music of a vital element. Both Beyer and Maunder call in the help of the woodwinds. Beyer starts on the second beat of each sub-phrase. In Maunder the effect is less successful because he has the wind fulfil two opposed functions: doubling each of the choir phrases *and* giving a connecting phrase ('fill') in bar 9. I prefer simply to continue the choir doubling in the wind, but with the basset horns doubling the alto and tenor. For a suggestion of the 'bottomless pit', the trombones seem to provide the ideal colour.

### Bars 14-20: Transition & 'libera eas de ore leonis,' (Development, first section)

Just as in bar 7, Mozart indicates the transition in bar 14 by writing a bass line only. Harmonically it must be almost identical, so: Cm - E<sup>b</sup>7/B<sup>b</sup> - A<sup>b</sup>. It goes at half speed, though, giving the listener some breathing space after the unexpected modulations just

31 Hess 1959, pp. 99-108; this commentary on p. 106.

32 Both here and in the Confutatis the modulation makes use of a 'common-tone diminished seventh chord': a diminished seventh chord that is, unexpectedly, resolved to a dominant seventh chord on the same bass note (the common tone).

33 Maunder 'avoided [them] (except in bar 13) lest they become tedious' (1988, p.182). Yet this is standard eighteenth-century practice.

heard. Mozart reintroduces the eighth-note accompaniment pattern of the first theme, with rests on the first and third beats, preparing the first theme's return. Again, as in bar 7, the arrival in a major key is a relief, but likewise it does not last long. The development starts with an  $A\flat$ -major version of theme 1, on 'libera eas', the sopranos beginning alone, imitated by the rest of the choir half a bar later. The harmony is a little more elaborate: I-vi-V-I, with a 4-3 suspension on V. Again there are irregular units of three bars. But the third bar is now different, to fit 'de ore leonis'. In forceful unison, an ascending minor seventh (sopranos) effectively depicts the opening of the lion's jaw (recalling 'de poenis inferni' as well). Harmonically, bar 17 suggests the dominant of a new key, one note higher (just as in theme 2). A sequence follows, in  $B\flat$  minor indeed, in turn moving up to C minor. And, like that which follows the rising sequence in theme 2, a musical suggestion of hell is to follow ('ne absorbeat eas tartarus').

Since Mozart prepares the return of theme 1 in the transition (the offbeat bass pattern), it is only logical that the strings will take up their sixteenth patterns again. This time, however, Süssmayr uses violas instead of second violins to alternate with the first violins. At first this seems unnecessary and illogical, but it may have to do with the different bass line and the suspension in bar 16, which put new limitations on the positioning of the sixteenth-note arpeggios, certainly if the violas move in thirds with the bass again. Probably Süssmayr discovered that, in order to avoid parallel octaves, it was best to have the main notes of the sixteenth-note patterns move in octaves with the bass, which is possible in the viola (bass doubling being a normal function of the viola), but not in the second violin parts. Therefore, he simply had the second violin and viola switch roles, the *Austerzung* now appearing in the second violin. If we do not like this solution, we clearly cannot just switch back these roles again. Beyer partially exchanges the middle parts, adapting the sixteenth-note patterns to avoid parallels. But this creates a somewhat disorderly texture. Maunder keeps bar 14 'as simple and "neutral" as possible', using eighth notes 'so as not to anticipate the rather more complex rhythms of the next few bars'.<sup>34</sup> Yet something livelier is suggested by Mozart's *forte*. In bars 16-17 Maunder does not double the choir as he did in bars 1-2, but rather does three different things at the same time: Süssmayr's 'filled in' top line of bars 32/3 etc. in violin I (although Maunder does *not* do that in bar 32), *Austerzung* in violin II, and long notes in the split violas; all in all I feel this is too complex and unclear. Maunder defends it with a reference to the 'suggestion of imitation' in the choir, a forerunner of the fugal sections to come. But the choir imitation is at a half bar distance, and Maunder's violins at one beat.

Druce, in bar 14, has the woodwinds anticipate the imitation between sopranos and the rest of the choir of bar 15. He doubles the choir in the woodwinds and has the strings move with the bass, as he does in bars 1-2, 15-16 and 32/3 etc. This is a consistent solution. Levin prefers sixteenths but, unlike Süssmayr, brings them back in the original instruments, violins II and I (in order of appearance). I agree. Levin, though, has the violas play in unison with the basses (also in bars 1-2), while I prefer thirds (or another chord note if necessary). As to the question when to write unison and when *Austerzung* (between violas and basses, or between violins I and II, in situations where both are harmonically possible), I think we can find a clue in Mozart's own *Austerzung* in the violins in bars 67-70. The fact that he uses it there, at a moment of sudden *piano*, seems to indicate it is a matter of dynamics too: unison is by nature more *forte*, strong, emphatic, while thirds are softer, more *dolce*. This is also clearly demonstrated by the *Gratias* from the C-minor Mass, K. 427. I think bars 1-2 and 15-16 benefit from the softer sound. Levin's viola unison, on the other hand, leaves him more choices for the second violin in sixteenths. Yet he still has one parallel with the bass, in bar 16, third to

34 Maunder 1988, p. 182.

fourth beat. Here, I have adapted the viola part slightly, in order to make my violin II part possible. In bar 16, just as in bar 2, Levin inverts the arpeggio in violin I, which I prefer not to do. Just as in bars 1 and 2, I add woodwinds. Because of the reappearance in bar 14 of the string figures of the beginning, I have the winds start there too, bridging the gap between the sopranos' ending and new beginning, and following the line of violin I, in anticipation of the melodic curves to come.

Obviously, bars 17 and 20 must be in unison as well, and Süssmayr's higher strings in contrary motion with Mozart's bass octaves obviously represent the melodic line more adequately. Maunder and Levin, unlike Süssmayr and Beyer, have the violas move with the upward octaves of the basses instead of the downward ones of the violins. Again it is confirmed by the *Gratias* of K. 427. Another difference between the editors is the choice of register for the winds. Most of them respect Mozart's normal highest notes for bassoon and basset horn, but Maunder dares to let them go a semitone higher, in this (indeed) extreme situation.<sup>35</sup> I prefer to abide by Mozart's usual boundaries.

### Bars 21-31: 'ne absorbeat eas tartarus, ne cadant in obscurum:'

#### (Development, second section)

Mozart sets the words 'ne absorbeat eas tartarus' as an intense choral fugato, over a restless sixteenth-note bass line, more than nine bars long. The subject, in eighth notes, two bars long, features a chain of falling sevenths, clearly representing the falling into the underworld, and connecting up with the rising octave of 'de poenis', the falling octave of 'et de profundo', and the rising seventh of 'de ore leonis'. Abert analyzes this subject, splendidly, as a hidden polyphony, by thinking all its notes as lengthened until the next note in their own register.<sup>36</sup> Thus, the subject appears to be a semi-displaced and slightly expanded quasi-two-part version of the inverted 'Requiem motif',  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ , now becoming  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{4}-\hat{5}-\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}$  (per quarter note), with every second note in the lower octave. There is also a close resemblance with the well-known plainchant 'Dies irae' melody:  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  (per quarter note), of which our subject is almost a complete parallel voice in thirds.

The subject is stated four times successively: by the tenors in C minor, the altos in F major, the sopranos in D minor, and finally by the basses in G minor, the four entries together forming a modulating fugal exposition. At first the order of keys and voices may seem a little arbitrary, but Abert demonstrates the logic as follows: 'Die Folge *gc-ad* läßt eine harmonische Sequenz erkennen. Beide Stimmenpaare stellen eine absteigende Skala her, Tenor und Alt von *g* bis *f*, Sopran und Baß von *a* bis *b*, denn die eine Stimme beginnt immer mit dem Schlußton der andern.'<sup>37</sup> If we consider the top-note registers of the tenor and the alto ( $g^1-c^1$  and  $c^2-f^1$ ), then the soprano and the bass ( $a^2-d^2$  and  $d^1-[g]$ ), two units of four bars become evident (bars 21/2-25/1 and 25/2-29/1), a sequence that moves one tone higher. This explains the rising tension in spite of the falling lines of the paired entries. Of course this sequence also explains the key pattern (C minor to F major and D minor to G minor). The fact that there is just one major key involved against three minor is explained by their relation to the main key of G minor.

