

# MOZART, REQUIEM KV 626

(NEW VERSION BY BENJAMIN-GUNNAR COHRS, 2013)

## INTRODUCTION

Bach's *Kunst der Fuge*, Mozart's C minor Mass, Schubert's *Unfinished*, Bruckner's Ninth, Mahler's Tenth, Berg's *Lulu*, Busoni's *Faust* – musical torsi exercise an endless fascination. Some represent fragments left as such for biographical reasons, for instance, because their creators turned to new projects, or died while at work on them. Others simply constitute notated ideas that from the outset were not intended for further elaboration, or compositional studies. Others, however, represent remnants of works which were once completed, but have come down to us in incomplete form.

Whether, in the first instance, it is appropriate to make performing versions of such fragments should be carefully considered on a case-by-case basis, bearing in mind all the facts as well as the surviving sources. Many dogmatists categorically condemn such completions even when they have never studied the original sources. Such polemics do no favour to the living experience of music. But while critics continue to debate whether it is sacrilege to create performing versions of the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth, of Mahler's Tenth or Schubert's *Unfinished*, such arrangements have long found their way into concert halls and are available as sound recordings.

Admittedly, in such debates between conductors, critics and listeners, Mozart's Requiem, for some strange reason, was always the exception. With remarkable consistency this fragment, which has come down to us as even constituting a 'work' only in second-hand completions, was granted a special status. Musicology and aesthetics were guilty of double standards here: when the present writer once asked Leopold Nowak, editor of the Requiem in the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* (NMA), why one could, on the one hand, reject completions of other works while at the same time acquiescing in the additions made to Mozart's Requiem, he answered: "With Mozart it's different. The Requiem has acquired a two-hundred-year-old right by tradition. Furthermore, Süßmayr knew Mozart's own intentions so well that in this case it is impermissible to object on the basis of principle."

In Mozart's own time such matters were seen far more prosaically. As is well known, the Requiem was commissioned by Count Franz von Walsegg (1763–1827). He wanted to have it performed in a memorial service for his wife Anna, who had died at an early age, and had ordered it from Mozart anonymously, using as his agent the Viennese lawyer Johann Nepomuk Sortschan. He had paid well for the deal – 25 ducats as a down payment and another 25 upon delivery. Unfortunately, Mozart died before the work was completed. What was to be done? Mozart's widow Constanze was hardly in a position to repay the down payment and urgently needed the second instalment. 50 ducats were equivalent to 225 guilders, more than the composer earned in three months (at an annual salary of 800 guilders, disregarding casual emoluments).

Mozart died on 5<sup>th</sup> December 1791, and only five days later, on 10<sup>th</sup> December, parts of the fragmentary work were performed at his own memorial service. The sections were the INTROITUS and KYRIE, the completed instrumentation of which was formerly ascribed to Mozart's oldest pupil Franz Jacob Freystädtler (1761–1841) and his young friend and copyist, composer Franz Xaver Süßmayr (1766–1803); according to the Critical Report, the manuscript shows evidence of the involvement of two writers, the identity of whom remains for the present unknown, and Michael Lorenz has been able to completely exclude the possibility of any involvement in the Requiem score by Freystädtler. On 21<sup>st</sup> December the young Joseph Eybler (1765–1846), whom Mozart had held in high esteem, had acknowledged receipt of the autograph score with the undertaking to complete it by the middle of Lent 1792, in other words, in only about two months. It wasn't long before he gave up, again for reasons unknown; he had completed the entire orchestration of *Dies irae* and *Confutatis* and that of the strings up to the *Lacrymosa*.

Süßmayr was brought in at the last minute. As we know, Mozart did not hold him in high regard as a composer. Constanze may even have only chosen him for his ability to imitate Mozart's handwriting, with striking resemblance to the original. Working under extreme time pressure, Süßmayr completed the score by end of February 1792 (there is documentary evidence that already on 4<sup>th</sup> March 1792 a copy of the entire piece was given to the Prussian ambassador in Vienna), and even imitated the deceased composer's signature on the cover: the Count had ordered a piece by Mozart, and that was what he was going to get. Süßmayr thus dated the title page with “di me W. A. Mozart m[anu] p[ropria] 1792” (Wolff, p. 59), despite the fact that it was known that Mozart had died in 1791. The delighted recipient immediately set about making his own copy of the score, on which he then placed his own name as author. This marked the beginning of a ‘con game’ that continues to this day, for we usually refer to the work as ‘Mozart's Requiem’, and not, as is more correct, ‘Requiem fragment’; moreover, no mention at all is generally made of the musicians or editors who completed the work.

### **Mozart's own Work on the Requiem**

Mozart's Requiem, in its performing arrangement by Franz Xaver Süßmayr, is one of the most performed pieces of church music. Certainly a second-hand completion of an unfinished work can never be regarded as ‘perfected’, since all possibility of that ends with the composer's death. But notwithstanding the fact that the quality of Süßmayr's work was queried from time to time, and entire generations of editors have tried to iron out at least his more egregious shortcomings, this ‘completion’ (actually an entirely inappropriate term here) is so widely acknowledged that even eminent authorities of historically informed performance practice employ it, without questioning the details of the musical text, as is the custom with performing versions of other fragments. There is only a handful of musicians who in principle choose not to perform the Requiem due to the shortcomings of its completion attempts. All the more important, it seems, that we should examine the surviving original documents themselves.

The perhaps most valuable contributions to the reception of the Requiem are the facsimile edition of the manuscripts prepared by Günter Brosche (Kassel, 1990) and the excellent study by Christoph Wolff, *Mozarts Requiem. Geschichte • Musik • Dokumente • Partitur des Fragments* (dtv/Bärenreiter, Kassel, 1991), which presents all the essential documents, valuable essays on specific questions, as well as an editorial transcription of the fragment as Mozart himself left it. Unfortunately, there has never been an edition in which a score of a completion appeared together with a facsimile or transcription of the fragment in one volume. It should be noted that there is also an earlier facsimile edition, edited by Alfred Schnerich in 1913, including a supplement which provides examples of the handwriting of all persons involved – an important instrument for the examination of the manuscript and the effort to distinguish between the indications of Mozart himself and those of others. (A reprint of this edition was published by Edition Kunzelmann in 1991, but unfortunately its editor, Franz Beyer, did not include this important supplement.)

Even the amateur music lover now has easy access to Mozart's manuscript. Following an idea of the record producer Christian Leins and with permission of the Austrian National Library, the sound recording of the work with the Concentus Musicus Wien under Nikolaus Harnoncourt includes a CD-ROM-section, making it possible to read the manuscript in a good, coloured reproduction on screen while playing the music (SACD DHM 82876 58705 2, Deutsche Harmonia Mundi, 2003). The Critical Report (ed. Dietrich Berke and Christoph Wolff) finally appeared in the NMA in 2007.

Regarding the status of the surviving original material and of Mozart's own work, several scholarly studies exist, but given their listing in the exemplary study by Wolff at hand, it seems superfluous to recapitulate such information. However, to understand whether and how it was possible to make the Requiem performable, it is helpful to have some idea of the form in which Mozart left it, and how he went about composing it. Mozart seems to have only made what we would regard as ‘sketches’ for a few, isolated passages, voice-leading, and harmonic progressions. Only a small number of these are extant.

On the other hand, the autograph represents neither sketch nor draft, but an emergent autograph score in its initial phase (just as would the unfinished Finale of Anton Bruckner's Ninth Symphony a hundred years later). Mozart conceived the Requiem in fully written-out vocal score and basso continuo, this representing the first stage of the original score. Occasionally he made notes on instrumentation in a kind of shorthand, and wrote out the instrumentation of the beginnings of sections and the transitions between them. The next steps were the orchestration of the violins and violas, the addition of the figured bass (which in this work remained incomplete), the wind parts (which here comprise only two basset-horns, two bassoons, two trumpets and three trombones) and timpani. The work was finally completed with the requisite performance directives. Mozart did not live long enough to do all of this. On the other hand, the final phases were largely regarded as routine; it was not uncommon to delegate this task to copyists or pupils working under the composer's supervision.

Mozart's own score, as can be seen from the facsimile editions, breaks off at the end of the *Hostias*, which bears his directive "quam olim da capo", i. e. at the end of the OFFERTORIUM. The legend that Mozart died after the eighth bar of the *Lacrymosa* is precisely that – a legend –, and it is impossible to find any confirmation for the assumption from documents, notwithstanding Nowak's suggestion that he deduced it from his examination of the sources. However, as Wolff has shown, the break-off makes sense if one bears in mind that Mozart intended to add a complex *Amen* fugue at that point. A sketch of the exposition of this fugue was rediscovered in 1960 by Wolfgang Plath in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin. Mozart would have completed the closing part of the *Lacrymosa* when he elaborated this fugue in full.

### **Known and unknown Models for Mozart's Requiem**

Wolff pointed out that Mozart, in writing the Requiem in a new and innovative style of church music, obviously also consulted historical masses for the dead and sometimes even quoted from them quite audibly – thus making a contemplative review of the genre while creating a funeral music on a par with the finest music of his own era. According to Wolff, the INTROITUS is "largely based on the initial chorus of Handel's *Funeral Anthem for Queen Caroline* HWV 264, written in 1737". The final chorus from Handel's *Dettingen Te Deum* served as a model for the KYRIE. As established by Hartmut Krones, Leopold Nowak and other commentators, Mozart's Requiem further bears numerous reminiscences and quotes from masses for the dead by Gassmann, Gossec, and Michael Haydn, as well as from Bach's *Mass in B minor*, *Christmas Oratorio* and *Magnificat*, C.P.E. Bach's *Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu* and the *Missa S. Caroli* by Georg Reutter the younger.

However, one of the most important models for Mozart has remained undiscovered and unmentioned to this day – the *Stabat Mater* in F minor, c. 1734, of Giovanni Battista Pergolesi (1710–1736), a work which was sensationally successful at the time, as witnessed by various print editions as well as a great number of copies in numerous libraries and music collections all over the world. Furthermore, various parodies and transcriptions of it exist, among them those of Giovanni Paisiello, Johann Sebastian Bach (Psalm 51 "*Tilge, Höchster, meine Sünden*"), Johann Adam Hiller (1776), Joseph Eybler (c. 1800) and Alexej Fyodorovich L'vov (c. 1830). A curious arrangement by an editorial team has even survived – a four-part vocal setting by Salieri, with wind parts added by Süßmayr, trombones by von Seyfried (1831), the whole revised and edited by Otto Nicolai (1843). The old Pergolesi Complete Edition (Florence, 1942) even published an anonymous arrangement of this work as a *Dies irae*, from a manuscript found in Bologna that includes arrangement for chorus, the addition of two corni da caccia and a Largo in C major as an introduction. (The editors assumed here that this represented an initial version of the *Stabat Mater* from c. 1730/31; however, most present-day researchers have rejected this theory, even if it has not been possible to establish any definitive authorship.) This renders Pergolesi's *Stabat Mater* all the more interesting as a model or precedent for the Requiem.

Mozart most likely knew the original version, which appeared in print for the first time as early as 1742, and would at the latest have been familiar with it from the arrangement by Hiller (1776), which was quite widely known. The beginning of the *Stabat Mater* already reminds the listener of the beginning of the *Requiem* (and also, as a major-mode variant of it, the beginning of the *Recordare*). Particularly remarkable, however, is the similarity of the final sections of the *Dies irae* arrangement from the old Pergolesi edition, the *Lacrymosa* and *Amen*, to the corresponding sections in Mozart's SEQUENTIA: the initial motif of the *Lacrymosa* is quite similar, and in particular, the fugato beginning of the *Amen* by Pergolesi, even more so in its arrangement for four vocal parts, almost identical with the *Amen* sketch for the *Requiem* discovered by Plath – apart from Mozart's change to 3/4 metre.

### Early Performances of the Requiem

There is a further, hitherto-ignored fact important for any attempt to complete the *Requiem*. Not only did Mozart arrive here at an entirely new style, different to that of his earlier works written for Salzburg – we have to bear in mind that this work was never intended to be published under Mozart's own name, and hence also was not intended for performance under his own direction (for instance, in St. Stephen's Cathedral). Just the opposite: its dimensions and instrumentation may well reflect the specifications of its commissioner. Mozart's decisions about its instrumentation are certainly authentic, but we cannot know as to what extent this was a matter agreed upon with the anonymous commissioner via Sortschan's office. However, notwithstanding the anonymity of the commission, it would be difficult to imagine that Mozart conceived the instrumentation and dimensions of the work entirely out of the blue. In any case, whoever wishes to reflect upon questions of style and performance practice in connection with the *Requiem* has to consider the circumstances surrounding its early performances.

The performance of the INTROITUS at Mozart's memorial service, organised by Schikaneder and Bauernfeld, and held on 10<sup>th</sup> December 1791 at St. Michael's, Vienna, may best be viewed here as an accident that inadvertently revealed the existence of the work to its audience without regard for the wishes of its anonymous commissioner. But the second performance in Vienna, at a benefit concert organised by Baron van Swieten for Mozart's widow and her children, held at Jahn's concert hall on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 1793, cannot have been inadvertent. However, considering Mozart's intentions, these two performances can be set aside, because he himself had no reason to think that anybody else except its anonymous commissioner would ever perform the *Requiem*. Count Walsegg, on the other hand, was quite indignant about these performances as well as the publication, in 1800, by Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig, which took place at the instigation of Constanze. Only by virtue of his good nature did Walsegg take no legal action, as we know from a letter of Anton Herzog, at that time *regens chori* in Wiener-Neustadt, and musical adjutant of Count Walsegg. (Wolff, Doc. 12)

Walsegg himself performed the *Requiem* on 14<sup>th</sup> December 1793 within an ordinary service at the Neuklosterkirche in Wiener-Neustadt; a further performance corresponding to Walsegg's original intentions, a memorial service for his young, deceased wife Anna, occurred only on the third anniversary of her death, 14<sup>th</sup> February 1794, in Maria-Schutz-am-Semmering, the count's patronal church. Anton Herzog reported that Walsegg had only two of his own musicians at hand, the violinist Johann Benard and the cellist Louis Prevost. Herzog played second violin or viola, the count himself the flute, or cello as well. There must also have been a continuo player. Usually they played chamber music together, twice a week. For a performance in Stuppach there were simply not enough musicians. This was apparently clear from the outset, as we know from a letter of a certain Herr Zawrzel to Johann Anton André dated 25<sup>th</sup> July 1826. (Wolff, Doc. 24) As a result, Walsegg intended well in advance to “order the basset-horns from Vienna”.

Herzog reported of Walsegg's performance: "Since in the region of Stuppach it was not possible to find all the musicians required, it was agreed that the first performance of the Requiem should take place in Wiener-Neustadt. The musicians were selected in a such a way that the solo and other most important parts were taken by the best singers and musicians available, and so it happened that the male soprano Ferenz from Neustadt, the female alto Kernbeiß from Schottwien, the tenor Klein from Neustadt, and the bass Thurner from Gloggnitz were hired to take the solo parts. [...] Count Walsegg conducted the whole ensemble." There was most likely a limited number of players in the first performances, and the basset-horns, trumpets, timpani and trombones would have been played by contracted musicians. There was probably also a rather small chorus and just a handful of string players. Contemporary sources show that a string section consisting of 4-4-2-2-2 players was quite common, but there may have been even fewer at times. (Festive performances consisting of a large number of players were rare.) Trombones may not have been available everywhere, and the provision of trumpets and timpani for a Requiem was quite daring. Herzog complained: "I consider myself convinced that Mozart would not have composed the Sanctus in D major, nor in this style; since even if the text is the very same as in a high mass, the circumstances of a mass for the dead are entirely different; a funeral service is being held; the church is hung with black drapery, and the priests appear in their funeral garb. Shrill music is not appropriate. One can exclaim Holy, Holy without having to use drum rolls."

Finally it should be borne in mind that the notion of 'conducting' church music in Mozart's day was totally different from our modern understanding of the term. (See for example the chapter "Taktschlagen und Doppeldirektion im 18. Jahrhundert" in Georg Schünemann's *Geschichte des Dirigierens*, Leipzig, 1913.) There was a choral director, an organist, a *maestro di cappella*, and sometimes a violin director. Time was not kept with a baton but beaten with the hand, with choral staffs or even with rolls of paper. There was often a good deal of noise (stick or foot tapping on the ground, time counted out loud), especially when choral directors knew no better, as contemporaries often complained. Organist and violin director were also involved in leading the performance, and sometimes there was an additional harpsichord for the Kapellmeister. Beating time was far more prevalent in churches than in the opera house or concert hall due to the scale of the building and, at times, multichoral music-making. Direction from the piano or violin was the custom in opera and concert, but remained a rarity in eighteenth-century church music, where it only gradually took hold. On the other hand, Mozart must have become accustomed to direction from the keyboard from his travels in Italy, where it was usual and from whence it later spread to Germany. How exactly church music was to be conducted was ultimately determined by the interior of the church (the location of the organ console, the construction of the choral performance area, the arrangement of galleries, etc.) and by the individual talents and decision-making of the church music directors in each case. This kind of music-making certainly required alert communication among all participants.

### **Süßmayr's Arrangement**

The text of Süßmayr's arrangement, edited by Leopold Nowak, was published in the NMA in 1965. It has often been the focus of criticism, as explained by Wolff: "The results of his compositional labour turn out to be a peculiar mixture of surprisingly good ideas and their inadequate execution; not to mention possible half-understood or misunderstood references intended to help the listener find his way around. His additions certainly did not produce a homogenous score. [...] He had neither time, interest, nor the technical qualifications to respond to the contrapuntal challenges. [...] Süßmayr was without doubt a versatile and capable assistant and an experienced composer, but he was by no means a real master, and in fact Constanze regarded him as just one of Mozart's pupils – this was obviously the reason why Mozart's widow did not immediately turn to Süßmayr with the unfinished work." On the other hand, Wolff reminded us quite rightly that "this invaluable historic document represents not only the sole surviving and accessible source of Süßmayr's compositional additions but is above and beyond that the only source that offers the possibility of rediscovering musical ideas that originated with Mozart."

*Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, *Osanna* and *Agnus Dei* were written by Süßmayr, but quite possibly with the use of sketches today lost, and perhaps with the use of Mozart's directive to repeat the KYRIE at the end underlaid with the new text (as confirmed by a letter from Constanze to Breitkopf & Härtel dated 27<sup>th</sup> March 1799). So the work at least appears to have an authentic conclusion. The following table presents an overview of Süßmayr's work.

**Table: Completion by Franz Xaver Süßmayr, 1790/91**

I. INTROITUS & KYRIE (100 bars)

*Requiem* (48): Vocal parts & Basso Continuo (V/B) by Mozart; Instrumentation begun by Mozart, possibly not entirely completed by him.