More remarkable, and more puzzling for the listener, is the fact that each statement of

35 Maunder, in defence of these high notes for the basset horns, refers to the Clarinet Quintet. But this is a solo part for the virtuoso Anton Stadler, while the Requiem probably had to be playable by orchestral musicians.

36 Abert 1923-24, p. 875, or 2007, p. 1259.

37 Abert 1923-24, p. 875 (note 4), or 2007, p. 1329 (note 84): 'The notes *gc-ad* reveal a harmonic sequence. Both pairs of voices produce a descending scale, tenor and alto from *g* to *f*, soprano and bass from *a* to *b* flat, each voice invariably starting with the final note of the other.' Abert chooses the opening top notes of the theme, on the weak beats, to demonstrate this sequence. If we choose the bottom notes, falling on the downbeats, we recognize the 'Requiem tetrachord'  $\hat{6}-\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ .

the subject is harmonized differently. Mozart carefully figures the bass line until bar 29. These harmonizations are best understood as counterpoints of the orchestral bass, per quarter note, against the subject. The four series of intervals are:

Tenor entry:	3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3
Alto entry:	6-6-3-6-3-6-3-3
Soprano entry:	7-3-3-6-3-6-3-3
Bass entry (obviously):	1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1

Mozart completes these minimal harmonies in his bass figurations.

The first two counterpoints are obvious possibilities in smooth imperfect consonances. The first one is completed in the figuration to become a circle-of-fifths cadence.<sup>38</sup> A special note, at 22/2, is the raised  $\hat{6}$  (*a*). If it were for the harmony this would have been an *ab* just like at following beat. But the bass pattern has its lower turning point (halfway through the beat) at that note, and with an *ab* it would create an awkward tritone leap to the *d* of the next beat. The raised  $\hat{6}$  makes the bass line run more smoothly. In the pattern on the third beat the note has to be lowered again, now being a high point. The line *a-ab* clearly does not originate from a supposed four-part 'background' texture, but is rather a mere adaptation to the bass pattern.

The second counterpoint is also in imperfect consonances, just a little different, and its harmonization is a functional variant of the first, ending with the well-known Bach chorale cadence  $\text{IV}_5^6\text{-V}_3^6\text{-I}$ , with its typical bass line  $\hat{6}\text{-}\hat{7}\text{-}\hat{1}$ .

The third counterpoint is remarkable for its dissonant first interval. A consideration of all the possibilities makes this choice more understandable: the consonant possibilities are hard to fit into the bass line; the seventh, introduced as a passing dissonance between consonants, fits very well, and makes for heightened tension as well. The ending is the same as in the previous harmonization, but with the same Bach cadence it sounds even more striking in minor.

The fourth 'counterpoint' of the orchestral bass is, of course, an ornamented doubling of the bass version of the subject. Therefore the harmony has to come entirely from the figuration. Of Mozart's very striking double suspensions (ninths and sevenths, to heightened tension again), the sevenths double the higher line of the hidden polyphony of the subject, and are also present in the upper turns of the arpeggios of the orchestral bass. The ninth suspensions, in parallel thirds over the sevenths, add extra dissonance, and are partly used for the middle voices. So, while the whole passage is clearly sequential in melodic respect, its harmony is different in all of its four segments.

The fugato slips into a series of i-V half-cadences in G minor, the voices from top to bottom falling head-over-heels, with overlaps, on the words 'ne cadant', in a way that strongly recalls the 'ruinas' passage in the Judicabit movement of Handel's brilliant *Dixit Dominus* (1707) even more strongly than the parallel place in Michael Haydn's *Domine Jesu*. (We do not know whether Mozart or Haydn knew the Handel work.)<sup>39</sup> Similar to Haydn, this section then finally comes to a relative rest with a more subdued, low setting

38 If we are right to think all melody notes as lengthened in their own register, as Abert suggests, the top line forms ninths over the bass in bars 21/3, 22/1, and 22/3. In the subject (tenor) this ninth is used only at 'dant' in 'cadant' (22/3). Mozart does not put this ninth in his figuration. Therefore I conclude that the organist, and the orchestrator for that matter, is free to add ninths in bars 21/3 and 22/1, too. In the following three entries the suspension is always in the figuration.

39 A similar motif and technique Mozart used earlier in his *Misericordias*, K. 222, on 'cantabo' in bars 8-9, 126-128, 150-154; also in *Venite populi*, K. 260, on 'venite' in bars 17-19. Similar passages one can find already in the Requiem of André Campra (ca. 1700). *Misericordias* is also a piece in which Mozart had already used the 'Requiem motif'  $\hat{1}\text{-}\hat{7}\text{-}\hat{1}\text{-}\hat{2}\text{-}\hat{3}$ .

of 'in obscurum' (orchestral bass in eighths), the harmony being framed in another, more elongated half-cadence. Mozart's harmony here is very expressive: it is  $iv^7-V$ , but with a long and sinister suspension  $d-c$  in the bass against the subdominant upper structure in the other voices. Thus, the formal development section arrives at its typical half-cadence, which opens the door for a recapitulation.

The orchestration of this passage does not appear very problematic at first. There seems to be little reason to doubt that Mozart intended the whole string section to play in unison, a grim effect, well known from Handel, and certainly appropriate here. Druce, however, has the upper strings double the choir voices. Since the orchestral bass is in heterophony with the choir basses in bars 26-28, this fits well, although the total effect is less grim. The trombones should certainly double the choir, as they always do in fugal sections.

There is only one problem: what to do with the woodwinds? For me, Süssmayr's upper three wind parts – his bassoon II doubles the orchestral bass – are among the least successful of his contributions to this movement (Example 1a). They sound and look amorphous, and they just seem to do whatever fits with the ever-changing, non-sequential harmony.<sup>40</sup> Quite understandably, Flothuis jettisons them entirely; he gives the basset horns a break and has both bassoons simply double the orchestral bass. Beyer (Example 1b) provides an alternative to Süssmayr that appears even more chaotic, although his second and third (two-bar) fragments sound well in themselves. Maunder's version (Example 1c) looks a little more orderly, but is different for every two-bar segment. Druce's solution (Example 1d) is, I think, a major step forward, and I will come back to it. Levin (Example 1e) remains close to Süssmayr, only with the second bassoon playing in eighths instead of sixteenths.

Flothuis's conception of the woodwinds in this movement is a consistent though very sparing one. If we wish to make a wider use of the wind colours, we will have to find a convincing role for them in this climactic passage as well. If we furthermore wish to safeguard a Mozartean clarity in this rather complex passage, I think the woodwinds should stress what is *common* to all four thematic entries, not what is different. They should clarify the already complex structure, not make it even more complex. Therefore their parts must be deduced from the only constant factor, the subject, and not from the different harmonic progressions created by the restless bass line. Hidden in the subject, as shown above, is the inverted 'Requiem theme'.