*Instrumentation finished by Süßmayr and Freystädler.*

*Kyrie* (52): V/B Mozart; *Instrumentation in two unknown hands; final version by Süßmayr.*

II. SEQUENTIA (332) [+22]

*Dies irae* (68): V/B, Str. 1–4, Viol. 15–9, 19–31, 40–57, 65–68 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Tuba mirum* (62): V/B, Pos. 1–19, Viol. 44–62 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Rex tremendae* (22): V/B, Viol. 1 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Recordare* (130) V/B, 1–13, 126–30 compl., also Viol. 134–38, 52f, 68–79, 109f, Viol. 2109f, Vla. 52f Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Confutatis* (40): V/B, Viol. 17–12, 17–40, Viol. 238–40; B.-Hrn., Fag. 26–29 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Lacrymosa* (8) [+22]: 1–2 vollst.; 3–8 V/B Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr. 9–30 [22] Composition by Süßmayr. (c. 11–18 sketched by Mozart?)*

[*Amen* (16): Vocal sketch for exposition by Mozart; *not elaborated by Süßmayr.*]

III. OFFERTORIUM (167)

*Domine Jesu* (43): V/B, Viol. 1–43 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Quam olim* (35): V/B, Viol. 11–3, 24–35, Viol. 224–28 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Hostias* (54): V/B, 1–2 obviously compl., also Viol. 144–54, Viol. 244f Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr.*

*Quam olim da capo* (35): wie oben

IV. SANCTUS [114]

*Sanctus* [11]: *Composition by Süßmayr. (c. 1–5 sketched by Mozart?)*

*Osanna* [27]: *Composition by Süßmayr. (c. 1–16 sketched by Mozart?)*

*Benedictus* [53]: *Composition by Süßmayr. (c. 1–22 sketched by Mozart?)*

*Osanna da capo* [23]: *Composition Süßmayr, transposed from D major to B flat major, shortened by 4 b.*

V. AGNUS DEI & COMMUNIO [53] (+80)

*Agnus Dei* [51]: *Composition by Süßmayr. (c. 1–14 sketched by Mozart?)*

*Lux aeterna* [2] (+28): *1–2 Composition by Süßmayr. 3–30 (=28) Repeat of section from the INTROITUS.*

*Cum sanctis tuis* (52): Repeat of Mozart's KYRIE. *Instrumentation as in the Kyrie, final version by Süßmayr.*

<b>Total length:</b>	<b>866 bars</b>
Instrumentation completed by Mozart (incl. 28 b. of repeated material)	83 bars
Instrumentation by Süßmayr	735 bars
Vocal parts & Basso and sketches for parts by Mozart (incl. repeats)	594 bars
Total length of all music composed by Mozart	677 bars
Composition by Süßmayr (possibly by making use of some sketches by Mozart)	[189 bars]

Süßmayr's 189 b. comprise approximately one fourth (22%) of the total length.

As suggested by Wolff, anyone keen to see where in Süßmayr's additions possible traces of Mozart might be found would do best to start with the bass line and the vocal parts, which Mozart used as his starting point for the compositional structure. The strongest argument in Mozart's favour here is the use of motifs from earlier parts in order to forge an inner unity – a technique that Süßmayr himself had not mastered, as is apparent from his surviving compositions.

For example, scholars who set about analysing the work established early on that the choral bass at the beginning of the *Agnus Dei* quite audibly quotes the main Requiem theme that is developed by Mozart in numerous contrapuntal forms in many sections of the piece, ensuring its inner coherence. Further connections can be found in the *Sanctus*. The soprano part at the beginning is none other than a major-key variant of the beginning of the *Dies irae* in augmentation, while the subject of the *Osanna* fugue – which the young Franz Schubert found so delightful that he quoted it in the *Osanna* of his own G major Mass – is a variant of the *Quam olim* fugal subject. The opening of the *Benedictus* has been identified as a theme that Mozart jotted down in the exercise book of his pupil Barbara Ployer. The final phrase of the theme is also reminiscent of the *Incarnatus* of the unfinished Missa Solemnis in C minor, K. 427, which was certainly unknown to Süßmayr. Moreover, towards the end a solemn figure appears with which the composer might well have intended to form a bridge back to the *Osanna* fugue – a figure that appears earlier in similar form in the INTROITUS at the words “et lux perpetua”. Apart from these audible hints there are further small details which one can take as examples of planned connections – for instance, the continuous semiquaver figure at the beginning of the *Benedictus* as well as the *Agnus Dei*, which connect them with the *Lux aeterna* and the accompanying figure of the final fugue. Such elements support the impression that at the least the substance of the entire vocal setting of the Requiem was composed by Mozart himself. If that is the case, the corresponding sketches which Süßmayr had at his disposal, must now be regarded as inaccessible or wholly lost.

### Earlier Editions and their Intentions

Süßmayr's voice leading, his pallid instrumentation and the lack of inspiration in the sections composed by him have often drawn criticism. However, the new editions available today – and several more surely exist unpublished in desk drawers – present differing strategies in approaching the problems of the work. The newer editions by **Franz Beyer (1991)** and **H. C. Robbins Landon (1990)** maintain the compositional fabric of the Süßmayr completion with the intention merely of correcting or improving its instrumentation and voice leading. The new editions by **Richard Maunder (1988)**, **Duncan Druce (1993)** and **Robert Levin (1994)** are more critical as regards Süßmayr's compositional substance: Druce reproduced not only a corrected and edited Süßmayr text, but also, as a supplement, his own, new arrangement of the sections that follow the unfinished *Lacrymosa*. **Hans-Josef Irmen (1978)** even replaced the *Amen*, SANCTUS and *Agnus Dei* with parodies: for the SANCTUS he chose the chorus “God mighty above all” from the opera *Thamos of Egypt*, K. 345; the *Laudate pueri* from the *Vesperae Solennes*, K. 339, served as an *Amen*, and as *Agnus Dei* that of the *Missa Brevis* in B flat, K. 275.

The last edition of Robbins Landon can be regarded as a ‘mixed version’. It includes all of Eybler's instrumentation as well as own additions, as far as the *Lacrymosa*. Eybler had already finished most of the instrumentation up to the *Lacrymosa*, breaking off at a point onwards of which more substantial composition would have been required. As an example for his intelligent competence may serve here the instrumentation of trumpets and timpani in the *Dies irae*: Eybler complemented the rests of the chorus with short notes in the wind instruments and kept the choral texture open, so that the entire fabric sounds more transparent, and the trumpet and timpani entries more dramatic. Süßmayr, on the other hand, wanted to support the chorus with sustained notes in the wind instruments, but in doing so covered up the vocal parts. As Wolff has shown, Süßmayr sometimes used some of Eybler's ideas, sometimes ‘correcting’ them for the worse, but often he ignored them completely, replacing them with his own routine instrumentation. However, following the *Lacrymosa* Robbins Landon simply reproduced the pure Süßmayr text, so that his edition is marred by an internal dichotomy. In addition to this, Robbins Landon also maintained an often-criticised element of the Süßmayr arrangement: the *Sanctus* and the following *Osanna* fugue are both in D major, the *Benedictus* is in B flat major. Following the model of the *Quam olim* fugue, one would have expected a repeat of the *Osanna* in D major. Süßmayr, however, repeats it as a variant in B flat major.

Robbins Landon allowed this lapsus to remain. Its correction, after all, would have required a newly composed transition from the end of the *Benedictus* into the *Osanna*, perhaps by making use of Mozart's afore-mentioned modulatory motive.

Richard Maunder regarded both *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* as inauthentic and proposed dispensing with them entirely. However, he added Süßmayr's completions of these sections as a supplement to his score, leaving the decision to perform the Requiem as a torso or not to the conductor. On the other hand, the new instrumentation Maunder provided for the work does not at all match with that of Süßmayr's *Sanctus*, *Benedictus* and *Osanna*.

Duncan Druce found an even more radical solution. He composed an entirely new *Benedictus* with solo quartet on what is acknowledged to have been Mozart's theme, enabling him to compose his own transition to the D major of the *Osanna*. Unfortunately, apart from the theme, the results completely forsake any hint of Mozart's own work.

The harshest criticism of Süßmayr, as Wolff proposes, is that he was apparently incapable of further elaborating Mozart's sketches. An eloquent example for this is the *Sanctus*, continued by Süßmayr in a rather awkward manner (remarkably, he used the opening of this movement again some years later for the *Sanctus* of his own *Missa Solemnis* in D, SmWV 106). The break between Mozart and Süßmayr is marked by a rather ugly cross-relation (C sharp/C) in the bass. Beyer and Druce tried to cover this up rather unsuccessfully with a clear concluding flourish in the trumpets; Robbins Landon tried to mitigate the effect. Only Levin in his realisation followed an insight of Wolff's, that this was a purely harmonic problem, a possible misreading by Süßmayr of an original sketch, and convincingly replaced the C in the bass in b. 6 with an A in the alto.

Also, the *Osanna* fugue is most likely based on an original sketch for its exposition which Süßmayr was not capable of elaborating, or not prepared to. After presenting the theme in all four parts, he merely added a short, rather clumsy ending. In opposition to Beyer and Robbins Landon, both Druce and Levin were enterprising enough to elaborate this exposition into a full fugue. In doing so, Druce was less successful, because his version is longer than Mozart's own fugues in similar instances (for instance, the *Kyrie* fugue), and it also goes beyond the limitations of the Requiem's harmony and style. Levin's fugue has only 58 bars and remains shorter and simpler. However, one would expect a strictly vocal fugue here, whereas Levin introduces independent instrumental entries of the theme. Also, his decision to introduce clarinets for this section only is rather odd. He argues that Mozart himself would not have used basset-horns in F for a movement in D major, preferring basset-horns in G which, however, are no longer available. On the other hand, Süßmayr used basset-horns in F with three sharps in the *Sanctus*, something which, *pace* Levin, certainly lay within the parameters of performance practice at the time.

The *Amen* fugue concluding the *Lacrymosa* must be seen as indispensable in making clear the structure of the Requiem and its symmetrical axis in D minor (*Kyrie* fugue / *Amen* fugue / *Cum sanctis* fugue). Süßmayr, however, "dispensed with an elaboration of the *Amen* fugue in favour of a plagal cadence of two bars. But certainly not because he knew nothing of Mozart's intentions, the less so since Mozart 'had very often spoken with him about the working-out' (Doc. 15), but merely because he could not do justice to the demands of strict polyphonic writing – and even less so with the planned structure of the fugue in mind, for which Mozart intended inversion, diminution and perhaps even cancrizans. As one can see from Mozart's sketch, the principal subject of the *Amen* fugue is an exact inversion of the main theme of the first movement of the Requiem" (Wolff). On the other hand, in defence of Süßmayr it is possible that Eybler perhaps did not return all the sketches he obtained from Constanze. (Perhaps the *Amen* sketch remained in Eybler's possession?) The collocation of the sketch is, however, incontestable by virtue of its use of the Requiem theme in inversion.



Despite this, Beyer and Robbins Landon chose not to use it, even though they must have been familiar with the sketch, which was discovered in 1960. In his new edition of 1991 Robbins Landon went so far as to ascribe the *Amen* sketch to the earlier *Münchener Kyrie*, K. 341, despite the fact that Alan Tyson, after comparing watermarks, had explained in 1987 that the *Amen* sketch was notated on the same paper type II that Mozart first began using at the end of September 1791. (Is it really possible that this was unknown to Robbins Landon?) Maunder was perhaps the first to attempt an elaboration of this fugue. His version is convincing for its strength and brevity, even if it contains modulations, as Levin observed, while “18<sup>th</sup> century fugues of this kind remain in the same key, thereby providing a stable conclusion not just to the movement (*Lacrymosa*), but to the entire section (the Sequence)”. In addition, the ending, at a mere six bars, is perhaps a bit too short. Druce’s fugue contains bold breaks and some curious syncopations; stylistically it sounds more like Brahms (*Deutsches Requiem*), and with 127 bars is so long that it destroys the work’s proportions. Levin took a middle path: His fugue, with 88 bars, is slightly more than Maunder’s, uses denser counterpoint and contains a longer closing section, but following the *Lacrymosa* it seems too exuberant and virtuosic. Moreover, it again contains independent subject entries in the accompanying instruments, as opposed to Mozart’s fugues in the Requiem fragment, which are strictly vocal fugues where, with few exceptions (trumpets, timpani, bass), the instruments have only to support the vocal parts; in fugato passages they rarely appear in obligato roles.

As Mozart’s *Lacrymosa* breaks off after the eighth bar, Druce and Maunder composed their own transitions to the fugue. Levin, on the other hand, retained Süßmayr’s version, merely correcting details, making changes only at the end. Druce included the two further bars of melody that were sketched by Eybler, but his instrumentation, the lengthy composition of an interlude and transition again exceeds the stylistic parameters of the work. In all, his *Lacrymosa* occupies 36 bars. Maunder continued with his own composition as well, but with 24 bars it is six bars shorter than Süßmayr’s and stylistically more convincing.

Hans Josef Irmen had the in itself attractive idea of completing Mozart with Mozart, but the models he chose for this parodic technique are taken from works composed between 1773 und 1780, and the result is as unconvincing as, for instance, the pasticcio arranged by Alois Schmitt in 1901 to complete the C minor Mass. Irmen’s most interesting idea is perhaps the choice of the *Laudate pueri* from K. 339 as a final fugue for the SEQUENTIA, since it bears similarities not only with the theme of the *Kyrie* fugue in the Requiem but also with the final chorus from Pergolesi’s *Stabat Mater*. However, in the instrumentation of this fugue (as well as in that of the *Agnus Dei*, chosen from the Mass, K. 275) there is no independent viola part, and Irmen also made no use of basset-horns or bassoons. Overall, his scoring exceeds the limitations of Mozart’s own instrumentation, because for his SANCTUS parody Irmen adopted the instrumentation of the original, adding two flutes and two horns which nowhere else occur in the Requiem. He argued that the C minor Mass, in its *Incarnatus*, adds a flute too, but overlooked the fact that in Mozart’s time flute and oboe parts were often taken by the same players. In the C minor Mass, the *Incarnatus* has only one oboe; the flute part was certainly taken by the other oboist.

Irmen went so far as to criticise the generally dark colours in the Requiem with its basset-horns and bassoons as a “stereotypical, grey layer of sound”, but if we consider that Mozart in his Salzburg church compositions often dispensed with woodwinds completely, and that most of his orchestral compositions call for an orchestra of only strings, bass part, two oboes and two horns, we could similarly regard this as ‘stereotypical’. We should also not overlook the fact that neither Süßmayr nor Eybler added further wind instruments, which would have destroyed the unique simplicity of the Requiem. On the other hand, the instrumentation, as it has been handed down to us, still allows for many nuances. Essentially the basset-horns merely replace the otherwise typical oboes; the only problem here is the limited range of the basset-horn, which, if the first basset-horn is being led *colla parte* with the sopranos, requires variation when the soprano goes beyond the upper limit of the basset-horn’s range.

Irmen's score, which appeared in self-publication, must ultimately also be considered unfinished. Despite a few performances during his lifetime, there are many mistakes, missing performance indications, no figured bass whatsoever, and Irmen left many of the shortcomings of the Süßmayr arrangement unaltered. This edition is not even available anymore, since the editor's 'Prisca Verlag' was already liquidated by the time of his sudden death (2007). As Irmen's widow explained to the present writer in 2009, no further impressions of his edition are planned.

Looking at all the readily accessible arrangements of the Requiem, one can only come to the disappointing conclusion that one can raise a number of fundamental objections against each of them. The real devil is in the details – not only those of the compositional additions, but also of the instrumentation, since Mozart himself left the majority of the score unorchestrated. So one has not only to draw Süßmayr into question, but also all the other editions that have been discussed here. Beyer and Robbins Landon corrected some of Süßmayr's errors but left more standing. Maunder and Druce made reference to the later operas (*Zauberflöte*, *Titus*) as models for their instrumentation, but rarely recognised the entirely different demands of the 'pathetic style' of church music, and ignored Alan Tyson's research on paper types, concluding that the Requiem was begun only after Mozart had finished his operatic works, namely, after his return from Prague (mid-September 1791). Druce's imaginative additions go entirely beyond the work's stylistic domain; the passages composed by him show little knowledge of historic compositional techniques or of the *stile antico*, which occurs at points in the Requiem and would certainly have played a major role in the *Amen* fugue as well, as Mozart's sketch itself demonstrates. Levin is a similar case, making an even worse mistake by referring to Mozart's earlier Salzburg style, thereby ignoring the fact that the Requiem expressly followed Viennese models, as also with regard to instrumentation. Levin even used the stylistically wholly different, unfinished C minor Mass of 1783 as a model (*Sanctus*; *Amen* fugue). Such models cannot simply be transferred to the Requiem, for which Mozart developed an entirely new style that was unique to the work. Irmen even exceeded Mozart's own instrumentation; his completion also appears to be stylistically unconvincing with regard to the compositional parameters Mozart set himself – paradoxically, given Irmen's method of using parodies of Mozart's own works, of which only the *Laudate pueri* is in any way stylistically appropriate.

### Concerns of the New Edition

In view of the above, anyone preparing to perform the Requiem finds himself on the horns of a dilemma: if one cannot decide wholly and solely in favour of one of the editions, one can only attempt to assemble elements of them. Indeed, entire generations of church musicians have created their own personal 'versions' of the Requiem by doing so. But this calls for far too many fundamental decisions, and some of the problems would remain since they were not resolved in any of the existing editions. For this reason, the present writer has attempted to arrive at his own edition, which was undertaken under the following premises:

- 1.) Since Süßmayr's supplementations lie closest to Mozart's own time and we can assume quite rightly that they are based at least partially on sketches by Mozart himself (as explained above), they represent an indispensable consideration for every new edition, particularly as regards the vocal parts and bass line in the second half of the Requiem. However, they have to be scrutinised and wherever necessary modified or replaced with other material. The *Amen*, *Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, *Osanna* and *Agnus Dei* required entirely new versions (despite maintaining passages most likely sketched by Mozart himself). Inevitably, similarities with other editions appear where the text of Süßmayr or Eybler has been used, and where either the corrections were obvious or very few alternatives were possible.
- 2.) Since Eybler was certainly a much better and more experienced composer than Süßmayr, his additions in the SEQUENTIA were preferable to those of Süßmayr, where necessary modified, amended or corrected, sometimes even reduced, given their stylistically doubtful "tendency towards a more elaborate, independent orchestral accompaniment", as Wolff rightly noted.

The instrumentation must respect the peculiarities of the composition. Thus, as Mozart's existing instrumentation suggests, independent passages for the trombones were largely avoided, with only a few, carefully considered exceptions. In the tutti passages the woodwinds support the chorus, the bassoons from time to time the bass line, to which they contribute greater rhythmic profile as well as adding to the orchestral resonance. The compositional texture of the upper strings is orientated around the bass and vocal parts.

3.) Since the autograph itself offers only few such indications, this new edition had to a large degree to supplement articulation, tempo markings, dynamics and figured bass in line with Mozart's usual procedures and the sparse directives to be found in the manuscript.

The main purpose of this new edition (= NE) is to complete the piece in a style corresponding more closely with that of Eybler (including freer part-writing in the winds, and greater independence in the violins and violas, occasionally resorting to *divisi*). The effort to eliminate the majority of Süßmayr's technical shortcomings is intended to render the work more stylistically coherent, even if this means replacing Süßmayr's second-hand additions with those of the present writer, who is all too aware of the problems involved.