For a woodwind setting of this passage, my first idea, performed in the Audio Example, was to use the inverted 'Requiem theme' as the top voice of the section, and harmonize it in four parts, realizing Mozart's figured bass. What sounds good about this solution is its sequence of a stylized version of the fugal subject in the top voice. But this arrangement still lacks clarity, through its ever-changing lower voices, each time unduly bringing out the *difference* in harmonization. Also, full four-part harmony takes some of the magic away from the strings in unison, a part that itself already suggests the harmonic progressions clearly enough. Lastly, a complete four-part wind setting stresses the less pleasing, but unavoidable root-position D-diminished triad, and, worse, the less satisfying middle voice  $a-ab$ , in the middle of bar 22, which, if played in the small octave, runs in parallel fifths with the tenor  $e^b-d^1$ . Actually, Mozart's figuration,  $b5-6$ , almost invites the organist to play this parallel. Obviously it would hardly be noticed in the turmoil of the string sixteenths, but it is of course better to place it in the one-line octave. In most completions it is hard to judge whether the author is fully aware of this problem. Beyer and Maunder, who both criticize Süssmayr harshly for his forbidden parallels (Maunder even for ornamental and

40 Even the similarity between the rising fourths and falling fifths in the first basset horn and the soprano 'et semini ejus' line in bars 67-71, which Keefe (2008a, p. 17, note 69) points at, cannot convince me. The part is hardly audible.

*Example 1a*

Domine Jesu, bars 21-32, woodwinds: Franz Xaver Süssmayr (1792), after his autograph.

Corno di Bassetto  
I, II in Fa / F

Fagotto I, II  
fagotto 2do col Basso

25

29

*Example 1b*

Domine Jesu, bars 21-32, woodwinds. From: Mozart, Requiem, edited and with a new completion by Franz Beyer (1971). © 1980 Edition Kunzelmann, Adliswil. Reprinted by kind permission.

Corno di Bassetto  
I, II in Fa / F

Fagotto I, II

25

29

*Example 1c*

Domine Jesu, bars 21-32, woodwinds. From: Mozart, Requiem, edited and with a new completion by Richard Maunder (1986). © 1988 Carus Verlag, Stuttgart. Reprinted by kind permission.

Corno di Bassetto  
I, II in Fa / F

Fagotto I, II

25

29

*f*

*a<sup>2</sup>*

*p*

*Example 1d*

Domine Jesu, bars 21-32, woodwinds. From: Mozart, Requiem, edited and with a new completion by Duncan Druce (1991). © 1993 Novello & Company Limited, London. Reprinted by kind permission.

Corno di Bassetto  
I, II in Fa / F

Fagotto I, II

25

29

*p*

*p*

## Example 1e

Domine Jesu, bars 21-32, woodwinds. From: Mozart, Requiem, edited and with a new completion by Robert D. Levin (1993). © 1996 Carus Verlag, Stuttgart. Reprinted by kind permission.

Corno di Bassetto  
I, II in Fa / F

Fagotto I, II

25

29

## Example 1f

Domine Jesu, bars 21-32, woodwinds: my alternative.

Corno di Bassetto  
I, II in Fa / F

Fagotto I, II

25

29

hidden parallels that are not problematic at all), both write this parallel fifth themselves. Maunder even doubles the line *a-d♭* an octave higher.<sup>41</sup> Süßmayr and Levin at least put the line *a-d♭* in the safe one-line octave only. But why bring out this line anyway if it is just a by-product of the bass pattern? By having all the chords spelled out, we partly spoil the magic of the rugged and suggestive bass line. Lastly, why should bassoon II play, as Beyer and Levin write, a stylized version of a bass line that is not melodic, and that gets its special quality from its massive string sound, restless sixteenths and rich harmonic suggestion? Why, then, not just have both bassoons double the bass line exactly?

I think there is a better solution. Again, it is hidden in the theme. If one actually realizes in the woodwinds what Abert only imagined in his analysis, if one lengthens all of the subject's notes until the next note in their own register, and writes the low notes an octave higher, the result is (a) an underlining of the inverted 'Requiem motif' hidden in the subject, and (b) a chain of parallel 2-3 suspensions, which is Mozart's (and many others') beloved treatment of woodwind pairs. This is what Beyer does in the second and third entries, but his version is inconsistent (as is his whole treatment of the four entries). Also, unlike in Beyer's second entry, Mozart almost invariably assigns such a chain of suspensions to two identical instruments, or to different pairs of instruments simultaneously, each in their own register. Druce uses such classical pairs, and his solution is very good indeed, as is the exciting little descending 'rocket' in the violins with which he 'attacks' the passage. For the first two bars, though, Druce chooses a pair of pitches different from the ones hidden in the vocal motif, including, unfortunately, the line that passes the *a* and *d♭* (see above). If we decide on the 'thematic' notes from the outset, these four chains simply underscore the harmonic essence of the passage, while keeping the texture clear and consistent (Example 1f).

In the fourth entry, the dramatic climax of the passage, with the subject in the bass and dramatic 'ne cadant' exclamations in all the upper voices, the chain of suspensions has to be placed a third higher, which can be deduced directly from Mozart's 9/7 figurations and which only adds to the climactic effect. I give the chains of suspensions to both the bassoons and the basset horns, each in their own register. Finally, at the collapse in bars 18-19, I have both pairs of instruments join the repeated half-cadence.

The soft and sinister 'in obscurum' is scored for strings only in Süßmayr's version. That is fine, of course, and Flothuis, Beyer and Levin leave this intact. Maunder adds bassoons only, doubling the alto and tenor voices. This, I think, brings out the middle voices too strongly, since the harmonic essence is in the minor ninth suspension between the top line and the bass. I use all four woodwinds, since the dark colour of the low basset horns depicts the text perfectly. A doubling of the four-part texture seems best to me, because it stresses the top *d♭*, against which the bass places its dark dissonant suspension *d*. Like all my predecessors, I leave out the trombones to illustrate the ebbing away of all powers.

### Bars 32/3-43: 'sed signifer sanctus Michael repraesentet eas in lucem sanctam:' (*'Recapitulation' of theme 1, as solo quartet*)

After the fearful, exhausting choral fugato, ending in a literal collapse, the music has, as it were, to start up again from almost nothing, and gradually regain forces. Mozart does this by reshaping the recapitulation of theme 1 into a new fugato, this time for the solo quartet, the female voices taking the initiative. The first theme's opening motif now

41 In his book Maunder shows he has noticed the fifths, but now his perspective is different: he wants to write something that is more clearly audible than Süßmayr's parts. Therefore he opts for the 'slightly exotic sound' of basset horn octaves, which 'also mollify the effect of the consecutive fifths'. For an excuse he refers to bar 20 of the Introitus, where, according to him, a similar doubling of the line of violin I in the lower octave by bassoon I produces parallel fifths with violin II. The difference, however, is that in that case the fifths are ornamental, so completely unproblematic, while here they are structural, i.e. between actual chord notes.

functions as a subject for a fugal exposition that ultimately slips into a literal reprise of the second half of theme 1 (bars 40/4-43/3 equals bars 4/2-7/1, except for the augmented sixth near the end). It is again a modulating fugato: the theme itself ('sed signifer sanctus Michael'), now ending on a major third, modulates a fourth up/fifth down: the soprano version from G minor to C minor, the alto from C minor to F minor, the tenor from F minor to B $\flat$  major, and finally the bass from B $\flat$  major to E $\flat$  major, which is the pivot back to G minor, from which the theme is continued as before. There are two countersubjects as well: the first ('repraesentet eas'), heard three times (S-A-T), features a long eighth-note melisma on 'eas'; the second ('in lucem sanctam'), heard only twice (S-A), is syllabic and in quarter notes again.<sup>42</sup> The whole exposition is accompanied by the bass pattern of the opening, as an independent voice. As in the previous fugato, Mozart varies the bass line under each statement of the subject, continuing a process of variation that already started at 'libera eas' (bar 15).

Mozart does not leave us any clue for the violins, but Süßmayr copies Mozart's bridge from the upbeat to bar 44 ('Quam olim'). Although this sounds excellent, Beyer, Maunder, and Druce may be right in preferring to reserve it for that special moment. The orchestration of the fugato is rather problematic, even if we use strings alone, as most arrangers do (a break for the winds is of course welcome). Generally speaking, fugal writing can be orchestrated in two ways: either by doubling the voices, or by creating an independent accompanying role for one or more instrumental sections. In complete fugues, like the Kyrie, doubling is the normal technique for all sections (except, of course, for the trumpets and timpani). The Introitus, on the other hand, being a clear fugato, is a fine example of the second technique: from bar 8 onwards the violins play a fixed pattern in unison, while the rest of the orchestra doubles the choral voices. The Rex tremendae is another obvious example of polyphony in the choir with independent patterns in the strings.

When we consider both possibilities in our case, we soon find out that doubling the voices in the strings, if at all desirable, will be problematic. Since the bass is already occupied with the accompanying offbeat eighth-note pattern, it cannot be used to support the vocal bass in bars 38/3-40/3, unless we have the cellos split off from the double basses. But Mozart wrote an undivided bass part, so most likely he did not have string doubling in mind at all. And why should he? Soloists sound fine on their own as well, certainly in *piano*, and, after the climax just before, a soloistic and thinner sound is most welcome. The obvious choice, therefore, is an independent string accompaniment that follows a logic of its own and fits well with the already present offbeat bass patterns.

It is quite clear that Süßmayr's accompaniment starts with something in exactly this vein. His (or Mozart's?) idea for the upper strings is interesting and fresh-sounding: groups of three staccato eighth notes, complementing the rhythm of the bass. Violin I starts as an imitation of the bass, but then follows the theme in its top notes, thus paraphrasing it in a wholly new but inconspicuous way (a subtlety that could be Mozart's invention). Violin II moves in parallel consonances with violin I, as does the viola with the bass. This soft 'tiptoeing' of the entire string section lends the theme a wholly new and remarkably light character and does excellent justice to the text.

Süßmayr's elaboration, though, is less convincing. Apart from some strange aberrations and errors (e.g. the second g in the viola in bar 35), he changes his mind about the concept at the second entry, where he starts doubling the first countersubject. In spite of its pleasing sound, this can only cause problems: violin II now has to paraphrase theme 1 all by itself.

42 Its cadence  $c^2-f^1$  (a *clausula basizans*) is good example of how Mozart allows 'virtual' parallel fifths (i.e. between the accented notes) if the voices leap, and one of the voices (here, the orchestral bass) has a rest at the moment the fifth is expected (see also the Recordare, bars 46-50).

If this is not yet a significant impediment, things get somewhat knottier at the third entry where, logically, it is the viola's turn to paraphrase the theme, with the countersubject in violin II (and perhaps the second countersubject in violin I). But Süssmayr has only violin II do its job, assigning to the viola the task of playing the bass *Austerzung*, with a free line in violin I that doubles only a few notes of the second countersubject and the theme. In the fourth entry, the viola finally gives up its bass *Austerzung* to pick up the first countersubject, while both violins return to their initial roles, but only partially. It seems unlikely that Mozart would have approved of this attempt at realizing two concepts at the same time.

Beyer tries an improved version of Süssmayr's mixed concept, but gets into trouble too. In the third entry, he almost succeeds in realizing the expected theme paraphrase in the viola part, putting the bass *Austerzung* more or less in violin I. In the fourth entry, he again gives the paraphrase of the theme to violin I (as far as possible), but has violin II go along with violin I instead of providing a bass *Austerzung*. This is no great improvement. Also, his alternating of trombone and woodwind fills, which gives the passage a ceremonial effect in the vein of *Die Zauberflöte*, seems out of place here.

Maunder opts for 'contrapuntally independent' strings, inspired, as he points out in his book, by the independent strings in the 'Quam olim' fugue (indicated by Mozart) and bars 21-31 of the Introitus (he probably means the section from bar 26 onwards.). He thus avoids the problems faced by Süssmayr and Beyer. In his book he goes into minute detail about the many pitfalls in this passage. The result, however, is not very satisfactory: his parts lack linear shape; even his violin I makes a rather arbitrary impression.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, in bar 35, he has his violins move in parallel octaves ( $ab^1-g^1$ ) and fifths ( $cb^1-d^1$ ) with the bass's main notes  $ab-g$ .

Druce's solution, perfectly in line with his arrangements of the beginnings of the exposition and the development section, is to have all strings move with the offbeat bass, all winds moving on the beat with the voices. This is a good example of Druce's sturdy logic, profound structural understanding, and great musicality. The result, as elsewhere in his orchestration, is a clarity of texture that is highly audible, at least in Norrington's recording. Yet I have my doubts about his wind doubling of the solo voices. For me, the individual voices need to be heard on their own in this passage, and, again, a pause in the winds is very welcome anyway.

Levin is the only one to have the strings double the voices consistently from the beginning. He tries to solve the problems described above by having the viola double the bass throughout the passage<sup>44</sup> and assigning the task of doubling to the violins only. He is therefore compelled to sacrifice the doublings of theme entries number 3 and 4 in favour of doubling both countersubjects. By selecting only the main (chordal) notes from countersubject 1, Levin has all doublings move in smooth half notes, which gives his arrangement a nice consistency. All in all, Levin's solution sounds good, but I still have three objections: (a) it is a pity to discard Süssmayr's (or Mozart's?) tiptoeing strings; (b) there remains some inconsistency in the doubling of the voices; and (c) Levin's fill of the violins between the first and second entries, anticipating the (unsupported) melisma of the first countersubject, makes his violin parts a little inconsistent in themselves.

I have decided on independent strings. But, as we have seen with Maunder, this solution can only be convincing if at least violin I has a certain shape, and the best one seems to be the subtle eighth-note paraphrase of the theme we find in Süssmayr. Violin I is able to do

43 Maunder's difficulty seems to be the consequence of an overly vertical approach. For instance, his explanation (1988, pp. 184-185) about the possibilities at the fourth eighth note of bar 37, is based on reasoning from *f* as the bass note, while the ear perceives the *B* of the third eighth note as the bass note still prevailing. This is the reason why, in the harmony on the fourth eighth note, there is no need for the *b* Maunder worries about.

44 Levin discards *Austerzung* completely in this movement.

this consistently, in its own register, behind all four entries, as a sequence. Both violin II and viola can conveniently be shaped as *Austerzung* (or parallel setting in any consonant interval) of violin I and bass respectively. Only where the first countersubject ornaments the harmony with legato eighth notes does the second violin have to follow it to a greater or lesser degree (not double it *per se*) in order to avoid clashes. I prefer to keep the strings as consonant as possible, preferably in thirds or sixths. This leads to a seamless connection with the second part of theme 1 (at bar 40/3), along with a perfect large-scale linear progression in violin I: a descending tetrachord from  $g^2$  at bar 35/3, via  $f^2$  at bar 39/3, to  $e^2$  at bar 40/4, finally arriving on  $d^2$  at bar 43/3. I have the woodwind ‘sneak back in’ at bar 40/1, which obviously is felt here as the light half of the bar.

**Bars 44-67/1: ‘Quam olim Abrahae promisisti et semini ejus,’  
(Fugue: exposition and development)**

By continuing with a fugue for the remainder of the text, Mozart again follows Michael Haydn’s example. It also slots in perfectly with his overall, more contemporary sonata concept: this is the moment for the normal reprise of the second theme in the main key, responsible for a feeling of ‘homecoming’, a release of all the tonal tension built up in the exposition and the development section. In Mozart’s sonata forms in the minor mode this moment is even more special, because here he normally reworks the exposition’s major-mode second theme in the minor mode, often in a most surprising and moving way (e.g. the first movement of the Piano Concerto, K. 466). In his *Domine Jesu* he not only creates a new theme, appropriate for the ‘Quam olim’, he also makes an amazingly effective connection with the movement’s first theme: a bass accompaniment pattern that fills in the downbeats of the first and third quarter notes of the bar, so carefully left open in all three earlier versions of the main theme. These downbeats remain now fixed in the lowest register of the orchestral bass, while the offbeat eighth-note pattern keeps to the upper bass register, partially filled-in with sixteenths. One can feel the inspiration of a Handel movement like ‘Thou shalt break them’ (No. 38 of *The Messiah*). Moreover, Mozart writes the beginning of a violin-I pattern that is the perfect rhythmic complement (a further indication that Mozart conceived the idea for the complementary string rhythm in the previous section?). This string accompaniment gives the movement a new and overwhelming rhythmical drive.