For this reason, the question as to whether it might be possible to find convincing earlier pieces by Mozart which could be used as a basis for parodies (*Amen*, *Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, *Osanna*, *Agnus Dei*) was examined. But in opposition to his completion of the CREDO and AGNUS DEI of the C minor Mass, the present writer came to the conclusion that this would make little sense here. First of all, the style of the Requiem, as is apparent from the passages in Mozart's own hand, is so unique in its texture and its simplicity that it would be extremely difficult to find pieces to convincingly adapt and parody in such a way as to form a credible match with its style. Irmen's decision to use an extract from *Thamos* as a SANCTUS, which goes entirely beyond the stylistic parameters of the Requiem, bears witness to this dilemma. (Irmen's arrangement would have been better suited to a completion of the unfinished Mass in D following the *Münchener Kyrie*, K. 341 the other movements of which Mozart did not undertake.) Generally speaking, there were few convincing models to be found. There was no appropriate piece whatsoever to use for the SANCTUS. For some time the editor was tempted to follow Irmen's lead and provide an *Amen* fugue based on the *Laudate pueri*, with the instrumentation expanded to match that of the Requiem. But the piece seems overly long, and worse, the metre is wrong; as the sketch reveals, Mozart clearly intended a fugue in 3/4 time, not in *alla breve*. (He even changed the metre of Pergolesi's original, of which the *Laudate pueri* is even more reminiscent, for that of the *Amen* sketch.)

Christoph Wolff underlined the importance of this decision for the structure of the work: "For formal reasons, ending the SEQUENTIA with a fugue is an almost compelling necessity: all five sections of the work would then include a fugal movement, and in a clearly symmetrical fashion: even – odd – even – odd – even metre. The *Osanna* fugue (seen apart from the shortcomings of Süßmayr's elaboration) fits perfectly within the continuum of intentionally original solutions, being based on a clearly profiled theme that further develops basic elements of the *Quam olim Abrahae* fugue subject, and in doing so fulfills the requirements of overall structural stability. On the other hand, the *Osanna* fugue highlights the novel and individualistic, not least of all due to its syncopated beginning in triple metre, but moreover due to the strong contrasts of its internal organisation: its asymmetrical structure (3+3 bars), with syncopated beginning and finally sequence of regular quavers. But in Mozart's treatment of the fugue more generally, i. e. as a compositional category, it becomes evident that two main concerns are in operation: Mozart observes tradition, but does so by transforming it qualitatively into something new. One is reminded here of Nissen, who spoke of a bond linking the 'holy dignity of old music with the rich decoration of the new'. Hence, it is no coincidence that the entire Requiem is embedded in a stylistic frame of precisely this kind: the music of *Introitus* and *Kyrie* represents the point of setting out; their repeat, with altered text, the point of arrival."

For all these reasons, it seemed to be better not to disturb the structural disposition of the piece and to favour a new ‘second-hand completion’ of the *Amen* fugue over a parody. For the same reason, no model was chosen for a parody of the *Cum sanctis*, despite some good arguments – the insufficient text distribution of Süßmayr's KYRIE parody, and particularly the ending of the work, which has nothing of the mildness appropriate to the text, “quia pius est”, nor lends comfort to those in mourning, as a requiem should. The latter problem was solved by the editor's decision to add an alternative ending in D major, one bar longer, and with a more comforting plagal cadence. There was, in fact, a very good model available for a parody *Cum sanctis*, namely, the motet *Misericordias Domini*, K. 222 (1775), which is in D minor, contains in b. 3 the later, well-known Requiem theme, and has a main section anticipating elements of the *Kyrie* fugue. (It would certainly be interesting to perform this motet and the Requiem within the same programme.)

### Editorial Method and Layout

In the autograph score and Süßmayr's first copy the movements, designated by the initial word of their texts, are unnumbered. These titles were generally maintained for the NE. The five main sections were ordered here in accordance with the *ordinarium missae*, and provided with roman numerals:

[I. INTROITUS & KYRIE]

***Requiem*** • *Kyrie*

[II. SEQUENTIA]

***Dies irae*** • ***Tuba mirum*** • ***Rex tremendae*** • ***Recordare*** • ***Confutatis*** • ***Lacrymosa*** • [*Amen*]

[III. OFFERTORIUM]

***Domine*** [*Jesu*] • ***Quam olim*** • ***Hostias*** • ***Quam olim***

[IV. SANCTUS]

***Sanctus*** • [*Osanna*] • ***Benedictus*** • [*Osanna*]

[V. AGNUS DEI & COMMUNIO]

***Agnus Dei*** • ***Lux aeterna*** • [*Cum sanctis*]

Mozart's own titles are given in bold and in italics, those of Süßmayr in italics only; additions of the editor are given in italics and squared brackets. The individual movements were not numbered in order to avoid misunderstanding: The various editions of the Requiem all provide different numbering, depending on whether repeated sections were included or not, or whether one should regard the fugues as belonging to the preceding movement, or as separate movements. In order to make rehearsal easier, the NE provides an independent bar numbering for each movement, beginning in each case at bar 1. The *Quam olim* is regarded here as a separate section, in line with Mozart's words “quam olim da capo” and his separation of it from the *Domine* with a double barline, despite the fact that the repeat has been written out for greater convenience. This made it possible to number the bars of this movement independently, the numbering being identical for both movements. Mozart's famous last words also justify accepting the separate title *Quam olim* as original, even if Mozart had not (yet) written it above the first bars.

The NE is expressly intended as a practical arrangement rather than a ‘critical edition’; it therefore seemed unnecessary to differentiate its other additions by means of small type, dotted slurs or squared brackets, which would only have looked cluttered. Mozart's autograph, after all, is available in facsimile, and anyone interested can consult it wherever questions arise. For the same reason this edition contains only a comprehensive Commentary and no ‘Critical Report’ on each and every tiny detail of the sources. Practical musicians nowadays rarely take the time to study such reports, or investigate detailed philological problems. Furthermore, even now scholars do not agree as to the extent of the various hands that can be found in the manuscript. In his edition Robbins Landon, for instance, marked with an “M” sections which were assuredly not written by Mozart himself.

Finally, the layout of the bass part must be explained. Mozart notated cello, double bass and organ in a single system, and hence inconsistencies arise where the double basses are silent for some time. These had to be resolved. It seemed both more appropriate and more clear to reproduce the organ part in a second system. After passages marked 'Vc.' only, the entrance of both double bass and Cello is indicated by 'Bassi'.

The layout of this edition follows the demands of performers as well as Mozart's own notational habits; for instance, he designates the soprano part as "Canto", as does Maunder's edition; the NE does likewise. Also, the editor was happy to follow up on a suggestion made by Nikolaus Harnoncourt, namely, to assist the conductor by placing a header with the name of the movement on each page.

### Concerning the Trombones

The autograph shows that Mozart was quite careful with the use of independent trombones, which he gives *colla parte* within the vocal parts. Due to the small number of participants, which do not exceed the scope of 12-stave music paper, this was a practical solution (secondary partial scores would otherwise have been required, as in the case of the C minor Mass, which is laid out for much larger forces). Only two independent cues of the trombones exist in Mozart's own hand – their first appearance in the Requiem and, as dictated by the character of the piece, the tenor trombone solo at the beginning of the *Tuba mirum*.

Süßmayr, on the other hand, was tempted to write more independently for the trombones, which he notated separately on two staves wherever possible. However, the excessive independent trombone writing of other editions based on Süßmayr – particularly irritating in the *Benedictus* – seems alien to the style of the work. One should also not overlook the fact that the original manuscript can be regarded an 'emergent autograph score'; its indications of trombone cues in Mozart's own hand are rare and where added by Süßmayr not without contradiction. Hence it seemed best to deal with the trombones as schematically as possible and use them independently only in rare, well-reasoned instances. The trombones have also to rest in vocal solo as well as in soft passages; these are indicated throughout the NE with 'senza Trb.'

Nowak made a comprehensive examination of the practice of trombone writing and playing in the Requiem. (NMA, Vol. I/1/2/2, pp. XVIIIff; see also Vol. I/1/2/1, pp. XIIIff) In particular he noted the following: "It could sometimes occur that smaller rhythmic values given in the vocal parts were represented in the trombone parts by notes of longer value. However, this differed according to the customs of music making and place of performance." Only rarely did Süßmayr indicate such simplifications. (Nowak, p. XIX) However, the NE gives no such simplifications of rhythm, leaving them to the discretion of players; this corresponds to the practice of Mozart's time, as can be seen from surviving trombone parts (where the trombone players did not simply play from the vocal parts), although one may perhaps agree with Irmen, who noted that in rapid passages the trombones most likely played only the main notes: "The delightful virtuosity of present-day instrumentalists should not cause us to overlook the fact that Mozart himself nowhere expressly demanded such artistry as can often be heard today in Requiem performances." On the other hand, in Mozart's time coloratura passages may already have been seen as a challenge for good trombone players, and he would surely not have objected if they were capable of playing every note as written...

In order to underscore the uniqueness of the Requiem, the NE, just like the manuscript, notates the trombones *colla parte* with the vocal parts, giving tenor and alto in corresponding clefs. Reading them should not prove difficult for the conductor. The modern treble clef was maintained for the soprano, however, and of course the vocal score places all parts in modern clefs.

## Concerning the Organ Part

Mozart himself provided figured bass indications only at isolated places in the Requiem. Süßmayr added them at several points, but not throughout, perhaps due to the haste in which his work was undertaken. Some figures may also have been added by Eybler or Stadler. Due to this, the figured bass in editions of the Requiem is traditionally a mixture of what is indicated in the manuscripts and the further supplementation which appeared for the first time in the earliest print edition (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1800), and in the subsequent edition by André (Offenbach 1827). Certain discrepancies can be found here: in figured bass, Mozart habitually placed the accidental in front of the figure, whereas today it is customary to do the opposite. Nonetheless, most Mozart editions remain faithful to his practice, as does the NE. In any event, continuo players may be expected to be familiar with both forms of notation, and the author finds it more natural to read the accidental first and then the figure, as in normal staff notation, where accidentals appear in front of the notes. The figures were corrected or extended where necessary, since even Mozart himself made small mistakes from time to time. The old idiosyncratic figures for the augmented fourth and sixth were replaced with figures with accidentals.