Mozart’s fugue is a little more ambitious than Michael Haydn’s. Its first half is close to the model of a Bach fugue, such as the one in G minor from the first book of *Das Wohltemperirte Clavier*. From bar 58 onwards, the texture changes from a polyphonic to a much more homophonic one (see below). The rhythm of the fugal subject is the same as in Michael Haydn’s ‘Quam olim’ (as well as many other settings, such as those of Heinichen and Lotti). For the *melos*, Mozart relies on the well-known progression  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  (which he also used in the *Recordare*). Obviously this progression takes its melodic attractiveness from the fact that it is a sequence in itself: a descending second twice, first moving away from, then returning to tonic function. The harmony, clearly laid out in the new bass pattern, is the well-known progression  $i - vii_6^6 - V^7 - i$ , the result of a simple counterpoint in the intervals 8-6-7-3. In the subject there are the suspensions 7-6 on the second chord (‘A-brahae’) and 4-3 on the fourth one (‘-si-sti’). The first 7-6 suspension creates a half-diminished  $ii^7$  just before the (diminished)  $vii_6^6$ , which brings out the subdominant function. The second entry’s first chord overlaps the last chord of the first one: quite a normal overlap, but a bit longer than usual, because of the suspension on ‘si-sti’. This small overlap gives an impression of *stretto* from the beginning. Quite surprisingly (and erroneously, I think), both Abert and Gerstmeier see bar 46 (‘et semini ejus’) as part of the subject.<sup>45</sup> This view is not only contradicted by the differing continuations of the

45 Abert 1923-24, p. 876, or 2007, p. 1330. Gerstmeier 1997, p. 110.

second and fourth entries, the fact is that eighteenth-century fugues (certainly Bach's) normally do not begin with a stretto; and in spite of the slightly unusual overlap, we do not have a real stretto here. This is yet to come. Lastly, eighteenth-century fugue subjects are normally rounded off in the tonic, mostly with the third in the melody, which is exactly what happens here. This G-minor chord, at bar 45/3, functions as a pivot: both as the last chord of the first entry and the first chord of the second (in the tenor). Therefore, the second entry's harmony is in D minor:  $iv - vii_5^6 - V^7 - i$ . The concluding D-minor tonic is then replaced by a dominant seventh chord, introducing a brief internal episode that leads back to G minor, the key in which the third (alto) entry follows, again harmonized with the progression  $iv - vii_5^6 - V^7 - i$ . Perfectly in Bach tradition, the remaining soprano entry, again in D minor, is followed by a longer episode, modulating (via a chain of dominants) to the relative B $\flat$  major.

The melody over 'et semini ejus', in the bass in bar 46, appears to be a first countersubject, reappearing, as normal, in the tenor in bar 48/3-49/2 and in the alto in bar 50. Also, the longer line in the bass in bars 48-49/3, on 'promisisti, promisisti', appears to be a second countersubject, reappearing in the tenor in bars 49/3-51/1, but disappearing afterwards. The alto and soprano fill the episode in bars 51-53/1 with free derivations of the subject. What is remarkable is the temporary pause in the double basses and vocal bass after the G-minor tonic chord is reached in bar 49/3. This has the effect of 'launching' the music of the soprano entry and the following modulating episode, in which even the tenor pauses for a while. The orchestral bass and the tenor catch the ball again right at the beginning of the following section.

In bar 53 begins what looks like a normal Bach-fugue development, with a subject entry in B $\flat$  major, in this case in the tenor, and the first countersubject in the alto. But the B $\flat$  tonic expected at bar 54/3 is replaced by a D half-diminished chord, which immediately functions as the second chord (here  $ii^7$  half-diminished) of a new subject entry in C minor. The pivot is the F7-chord:  $V^7$  in B $\flat$  major, becoming  $IV^7$  in C (melodic) minor. The first half of this new entry is in the alto, but half a bar late, thus avoiding parallel motion with the second half of the subject in the tenor. The second half, on time again (catching up as it were), is in the soprano, with the first countersubject in the bass. A stretto, with the first half of the subject placed half a bar later, thus creates the impression of a stretto within a stretto! In bar 55/3, another entry in C minor follows in the tenor, with countersubject 1 in the alto. Again, its third chord,  $V^7$ , is used as  $IV^7$  in D melodic minor, that is, one step higher. And once again the first half of the subject in this key enters half a bar later in the alto, its second half now in the tenor (with the text halves exchanged!), allowing the soprano to state an extra countersubject, in stretto with the one in the bass. Apart from being a double stretto-within-a-stretto, the passage is also twice a harmonic sequence a whole step higher, a device heard before at 'de poenis' (bars 7ff) and 'libera eas' (bars 15ff).

From here on (bar 58), the texture reverts to the 'responsorial' device also used in 'de poenis' and 'libera eas', one voice taking the initiative, the others responding as a group. In this case the bass starts with an adaptation of the fugue subject, featuring falling octaves – and, in its top notes, the inverted Requiem motif  $d^1 - eb^1 - d^1 - c^1 - b^1$  – then dropping to an  $eb^1$ , which leads to the dominant on a sustained pedal point. The soprano, leading the choral responses, has another adaptation of the theme, and its main line is in sixths with the bass. In principle, the harmony is a *fauxbourdon*, a series of descending sixth-chords: Cm/E $\flat$  - |B $\flat$ /D - Am $\flat$ 5/C - |Gm/B $\flat$ . But all the chords are ornamented with appoggiaturas and chordal skips, so that in the chordal upper structure a circle of fifths (per quarter note) appears: |D - - - Gm - Cm - |F - B $\flat$  - E $\flat$  - Am $\flat$ 5 - | D7 - Gm. This is followed by an E $\flat$  augmented sixth (with 7-6 suspension), connecting to the dominant.

On the dramatic dominant pedal point (another echo of Michael Haydn's Requiem) the soprano takes the initiative again, in what is once again a version of the inverted Requiem

motif,  $d^2-e^b2-d^2-c^2-bb^1$ , all of its notes preceded by a rising appoggiatura, imitated by the middle voices. The harmony, from bar 61/3 onwards, is one of Mozart's strongest variants of the circle-of-fifths sequence: alternating seventh chords and triads on the dominant pedal. Here the harmonic rhythm is again one chord per half bar: |(D -) E♭Maj7/D - |A♭5/D - D7 - |Gm/D - C7/D - |F♯mb5/D (= D7). After V<sup>7</sup> and I<sub>4</sub><sup>6</sup>, the dominant pedal yields to #iv<sup>o7</sup>, after which, suddenly *piano*, a falling sixth  $e^2-g^1$ , again recalling all the falling leaps heard before, ushers in a complete perfect authentic cadence, lifted almost literally from Michael Haydn at the same point, which forms the first closure of the movement.

For the orchestration, it seems obvious that all the winds must double the choir voices. Süssmayr does this with the trombones and the basset horns, but only partially with the bassoons, which he has change roles to double the bass from bar 51 onwards. One can understand that he does this as a support for the cellos during the break in the parts of the double basses, as Mozart often does. But the cellos are already left alone one and a half bars earlier. Of course, bassoon I still doubles the tenor at that point, but Süssmayr's solution remains unsatisfactory, all the more so because his bassoons do not revert to doubling the choir when the double basses re-enter.

Flothuis has the bassoons double the choir consistently, but discards the trombones, since, as he explains in the CD booklet, he considers them unnecessary when the voices are doubled by the woodwinds anyway. But this means that his trombones, having played until bar 30, only return in bar 75, at the very end of the movement, thus missing the entire climax!