The use of the organ in the subsequent movements of the SEQUENTIA up to the *Sanctus* is more problematic. At the beginning of the *Tuba mirum* Mozart wrote the word “Basso”, but there is no reference to the organ throughout the entire movement. In the *Rex tremendae* we again find “Basso ed Organo”, likewise in the *Recordare*, but the latter again omits any indications as to the organ's role. Nothing at all is indicated initially for the *Confutatis*, but from b. 26 onwards Mozart himself provided figures. The *Domine* gives merely the indication “Basso” in Mozart's hand, but autograph bass figuring can be found between b. 21 and 28. The *Hostias* indicates “Basso ed Organo”, but no figuring. Most editions take these indications literally, as a result of which the *Tuba mirum*, as well as the *Recordare*, are usually performed entirely without the organ participating.

On the other hand, Mozart's own figured bass in the *Domine* demonstrates that the sheer existence of the word ‘Basso’ without ‘organo’ by no means excludes use of the organ entirely. In all, one thing can be regarded as definitive: as evident from the fragmentary nature of the work itself, indications as to the involvement of the organ are certainly not ‘final’, justifying, in some cases, supplementing the organ part for practical and stylistic considerations. It is actually inconceivable that the organ should rest throughout entire movements, particularly if one bears in mind the directive role of the organist. Furthermore, the entire manuscript nowhere indicates ‘senza organo’ at the beginning of a movement. It seems equally impossible that the *Tuba mirum* and *Recordare* are to be played *tasto* throughout; the NE thus adds organ parts for both movements as seemed appropriate. Further details are given in the Commentary.

One final problem merits discussion. In his edition of the Requiem, Robert Levin noted that Mozart, in his organ parts, makes a distinction between ‘Solo’ and ‘Tutti’. Referring to hypotheses advanced in the prefaces to the Mass volumes of the NMA, he claimed: “These indications refer to the local practice of using a ‘solo organ’ for orchestral and vocal solo passages and a ‘tutti organ’ for choral passages.” This assumption is based in particular on the unique disposition of Salzburg Cathedral, with its twelve galleries, some of them equipped with organs (an illustration appears on p. 32 of *Musikgeschichte in Bildern*, Vol. 4, Fascicle 2, Leipzig, 1971).

For Mozart's Salzburg church works, however, it is especially important to bear in mind the circumstances of their composition. Smaller occasional pieces performed during church services were probably not played with several instruments to a part. Yet even here we find Mozart's ‘Solo’ and ‘Tutti’ marks in the organ part. The practice described by Levin must have been at best an exception.

On the other hand, it would be absurd to call for different organs if the change between solo and tutti is limited to a few bars, sometimes only one or two, as often happens in Mozart's church music. Although Mozart definitely did not compose his Requiem for Salzburg, it nevertheless has these same markings. Imagine, for instance, performing b. 32 of the INTROITUS with a 'Solo organ', but at b. 34 changing to a different 'Tutti organ'... The markings do make sense, however, if we understand them as helpful reminders to the organist as to what he has to accompany in those bars, enabling him, if required, to change the registration or manual (which is how most players understand such markings today). They would also have been helpful when the piece was conducted from the organ, since the organist usually had only his own part in front of him (there were no vocal scores in those days, and playing from score was a rare and impractical practice), and he would need to know when to accompany the tutti. The introductory orchestral ritornellos (marked 'Solo') had also the function of establishing the metre and tempo for the chorus or soloists, meaning that the organist had to be especially attentive at that point. This edition uses 'Solo' and 'Tutti' in this sense, supplementing them where necessary.

### Performance Directives

Due to the fact that the Requiem was left unfinished and incomplete, performance instructions had to be added at numerous points. They are largely orientated on those given by Süßmayr and Eybler but by no means regard these as sacrosanct. Not even in the INTROITUS, most of the instrumentation of which is by Mozart himself, is it possible to recognise which slurs are actually original (certainly most of those in the vocal parts); most of these were more likely only added prior to the first performance of this section as part of the memorial service for Mozart, five days after his death.

As can be seen from the manuscript, Mozart himself left only sporadic performance indications – the most essential dynamics in the vocal parts and bass line, and only a handful of articulations. Interestingly, Mozart's vocal parts often contain short slurs within long melismatic passages. Though these slurs can be helpful in making the declamation and phrasing of long lines and melismas clearer for the singers, they were more likely intended to simplify the phrasing for the *colla parte* trombones, even though their ability to play legato in fast passages is naturally limited and rapid passagework can be replaced by supporting notes from time to time, as we have seen. Unfortunately, most Mozart editions are inconsistent on this point, since slurs in the vocal parts are seldom replicated in the *colla parte* trombone parts. Also, almost none of the earlier editions dared to add articulation to any great extent, even in cases where certain figures are often repeated (in particular the melismatic lines in the fugues). The NE gives slurs in both trombone and vocal parts, since they are notated within the same systems, and adds articulations wherever it seemed appropriate.

This was also necessary for the strings and woodwinds. Only the INTROITUS contains sufficient indications, doubtless the result of its early first performance. But already the *Kyrie* fugue bears almost no articulations, the weird consequence being that entire generations of musicians have let it rattle on as monotonously as a sewing-machine; this, despite that the old, light string detaché used for such figures had long been in decline by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Even Süßmayr added some slurs in the strings in his *Cum sanctis* parody of this fugue, which offers a starting point for further additions.

Articulation and dynamics throughout were again re-examined and supplemented wherever required. This edition also takes into account recent research findings in performance practice. Warmly recommended is Neal Zaslaw's book, *Mozart's Symphonies: Context, Performance Practice, Reception* (Oxford University Press, 1981), and the congress report, *Mozart's Piano Concertos: Context, Performance, Interpretation*, Zaslaw edited (Ann Arbor, MI, 1986), which contains various papers on this topic. For instance, it proved possible to clarify some peculiarities of Mozart's dynamics: if a *fp* or *mf* appears at the beginning of a beamed group of notes (e. g. repeated quavers), the *f* or *mf* usually applies to the entire group, not just to the first note beneath the beam, whereas given beneath a slur it applies only to the first note.

Consequently, *fp* does not necessarily mean a strong accent at the beginning and a sudden decrescendo, as is often heard. Such signs must always be evaluated within their context. When Mozart wished to bring out a single note within a group, he usually separated it, for instance by writing a single quaver followed by three quavers beneath one beam. Sometimes Mozart wrote “*dolce*”, but usually following a preceding *p*, so that its real meaning is not only timbral, but also ‘*p dolce*’, or, even softer. Much the same can be said of “*sotto voce*” in the vocal parts. Süßmayr sometimes used *ff* in the Requiem, but this is not characteristic of Mozart; it has accordingly been reduced here to *f*, more appropriate to the style of the work.

### Fermatas and Appoggiaturas

It was also necessary to examine and where necessary correct the placement of fermatas. For instance, Mozart placed a fermata on the last note of the INTROITUS, in order to indicate that the KYRIE should follow *attacca*. Placing a fermata over the double barline would therefore be unnecessary. On the other hand, in the Requiem Mozart was generally in the habit of placing a fermata over the last barline of a movement or section, even if the next movement was not necessarily intended to follow *attacca*. Earlier editions adopted these fermatas unquestioningly as they correspond to modern practice of performing the Requiem uninterruptedly within a concert. In a service, however, various prayers, readings, liturgical chants and responses follow the five sections of the liturgical text which were actually set to music. In order to avoid misunderstandings, it was tempting here to eliminate the fermatas over the final barlines of all five major sections, but it is nonetheless still better not to simply edit them out. Those movements which were intended to follow on directly were always marked with “*segue*”, as indicated by Mozart himself at the end of the *Confutatis*, but avoiding the word ‘*attacca*’ used by Robbins Landon. Another important instance deserves note: Mozart wrote a fermata in b. 7 of the *Tuba mirum* as an indication that a cadenza-like improvisation could be performed there – one which is almost never executed (cf. Commentary).

Finally, the appoggiaturas merit special attention (interesting details on their execution can be found on pp. 158–203 of Hartmut Krones and Robert Schollum's *Vokale und allgemeine Aufführungspraxis*, Böhlau-Verlag, Wien – Köln, 1983). In opposition to the practice of the NMA, this edition represents the appoggiaturas as written in the autograph. Of all the sections surviving in Mozart's own hand the *Tuba mirum* is the one movement in which they appear more frequently than any other; they otherwise appear only rarely, in particular in the INTROITUS and *Domine Jesu* movements. The appoggiaturas in the *Benedictus* and *Agnus Dei* are most likely those of Süßmayr, unless he had hand sketches for the vocal parts by Mozart himself (which is by no means impossible). The present editor was tempted to add suggestions for the correct execution of the appoggiaturas in square brackets, but ultimately dispensed with the idea, since their correct execution cannot be reduced to strict obedience to a set of rules.

Their appropriate performance has to be based on musical taste as well as on an awareness of a whole framework of expression, character, tempo, rhythm, metre, notation, as well, in the vocal parts of the text, the syllables, vowels and consonants. That said, it would be clearly wrong to execute all appoggiaturas short, or all the same way. In the specific case of the Requiem one should also note that many passages which could have been given with appoggiaturas were fully written out (perhaps because this was a Mass for the Dead in strict church music style, which scarcely allowed for operatic ornamentation). All the more important is the role of a certain licence and good taste in the execution of the few appoggiaturas that were notated as such. Some basic considerations follow.