Beyer has the trombones stop at bar 51, because he introduces a *diminuendo* here to a *mezzoforte* in bar 52, having them return *forte* in bar 61/3. I feel this is an unnecessary intervention. Much more puzzling are his independent woodwind parts, with strange offbeat *tenuto* harmonies, which I am unaware of in Mozart.

Maunder has the alto trombone stop in bar 51 as well, but only until bar 53 (apparently to make the bassless section still lighter; but it is still *forte* here, and I am not aware of any example of this in Mozart). His woodwind parts are stripped of all tonal repetitions and upbeat eighth notes, which comes down to stripping these doublings of the rhythmical identity of the subject, which I doubt Mozart would do in this case. Also, he lengthens notes in order to fill up harmonies, which seems unnecessary to me. Furthermore, he leaves out the countersubjects, clearly because these cannot be smoothed out like the subject. What seems perfectly in tune with Mozart's style, however, is Maunder's smoothed-out woodwind setting in the fauxbourdon (bars 58-60). But I cannot agree with his intervention on the dominant pedal. At the arrival on the dominant, the little 'gap' in the texture, under the sopranos (bar 61/2), does not call for a wind filling like Maunder's, and his  $f^\#$ 's interfere with the alto's entry on  $g^1$ .

Druce gives the woodwinds independent little motifs that simply confirm the harmony; one hardly hears them, and the harmony is already clear enough with the combination of subject, bass and violin figure.

Levin starts (bar 43/3) with an enthusiastic upbeat wind fill that almost overrules Mozart's own string fill. But in the fugue he very adequately does no more than double the choir with all the winds, in the rhythm of the choir.

This is my choice too. It may seem a good idea to have the cellos doubled by the bassoons at the two places where they split off from the basses, as Mozart often does. But at the first of these, bar 49/3, one bassoon is still occupied, as we have seen. And at the other, the dominant pedal, basset horn II cannot be left alone in providing the response to the sopranos and basset horn I. Support of the cellos at these places, however, can be assigned to the violas.

Here we come to the strings. The easiest task is to decide about the middle parts. We have a similar situation here to that in the *Rex tremendae*, with a complex contrapuntal texture and *forte* dynamics. Both of these circumstances call for utmost clarity in the independent string accompaniment. So violin II obviously moves 'col primo'. For the viola, one could think of a bass *Austerzung*, like in all previous thematic passages. Süssmayr actually assigns it this role, alas with many of the low bass notes an octave (or a fifth) higher, which slightly spoils the bouncing effect, at least in the viola part. More importantly, Süssmayr chooses (consciously?) to ignore all the suspensions in the harmonies, thereby certainly losing clarity, especially where the suspension resolves to a major third (in all the dominants!).<sup>46</sup> Süssmayr changes from thirds to unison with the violas where the cellos are alone.<sup>47</sup> This means he could have allowed the bassoons to continue their initial doubling of the male voices.

Beyer writes completely new, independent middle string parts (violin II as well!) in complementary rhythm with his offbeat *tenuto* woodwind parts. My feeling is that they are equally ineffective. Maunder lets the viola move with the bass throughout this passage, and so do Levin and I. In his book, Maunder also refers to bars 8-14 of the *Introitus*, where Mozart writes an independent two-part string arrangement to a polyphonic passage. Obviously, the reason why *Austerzung* in the violas works well in the earlier thematic passages, whereas unison seems better here, is that these earlier passages are *piano*, and hardly as contrapuntally complex as the passage we are discussing now. This is confirmed by Mozart's *Austerzung* in the violins in bar 78 etc. – a *piano* passage again.

The most difficult task is the elaboration of Mozart's idea for the violin part. Süssmayr's version is weak for several reasons. His top line, i.e. the line of his notes on the first and third beats, is shapeless: it has numerous tonal repetitions (bars 46, 50-51, 53, etc.), and he does not seem to be aware of his touching upon dissonant chord notes that need the resolution they cannot have because of the shape of the motif (e.g. bars 46/3, 47/3, 53/1, 55/1).

Beyer's new line is shapeless too, just as his new middle parts are. He puts irresolvable dissonances even in the sixteenths (47), and, at clearly parallel spots, he eschews Mozart's figures in favour of his own inventions (the thirds in 46/3 and 49/1, the doubling of part of the countersubject in 50/2). But most curiously of all, he discards Mozart's wonderful pattern in bar 53, and goes on with a rather shapeless mixture of choir doublings and other ideas instead.

In his book, Maunder points out Süssmayr's unresolved sevenths in bars 46 and 47, rightly replacing them with Mozart's fifths of the dominant seventh chord (see both of his violin figures in bar 45). However, I do not share his complaint about the clash of the figure in bar 48/4 with the tenor, because this is Mozart's own, razor-sharp figure from the parallel passage at bar 44/4, outlining the diminished  $\text{vii}_3^6$  which is the basis of the tenor's countersubject 1 (its *d* is merely a passing note). His replacements, at parallel places, are weaker and unnecessary. In spite of various improvements, Maunder's line also lacks shape and still has tonal repetitions.

The same objection holds for Druce's version. Furthermore, from bar 53/3 onwards, Druce replaces the two successive eighth notes of the pattern with one quarter note, which weakens the effect of relentlessness.

Levin's version is much better. He follows Mozart's suggestions of the beginning much more consistently. But he uses the highest register very early (bar 46), and (probably therefore) changes the parallel figure in bar 50. He also changes several of the figures later on, which for me does nothing more than distract from Mozart's already breathtaking

46 It is not at all difficult to include the suspensions in the viola part. For example, in bar 47/1, instead of two sixteenths  $f\#^1-e^1$ , one could write one eighth note  $g^1$ .

47 Except in bars 51/3-52, where there are only female voices.

modulations and special stretto techniques. I have the same objection to his new figure over the dominant pedal (bars 61-64).

My elaboration is based on my analysis of the structure of the subject and its harmonization, and of Mozart's own suggestions at the beginning (see above). Each entry has four different accompaniment figures to accompany, or rather to emphasize, each of its four chord changes (see Example 2). I label these figures 'a' (octave), 'b' (sixth and third), 'c' (diminished seventh and twelfth) and 'd' (fifth and twelfth). However, because of the overlap of one chord between each pair of entries, and, as a consequence, the different harmonization of the beginning of the second entry (not as *i* but as *iv* in its key), violin figure 'd' (fifth and twelfth) also becomes the new figure 'd/a2' of the new entry. Now Mozart gives us one more figure, consisting of a fifth and fifteenth. This I see as a new figure 'b2', necessary as a replacement of what I now call 'b1' (sixth and third), in cases where *ii*<sup>7</sup> is preceded by *iv* instead of *i*. Let us see how this analysis works as a key to practical solutions.

*Example 2*

Mozart's violin-I fragment in bars 43-46, with my designation of its figures.

We can place figure 'c' perfectly around bar 46/3 (*vii*<sub>5</sub><sup>6</sup>-*V*<sup>7</sup>) (parallel place: around bar 44/1).<sup>48</sup> With its anticipation of the dominant function, this figure gives the music tremendous momentum, so it should not be left unutilized at an appearance of this type of chord change. Figure 'c' is logically followed by figure 'd/a2' (bar 47/1). With its fifth and twelfth, this figure is perfect for all three chords with suspended fourths of this short episode. The third and fourth subject entries (bars 48-50) are both served perfectly by 'd/a2-b2-c-d/a2', the last figure overlapping both entries. I use figure 'd/a2' for the entire chain of dominants in bars 51-52.