In the *Tuba mirum*, Mozart wrote crotchets in b. 20, but from b. 27 onwards quavers as appoggiaturas, despite the identical rhythm of the main notes in all instances (a dotted crotchet followed by a quaver); likewise in b. 35, 38, 41 and 43. According to the rules set out by contemporary commentators, in such instances the appoggiatura should take two parts of the dotted main note, and the main note itself only one part (hence the appoggiatura would be sung approximately as a crotchet, the main note as a quaver; cf. Krones & Schollum, p. 181).



The deviation from this notation in b. 20 could simply be an error by Mozart, but it may be also possible that Mozart here intended a different style of execution. In fact, there is an exception to the above-mentioned rule that in certain cases of appoggiaturas before dotted notes the following main note itself is to be taken as double dotted and the following note further abbreviated (here: double-dotted crotchet and semiquaver; cf. Krones & Schollum, p. 182). Such an intensification would match with the more excited character, accompaniment and heightened articulation from b. 18, but would no longer be appropriate from b. 27 onwards. Wrong here in any case would be to reduce the appoggiaturas to the length of a single quaver, as can often be heard.

At b. 36 of the *Tuba mirum* as well as b. 41f of the *Domine Jesu* a further specific case occurs. At first sight the manuscript appears to give these appoggiaturas as quavers with a stroke. However, Mozart's handwriting reveals a curious idiosyncrasy: only for quavers did he write flags; instead of adding further flags for semiquavers he placed a further stroke through the stem. For this reason, the NMA printed all such appoggiaturas as semiquavers.

However, the suggestion of the NMA that all such appoggiaturas with a quaver following should be executed as two semiquavers is certainly not correct, because if a figure with appoggiatura, quaver and two semiquavers (in particular if it appears within sequences of semiquavers) would be executed as four semiquavers, to notate it differently (which must have had a purpose) would be absurd.

However, a problem soon arises: the performance of such appoggiaturas short and on the beat (as semiquavers or demisemiquavers) really only works at a rather slow speed; from a certain tempo onwards one naturally arrives at two more or less equal semiquavers, or alternately one has to place the small note before the beat. Hence, it appears to be more likely that such appoggiaturas were intended to emphasize such notes (usually on a weak beat) by lengthening. On the other hand, one could well ask if such appoggiaturas, at the same pitch as the note before, are not better treated as anticipations, even where, as for instance indicated by L. Mozart and Quantz, such sequences of anticipations are not appropriate merely in specific cases such as ascending scales. (See also Leopold Mozart, *Violinschule*, p. 207!)

In any case, the three instances found in the Requiem (at b. 36 of the *Tuba mirum* and at b. 41f in the *Domine Jesu*) should not be executed as two equal semiquavers. For the present editor, tempo and text would make the performance of these two instances as emphasized notes within the flow of legato phrase more likely than treated them as short on-the-beat appoggiaturas. Further appoggiaturas can be found in the *Benedictus* (b. 15, 18, 33, 36, 40) and *Agnus Dei* (b. 14, 28). In these cadence-like formulations, the accompaniment as well as the words "Domini" and "requiem" may suggest two equal notes (semiquavers in the *Benedictus*; quavers in the *Agnus Dei*), but again one had better not execute these with metronomic equality.

Appoggiaturas at such places should by no means have an excited quality; they should be performed with a certain freedom and taste, and one should not overlook that, as Nikolaus Harnoncourt suggested, the main purpose of appoggiaturas is to heighten the meaning of the vocal text.

## Tempi

Only a few tempo markings in the Requiem originated with Mozart. Some were added by Süßmayr; other movements remained without specification, and have been supplemented by various editors according to varying criteria. They were therefore re-examined and where necessary modified for the NE. Mozart's indications appear here without brackets, all those added in square brackets (whether they originated with Süßmayr or not).

Helmut Breidenstein provided useful insight into the tempo problem: “The tempo indications of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century refer not so much to physical speed, about which we prefer to care, but merely the correct ‘performance’ in general terms [...] The kind of time, class of note and verbal tempo markings, taken together, constitute a kind of module for the definition of the relative weight of the emphasis as well as the speed, the character and style of playing – the ‘motion’ of the music in its broadest sense. Almost three-quarters of all verbal tempo indications by Mozart, therefore, do not refer to a particular ‘beat’, whatever unit of the bar it may be most appropriate to beat in practice.” (Helmut Breidenstein, ‘Worauf beziehen sich Mozarts Tempobezeichnungen?’, in: *Das Orchester* 3/2004, pp. 17ff, and ‘Mozarts Tempo-System: Zusammengesetzte Takte als Schlüssel’, in: *Mozart-Studien* 13, Tutzing 2004, pp. 11ff. Further information can be found on Breidenstein’s multilingual website: [www.mozart-tempi.net](http://www.mozart-tempi.net))

Regarding tempo markings in the Requiem one also has to consider the fact that the work is composed in the ‘pathetic style’ of church music, which rarely resorts to ‘lighter’ tempi. The announcement of the first performance outside of Vienna (Leipzig, 20<sup>th</sup> April 1796; Wolff, Doc. 13) reads “the piece performed will last almost one hour”, whereas present-day performances last 45 to 55 minutes. A further matter for consideration is the inner coherence provided by certain rhythmic motifs which seem to call for the same tempo in different contexts, as well as the fact that duple and triple time-signatures may in any case require different tempo indications, despite having an identical pulse.

Mozart himself established a frame of reference with his indications “Adagio” (INTROITUS) and “Allegro” (KYRIE), in addition to, probably, the “All° assai” for the *Dies irae* and “Andante” for the *Tuba mirum* and *Confutatis*; however, the handwriting of these words appears as if they might also have been written by Eybler (Mozart, for instance, usually wrote the capital A with more taper). Also the differing appearances of “Allegro” (fol. 5v) and “Adagio” (fol. 9r) in the final bars of the KYRIE represents at least two further hands. However, due to the note values and the metrical emphasis, ‘Andante’ is certainly an appropriate marking for the *Tuba mirum*. One should recall here that the INTROITUS constitutes an Adagio in the old “großer Vierviertheiltact” (greater 4/4 time). The *alla breve* Andante of the *Tuba mirum* should be seen in relation to this; its minims equal the quavers of the Adagio, as one can deduce from the rhythm of the accompaniment.

The ensuing movements, as well as the *Lacrymosa*, remained without tempo indication in Mozart’s original as well as in Süßmayr’s score. Due to its grave character and shorter note values (dotted semiquavers), ‘Andante’ is inadequate for the *Rex tremendae*; it is better regarded as an ‘Adagio’ (as we find in Maunder and Druce; note the similarity to the “exaudi” in the INTROITUS as well as to the *Gratias* of the C minor Mass).

*Recordare*, *Confutatis* and *Lacrymosa* together represent a difficult complex. The character of the *Recordare* is that of an ‘Andante’ in 3/4 time, but stands in relation to quavers as the basic note value, while the longer semiquaver groups at b. 90 suggest that the movement should not be taken too fast. The *Confutatis* in 4/4 time has considerably smaller note values, but the string figure at the words “voca me” (b. 7) is identical with the main characteristic motif of the *Recordare*, suggesting an equivalent pulse.

In order to interpret the motion of the *Confutatis* correctly, it seemed to be appropriate to give a slower tempo indication than that of the *Recordare*, notwithstanding the same pulse, but in accordance with the different class of metre and shorter note values, proposing ‘Andante con moto’ for the slower, but more fluid *Recordare* (3/4 time, but the tempo related to the quavers), and ‘Andante’ for the *Confutatis* (4/4) related to the crotchets, notwithstanding the shorter notes used here (a connection beautifully demonstrated by the end of the movement). Certainly the *Confutatis* is no ‘Adagio’, and it is not as slow as the INTROITUS.

Corresponding to this, the *Lacrymosa* that follows *attacca* is best designated 'Larghetto' by virtue of its compound metre (12/8). Duncan Druce came to the same conclusion. In the *Amen* fugue (in 3/4 time and whole bars) the crotchets correspond with the foregoing quavers. However, it would best be designed as 'Allegro', matching the 'Allegro assai' of the initial *Dies irae* (in 4/4 time, but with a minim pulse). The crotchets of the *Amen* should equal those of the *Dies irae*. Druce gave 'Vivace' for the fugue; however, this is contrary to Mozart's habits in movements in 3/4 (Mozart could have written 'Presto', but this would be inappropriate for a fugue in church music). Furthermore, 'Allegro' corresponds with Süßmayr's suggestion for the *Osanna* fugue, since it is written in the same metre and has the same kind of movement.

Süßmayr's 'Andante con moto' for the *Domine* seemed inappropriate: it is written in 4/4 time and has a forward-driving character based on semiquaver figures (note in particular the continuous semiquavers after b. 21). Druce mentioned this in the preface of his edition and compared the movement with the *Confitebor* from the *Vesperae Solennes*, K. 339. However, he maintained Süßmayr's marking and offered a quicker 'Allegro moderato' only in a footnote. The NE, on the other hand, replaces it with 'Allegro' as did Maunder – particularly because the character of the *Domine* is closely related to that of the *Kyrie* fugue. (Note also that the *Gloria* of the C minor Mass, similar in its time signature and movement, is even marked 'Allegro vivace!') Süßmayr's suggested 'Andante' for the *Hostias* was also not retained, because the movement should be faster than the *Recordare*, due to its note values, restless, syncopated accompaniment, and buoyant 3/4 time. 'Allegretto' seemed more appropriate here.

Süßmayr's suggestions for the *Sanctus* and *Osanna*, however, were entirely satisfying and were maintained, not, however, his 'Andante' for the *Benedictus*. As Christoph Wolff suggested, the 'modulation motif' from the INTROITUS (which appears at the words "et lux perpetua") had to be respected; the note values are also shorter and the beat heavier. So 'Adagio' (as in the *Sanctus*) was given preference.

Süßmayr gave no indication for the *Agnus Dei*. Certainly the pulse should match that of the 'Adagio' of the subsequent *Lux aeterna*, as suggested by the transition and accompanying semiquaver figuration. But it seemed to be untypical for Mozart in church music style to designate movements of differing time signature with the same indication. Due to the weightiness of the beat, the grave character and 3/4 time, 'Andante maestoso' seemed more appropriate, even though the crotchets should be equal with those of the following 'Adagio'. Finally, for the *Lux aeterna* and *Cum sanctis*, Mozart's own indications for the INTROITUS and KYRIE remain valid.

Many present-day musicians are unfortunately not familiar with the historical basis of their art and thus long ago 'unlearned' how to determine a tempo from all relevant parameters, as Breidenstein rightly lamented. Despite the fact that the use of metrical relations in accordance with the *tactus* principle is much debated by musicologists and musicians and certainly has still to be established on a case-by-case basis, we find in the Requiem various motivic connections between the movements, suggesting that certain relationships, based on clearly apparent proportions, should be established.

Due to this, the NE indicates that the most important relationships (note here, that in opposition to common usage, the earlier value is placed first, the new value second), and goes so far as to suggest metronome markings. However, the latter were not included in the musical text, since they are merely intended to assist the conductor; they are given in the following table.

In order to avoid misunderstanding it should also be stressed that these suggestions are by no means directives with the intention of being rigidly observed under all circumstances, as if nailing the music to a Procrustean bed. However, those who condemn the metronome in general wilfully ignore the possible good intentions of composers, who certainly understood the limitations of the metronome alongside the high value they placed on flexibility: it is better to think of metronome markings from the time of Beethoven onwards merely as suggestions, intended to facilitate an understanding of the music's character.

It is in the same spirit that they are offered here. In doing so, some leeway has been given, a basic pulse within the range of M.M. = 50–54 being suggested. However, a slower basic pulse (44–48) is possible and may be even mandatory in reverberant churches; ♩ = 54 for the Adagio, which makes ♩ = 108 for the 4/4 Allegro and ♩ = 162 for the 3/4 Allegro (as well as the 4/4 Allegro assai of the *Dies irae*) may represent the upper limit for very dry concert halls. Should the tempi be taken faster than this, an expression of the repose that should be inherent with the work category of a ‘Requiem’ becomes impossible to achieve.

The relative breadth of the indications chosen here assuredly permits of some freedom. It should also be added that, in case of the Requiem, the particular demands of the pathetic style of church music be taken into consideration. This means a limited use of rubato, a certain strictness in execution, but also slower, heavier tempi than in opera or virtuoso orchestral playing, and, in opposition to the latter, a much slower basic pulse in general.

Finally it should be pointed out that the tempo relationships and indications given here merely represent the editor’s personal views. They may perhaps conflict with other contemporary ideas (for instance, some historical sources give 1:3 for the relationship between Adagio and Allegro), but they are for him the result of a weighing up of the various categories of metre, notes, patterns of motion, and overriding motivic relationships.

Of course, every interpreter has the freedom to come to his or her own conclusions and to modify or ignore the tempo and metronome markings suggested here.

**Table: Measure and Tempo Indications in the Requiem**

	<i>Mozart</i>	<i>Süßmayr</i>	<i>New Edition</i>	<i>Relation</i>	
<b>I. INTROITUS &amp; KYRIE</b>					
<i>Requiem</i>	4/4	Adagio	Adagio	Adagio	♩ = 50–54
<i>Kyrie</i>	4/4	Allegro – Adagio	Allegro – Adagio	Allegro – Adagio	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 100–108
<b>II. SEQUENTIA</b>					
<i>Dies irae</i>	4/4	Allegro assai	Allegro assai	Allegro assai	♩ = 150–162
<i>Tuba mirum</i>	2/2	Andante [Eybler?]	Andante	Andante	♩ = 50–54
<i>Rex tremendae</i>	4/4	---	---	[Adagio]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 50–54
<i>Recordare</i>	3/4	---	---	[Andante con moto]	♩ = 76–80
<i>Confutatis</i>	4/4	Andante [Eybler?]	Andante	Andante	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 76–80
<i>Lacrymosa</i>	12/8	---	---	[Larghetto]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 50–54
<i>Amen</i>	3/4	---	---	[Allegro]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 150–162
<b>III. OFFERTORIUM</b>					
<i>Domine Jesu</i>	4/4	---	Andante con moto	[Allegro]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 100–108
<i>Quam olim</i>	4/4	---	---	[Allegro]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 100–108
<i>Hostias</i>	3/4	---	Andante	[Allegretto]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 100–108
<i>Quam olim</i>	4/4	---	Andante con moto	[Allegro]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 100–108
<b>[IV. SANCTUS]</b>					
<i>Sanctus</i>	4/4	---	Adagio	[Adagio]	♩ = 50–54
<i>Osanna</i>	3/4	---	Allegro	[Allegro]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 150–162
<i>Benedictus</i>	4/4	---	Andante	[Adagio]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 50–54
<i>Osanna</i>	3/4	---	Allegro	[Allegro]	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 150–162
<b>[V. AGNUS DEI &amp; COMMUNIO]</b>					
<i>Agnus Dei</i>	3/4	---	---	[Andante maestoso]	♩ = 50–54
<i>Lux aeterna</i>	4/4	[as above]	Adagio	Adagio	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 50–54
<i>Cum sanctis</i>	4/4	[as above]	Allegro – Adagio	Allegro – Adagio	[♩ = ♩] ♩ = 100–108

## Liturgical Completeness of the Requiem

According to the Missal of Pius V, a GRADUALE and TRACTUS follow the INTROITUS and KYRIE, the COMMUNIO is followed by the RESPONSORIUM *Libera me* (for the consecration) and the ANTIPHON *In Paradisum* (procession to the grave). These sections were usually sung in plainsong. (However, nowadays the catholic church dispenses entirely with SEQUENTIA and RESPONSORIUM.) In liturgical usage then, as it still remains in many cases today, the musical settings of the sections stood on their own, separated by the usual readings, prayers and sermon. Furthermore, the form of liturgical rituals was dependent upon specific local traditions. Composers of Requiem settings have therefore sometimes composed sections which were otherwise omitted, depending on the differing demands made by tradition. The question must therefore be asked as to whether Mozart's Requiem is not in fact incomplete. Wolff noted: "Mozart limited himself [...] to the five central sections of the Ordinary of the Mass for the Dead, respecting the choice and structure of those sections as was obviously the custom in Salzburg and Vienna. [...] We have no reason at all to assume that the whole layout of the Requiem in the form in which Süßmayr completed it, did not faithfully follow what Mozart himself planned as a work." Hence, one should not see Mozart's Requiem as liturgically incomplete, despite the fact that **Sigismund Neukomm (1778–1858)** composed a *Libera me*, based on material from the original movements, for a performance of Mozart's Requiem in Rio de Janeiro in December 1819, doubtless for local liturgical reasons (this setting was rediscovered in the 1990s by Ulrich Konrad in Stockholm and is now available on disc). Another *Libera me* intended for performance following Mozart's Requiem, was written by **Ignaz Ritter von Seyfried (1776–1841)**, and was performed at Beethoven's funeral in 1827. It has recently become available in print. However, one should not regard such supplementations as attempts at a 'completion' in a cyclic, Romantic sense.

Even nowadays Mozart's Requiem is often performed at services and especially at funerals, and church musicians are on the lookout for suitable musical settings of the remaining sections of the liturgy. However, in order to not to transgress the stylistic parameters set by Mozart himself, it may still be better to perform the GRADUALE, TRACTUS, RESPONSORIUM and ANTIPHON, if required, in plainsong (included into this Edition) Solely for liturgical use, H. C. Robbins Landon suggested for the RESPONSORIUM a contemporary *Libera me* by **Josef Haydn (1732–1809)**, probably composed for the funeral of Marie Elisabeth Esterházy, 25<sup>th</sup> February 1790 – a plain, short piece in D minor that charmingly alternates Gregorian chant with four-part figural passages, accompanied only by strings and the organ (cf. Appendix of the NE). Finally, mention should be made again that this new effort to complete Mozart's Requiem, begun in 2001 and finished in 2013, has only been undertaken with the "(legitimate) intention of enabling a performance that presents as much original music by Mozart as possible, and as little alien music as necessary," as Christoph Wolff put it, "because the dividing line between the two is and remains unclear. For those passages where Mozart had established the essentials of his music [...] the instrumentation and additions by Eybler and Süßmayr can clearly be recognized and, if necessary, quite easily corrected. But for those movements that were composed subsequently, the inevitable dilemma exists that, if we correct too much, we may efface something of the Mozartian substance, while if we do not correct enough, we contradict the composer's intentions. But Mozart's intentions themselves are merely to be understood hypothetically." The editor is all too well aware of his own limitations, and naturally this edition cannot claim to represent the 'final word', since, as a finished 'work' the Requiem died with its composer on 5<sup>th</sup> December 1791. Nevertheless: it is to be hoped that this new edition may contribute to a better understanding and enrich the debate surrounding the Requiem, a debate that is renewed constantly by every performance, with new viewpoints.

© DR. BENJAMIN-GUNNAR COHRS, BREMEN, 2013

(© OF TRANSLATION: DR. JOHN A. PHILLIPS, ADELAIDE/RUTHERFORD)

Information and Performance Material (on sale):

BGC Manuscript Edition, [www.benjamin Gunnar Cohrs.com](http://www.benjamin Gunnar Cohrs.com)