The development section (bar 53ff) could start with 'd/a2-b2', but 'b2' needs preparation in the high register. I therefore make the two eighth notes at bar 53/1 a rising octave *b*<sup>1</sup>-*b*<sup>2</sup>, which is in fact a high version of 'a1' at bar 44/1, the start of the fugue. In this case the start of the fugue's development section is effectively marked by the octaves in both bass and violins.<sup>49</sup> The *B*<sub>b</sub> version of the subject poses no problems, but in the following stretto the figure 'b2', around bar 54/3, has to be adapted slightly because its proper low *f* is obviously not available on the violin: an *a*<sub>b</sub> is its replacement. The ensuing figure 'c' needs slight modification too, because the stretto causes the leading note (belonging to the original figure 'c', here *b* in C minor) to appear only a half bar later. The following three bars speak for themselves. It appears that Mozart knew exactly how much he had to fix in order for the elaboration to be made later.

After the last figure 'd/a2', around bar 58/1, we reach the end of the strict-style section of the fugue and enter the section with the fauxbourdon and the dominant pedal. Here I think the challenge is to continue with a figure with roughly the same shape as 'c' or 'd/a2', and adhere to that (something not all editors do). The fauxbourdon limits the possibilities, which makes it easy. The harmony of the choir, with all its suspensions (see above), is exciting enough to confirm the fauxbourdon in the violin figures only. To get the

48 Again, I do not see a problem in the 'clash' (Maunder) with the passing *a* of the countersubject in the bass.

49 I thank Hans van der Heide, arranger for the Netherlands Wind Ensemble, for pointing out this problem to me, and for his help in finding what seems to be the best solution.

most out of Mozart's favourite harmonic progression on the dominant pedal, the circle of fifths in seventh chords alternating with triads, it is even more a matter of confirming each chord, stretching each as long as possible. This can be done by giving maximum clarity to each seventh chord. Here are the chords: |D - E $\flat$ Maj7/D - |A $\flat$ 5/D - D7 - |Gm/D - C7/D - |F $\sharp$ m $\flat$ 5/D (= D7) etc. In the top notes of my violin figures I follow the soprano line. In the lower notes I slow down the pace of the harmony where possible, making use of the rising suspensions in the middle voices. The f $\sharp$ <sup>1</sup> in the G-minor chord of bar 63, a logical consequence of the g<sup>1</sup> added to the A $\flat$ 5/C chord, is the most poignant result. In bar 64, where the circle is broken, I follow a rising sequence, aimed at the e<sup>2</sup> in bar 65/2. In the soft first full cadence of the movement I double the choir with strings and trombones in order to set it off against the next, much lighter section. I leave out the woodwinds, because I feel trombones better express the strength of renewed hope.

### Bars 67-71/1 'et semini ejus,'

#### (First concluding section: circle of fifths and second cadence)

A series of concluding sections follows, all rather short and ending with a full cadence. The first of these concluding sections is a soft one: the violins take over the figure that, so far, has served as a bass accompaniment. Mozart wrote out both violin parts, in parallel thirds and sixths, creating a sudden *dolce* atmosphere. It seems to confirm the idea that the previous section was intended to be a violin unison, and that *Austerzung* was an appropriate technique for the previous soft passages.

The soprano takes the initiative this time, with a sequence that describes a descending scale all the way from the high g<sup>2</sup>: first with long suspended notes; after two bars more quickly, down even to the leading note; and then, quoting the 'Requiem motif' in passing, rising to the third again and cadencing on g<sup>1</sup>. The harmonization is a circle of fifths, this time starting in  $\frac{6}{5}$ - and  $\frac{5}{3}$ -chords alternately, with ninth-suspensions over the triads, giving some poignant dissonances again. The setting is again more polyphonic, the voices entering one after the other: soprano, bass, and alto one beat apart, the tenor two beats after the alto.

Mozart's thirds and sixths in the violins invite the viola to return to its previous *Austerzung*, and Süßmayr takes this cue. Beyer writes a new viola part, with an overemphatic descending tetrachord on the strong beats. A simplification of the subtle harmonic progression, it partly spoils the effect of the suspensions in the soprano. In Maunder's new part, with emphatic fifths of the chords, I cannot see an improvement either. Levin stays with his unisons in the viola, which is consistent with his whole approach. I choose a descending line in long notes for the viola, which supports (by doubling it in the lower octave) the harmonic suspensions of the soprano. It connects nicely to a quote of the inverted 'Requiem motif' in the cadence of bars 70-71/1.

### Bars 71-75/1: 'quam olim Abrahae promisisti'

#### (Second concluding section: lamento bass and third cadence)

All forces are then gathered again for a final, forceful 'quam olim'. The basses take the initiative, the remainder of the voices responding as a group again and the sopranos imitating the basses. The motif is rhythmically the same as the fugue subject, but melodically it starts just like the bass accompaniment figure under theme 1 of the previous 'sonata' part: a brilliant way of unifying the movement. Harmonically the passage is a fauxbourdon again, based on the chromatic variant of the lamento bass. The chords, two in each bar, are: VI<sup>6</sup> - |V<sup>6</sup> - v<sup>6</sup> - |IV<sup>6</sup> - iv<sup>6</sup> - |V<sup>7</sup> - i, followed by a perfect authentic cadence. This fauxbourdon is more simple and straightforward than the one in bars 58-60, but its chromatic bass line and its descending progression through major and minor triads of the same scale degrees, lends it a special, more solemn character.

Several editors copy the figuration from the first edition of the parts, which, interestingly,

has 7-6 suspensions in bars 72/1 and 73/1. These are not to be found literally in Mozart's notes, but they are implied by the soprano part, of which the last eighth notes in bars 71 and 72 can be heard as lengthened into the first beat of the next bar.

This is a reason for Süssmayr, in his basset horn doubling of the female voices, to give the first basset horn a sounding  $b^2$  in bar 72/1, instead of the  $a^2$  of the soprano, which is too high for it; the same thing happens a bar later. This is an apt solution, but, without its high points, the line is less attractive. He furthermore has the bassoons double the orchestral bass rather than the male voices, sacrificing a doubling of the responsorial effect in the choir. But this is present in the trombones, which take up their normal role of choir doubling again. Süssmayr's violas continue their thirds with the bass, alternating them with other intervals. But the whole part lacks logic and shape. The same holds for his violin II part, which plays in thirds, sixths, fourths, and even a fifth with violin I.

Beyer gives both the woodwinds *and* the trombones a simplified version of the choral parts, thereby emphasizing the simplicity of the descending sixth-chords. But not only do his tonal repetitions (instead of alternating thirds) deprive the melodic lines of all their elegance, the second basset horn, moving in parallel fourths with the first (instead of the voices' parallel sixths), now produces parallel fifths with the alto trombone (albeit with suspensions). His violin II begins in octaves with violin I, after which it continues in sixths, but then, having to avoid the suspension, is forced to take yet another different turn. Why no consistent octaves then? He gives the viola a part in harmless chordal notes, but why does he not let it join the basses?

Maunder, of course, has smoothed-out woodwinds, and this time, I feel, they work well. His arrangement includes a *unisono* high-register realization of the 7-6 suspensions in the basset horns, which I like very much. He probably avoids the lower register 7-6 for fear of Beyer's parallel fifths; but the unsimplified version of the alto voice comes from underneath, so there is no problem. Maunder's descending thirds in the bassoons, paraphrasing the vocal bass, nicely emphasize the alternating major and minor character of the chords. Maunder opts for *unisono* violins as well as *unisono* violas and basses, which is perfectly logical in a *forte* passage. However, the rather simple vocal arrangement would perhaps make a somewhat richer string sound desirable.

Levin's woodwinds and trombones double the choir almost literally, but the (necessary) adaptation of the first basset horn makes the part a little inconsistent. Remarkably, Levin now has his violas *not* move (in unison) with the basses, as he consistently does before this, but in more or less parallel triads with both violins.

Druce's strong suit is, again, consistency. He continues the first basset horn's adapted doubling of the soprano line throughout the sequence, the second basset horn even playing in unison with it.

My solution for the woodwinds is close to Maunder's, the difference being that I have the basset horns start a little earlier, the first one on a sounding  $d^2$ , thus stating the complete inverted 'Requiem motif' in the line. Except for the cadence in bar 74, my violin II moves in unison with violin I, for two reasons: (a) there is a *forte* again, and both violins happily join together again, as in the fugue; (b) unison automatically avoids the danger of getting in the way of the 7-6 suspensions. My violas, on the other hand, continue in thirds with the bass, in spite of the *forte*. Again, there are two reasons for this: (a) imitation of Mozart's thirds in the violins in the previous section, and (b) the need for a richer sound, complementing the somewhat bare choral setting.

**Bars 75-78: 'et semini ejus.' (Third concluding section: final, plagal cadence)**

Again, the sopranos take the initiative, with a repeated  $g^1$ , under which the bass provides a counterpoint: 1-|3-1-3-6-|5- - - |8- - - ||, its two descending fourths, connected by an ascending second, no doubt symbolizing the Holy Cross. The bass line is harmonized by the middle voices as (V)-|iv<sup>6</sup>-(V)-iv<sup>6</sup>-(V<sub>5</sub>^6)-|iv<sup>9</sup>- - -<sup>8</sup>- - |I picardian||, an overt quotation of an old-style plagal cadence. It is remarkable how well it works in a composition that already unites the high baroque and classical styles.

Süssmayr's orchestration here is impeccable, especially his decision to give the bassoons the two middle voices in parallel thirds. Beyer, however, prefers a *unisono g* for the bassoons. Levin doubles the complete choir in the woodwinds. Maunder prefers Süssmayr's bassoons and so do I. Also, Süssmayr's syncopations in violin I are perfect, and are replicated by everyone.

**V. Conclusion**

In conclusion we can say that the various orchestrations of this movement, apart from the peaceful plagal ending, display numerous and considerable differences. Süssmayr's version may be not as bad as some contend, but it clearly has several weak spots, e.g. the woodwinds in the choral fugato and the elaboration of the violin figures in the fugue. Flothuis limited himself to changes in the winds, most of them being cuts; the ones in the trombone parts must, of course, be seen in historical perspective (1941). Unfortunately, Süssmayr's two fiercest critics, Beyer and Maunder, have come up with solutions that are often quite problematic as well. I agree more often with Druce and Levin, whose solutions seem to me much more inspired and closer to Mozart's style. Of the existing versions of this movement, Druce's is my favourite: his invention, clarity, consistency and musicality are evident throughout. Yet even in his work I find things that I think could be improved.

As the reader may have noticed, various types of arguments come into play when trying to back up one's choices. One could roughly distinguish between (a) the text and the musical underpinning, illustration, or representation it calls for, (b) general matters of musical logic, i.e. melodic, rhythmic, harmonic, textural and/or syntactical considerations, and (c) matters of musical style, in this case eighteenth-century style and Mozart's individual style in particular.

Inevitably, there has to be a 'remainder category' of arguments that comes down to one's personal intuition and experience. I have of course tried to restrict such arguments to a minimum. But it would be a mistake, I feel, to rely too strictly on the more objective categories mentioned above. If, for instance, a comparable passage can be found in Mozart's earlier work, it still cannot be concluded that Mozart's earlier treatment of such a passage can simply be copied. In my experience, one has to be extremely careful with 'evidence', and try to remain as sensitive as one can to all possible factors at work in each individual case. Not seldom have I found solutions in a more or less intuitive way, only afterwards finding more objective 'justifications'.

Writing an artistically convincing completion of an unfinished Mozart work and delivering a good piece of musicological research are obviously two different activities. However, one can decide to try to combine them, hoping for some surplus value, if possible to both aspects. In doing so, it seems wise to acknowledge the principal distinction between these activities, and to realize that the one does not guarantee anything regarding the other. For, inevitably, both the scholarly and musical aspects of such a project, including mine of course, will rightfully be judged on their own merits. And ultimately, anybody's completion of the Requiem will not be judged on the basis of the scholarship it is supported by, but simply on its potential to convince musically.

## Editions of the Requiem

- Mozart, W.A. (1965) *Requiem*, KV 626, edited by L. Nowak, *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe* I/1/Abt. 2/1 and I/1/Abt. 2/2, Kassel: Bärenreiter (*Kritischer Bericht* by Dietrich Berke and Christoph Wolff, 2007).
- Mozart, W.A. (1971/1980) *Requiem*, KV 626, *Instrumentation Franz Beyer*, Zürich: Eulenburg / Adliswil: Kunzelmann.
- Mozart, W.A. (1988) *Requiem*, K 626, edited by Richard Maunder, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Autorisierter Sonderdruck, Stuttgart: Carus Verlag.
- Mozart, W.A. (1990) *Requiem*, KV 626, *vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe im Originalformat der Originalhandschrift in zwei Teilen nach Mus. Hs. 17.561 der Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, edited by G. Brosche, Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Mozart, W.A. (1992) *Requiem*, KV 626, *Mozarts Fragment mit der Ergänzungen von Joseph Eybler und Franz Xaver Süssmayr*, completed and edited by H.C. Robbins Landon, Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Mozart, W.A. (1993) *Requiem*, K. 626, edited and with a new completion by Duncan Druce, London: Novello.
- Mozart, W.A. (1996/2004) *Requiem*, KV 626, completed and edited by Robert D. Levin, Stuttgart: Carus.

## References

- Abert, Hermann (1923-24) *W.A. Mozart*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Abert, Hermann (2007) *W.A. Mozart*, translated by Stewart Spencer, edited by Cliff Eisen, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Black, David (2008) 'A Response from David Black' [to Keefe 2008a], in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/2, 596-600.
- Druce, Duncan (2008) 'A Response from Duncan Druce' [to Keefe 2008a], in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/2, 593-596.
- Gerstmeier, August (1997) 'Zur Metrik im Offertorium des Requiems von W. A. Mozart', in: *Mozart Studien* 7, Tutzing: Schneider, 1997, 105-114.
- Hess, Ernst (1959) 'Zur Ergänzung des Requiems von Mozart durch F. X. Süssmayr', in: *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1959*, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 99-108.
- Keefe, Simon P. (2008a) "'Die Ochsen am Berge": Franz Xaver Süssmayr and the Orchestration of Mozart's Requiem, K. 626', in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/1, 1-65.
- Keefe, Simon P. (2008b) 'A Reply from Simon P. Keefe' [to Black 2008, Druce 2008, Levin 2008, Maunder 2008, and Wolff 2008], in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/2, 602-08.
- Korten, Matthias (1999) *Mozart's Requiem KV 626 - Ein Fragment wird ergänzt*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Levin, Robert D. (2008) 'A Response from Robert D. Levin' [to Keefe 2008a], in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/2, 583-88.
- Maunder, Richard (1988) *Mozart's Requiem: On Preparing a New Edition*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Maunder, Richard (2008) 'A Response from Richard Maunder' [to Keefe 2008a], in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/2, 588-93.
- Schmid, Manfred Hermann (2006) *Mozart in Salzburg: ein Ort für sein Talent*, Salzburg: Pustet.
- Wennekes, E. (1997) 'Dichter bij de stijl van Mozart. Flothuis' adaptatie van Requiem uit 1941 eindelijk uitgevoerd', in: *De Volkskrant*, 16 January 1997.
- Wolff, Christoph (1991) *Mozarts Requiem: Geschichte, Musik, Dokumente*, Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Wolff, Christoph (1994) *Mozart's Requiem: Historical and Analytical Studies, Documents, Score*, translated by Mary Whittall, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Wolff, Christoph (2008) 'A Response from Christoph Wolff' [to Keefe 2008a], in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 61/2, 600-02.

## Audio Example at [www.djmt.nl](http://www.djmt.nl)

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Requiem: Domine Jesu (orchestration Clemens Kemme, version 2006), performed by The Netherlands Bach Society conducted by Johannes Leertouwer, De Oosterpoort, Groningen, The Netherlands, 22 October 2006.