

# WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART

Series I

## Sacred Vocal Works

WORK GROUP 1: MASSES AND REQUIEM  
SECTION 2: REQUIEM • SUB-VOLUME 2:  
MOZART'S FRAGMENT WITH EYBLER'S AND SÜSSMAYR'S  
COMPLETION WORKS

PRESENTED BY LEOPOLD NOWAK

1965

Neue Mozart-Ausgabe (New Mozart Edition)\*

WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART

## The Complete Works

BÄRENREITER KASSEL ● BASEL ● LONDON

En coopération avec le Conseil international de la Musique

Editorial Board: Dietrich Berke ● Wolfgang Plath ● Wolfgang Rehm

Agents for

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS: Bärenreiter Ltd. London

BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND: Bärenreiter-Verlag Kassel

SWITZERLAND and all other countries not named here: Bärenreiter-Verlag Basel

As a supplement to each volume a Critical Report (Kritischer Bericht) in German is available

The editing of the NMA is supported by

City of Augsburg

City of Salzburg

Administration Land Salzburg

City of Vienna

Konferenz der Akademien der Wissenschaften in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland,  
represented by

Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz,  
with funds from

Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie, Bonn and

Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus

Ministerium für Kultur der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik

Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst, Vienna

---

\* Hereafter referred to as the NMA. The predecessor, the "Alte Mozart-Edition" (Old Mozart Edition) is referred to as the AMA.

## CONTENTS

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Editorial Principles .....   | VI    |
| Foreword.....  | VII   |
| Facsimile: Leaf 11 <sup>v</sup> (1 <sup>v</sup> ) from <i>Cod. 17. 561 a</i> of the Austrian<br>National Library, Vienna ..... | XXII  |
| Facsimile: Leaf 20 <sup>r</sup> (9 <sup>r</sup> ) from <i>Cod. 17. 561 a</i> .....   | XXII  |
| Facsimile: Leaf 35 <sup>r</sup> (24 <sup>r</sup> ) from <i>Cod. 17. 561 a</i> .....  | XXIII |
| Facsimile: Leaf 47 <sup>v</sup> (3 <sup>v</sup> ) from <i>Cod. 17. 561 a</i> .....   | XXIII |

## A. MOZART'S FRAGMENT WITH EYBLER'S COMPLETION WORK

## Sequence

|                     |    |
|---------------------|----|
| Dies irae .....     | 3  |
| Tuba mirum .....    | 11 |
| Rex tremendae ..... | 15 |
| Recordare .....     | 18 |
| Confutatis .....    | 28 |
| Lacrimosa .....     | 33 |

## B. THE REQUIEM COMPLETED BY SÜSSMAYR

## I. Introitus

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| Requiem ..... | 37 |
|---------------|----|

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| II. Kyrie ..... | 49 |
|-----------------|----|

## III. Sequenz

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| N° 1 Dies irae .....     | 62  |
| N° 2 Tuba mirum .....    | 78  |
| N° 3 Rex tremendae ..... | 83  |
| N° 4 Recordare .....     | 90  |
| N° 5 Confutatis .....    | 100 |
| N° 6 Lacrimosa .....     | 111 |

## IV. Offertorium

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| N° 1 Domine Jesu ..... | 118 |
| N° 2 Hostias .....     | 137 |

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| V. Sanctus ..... | 149 |
|------------------|-----|

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| VI. Benedictus ..... | 155 |
|----------------------|-----|

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| VII. Agnus Dei ..... | 170 |
|----------------------|-----|

## VIII. Communio

|                   |     |
|-------------------|-----|
| Lux aeterna ..... | 179 |
|-------------------|-----|

## EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

The New Mozart Edition (NMA) provides for research purposes a music text based on impeccable scholarship applied to all available sources – principally Mozart's autographs – while at the same time serving the needs of practising musicians. The NMA appears in 10 Series subdivided into 35 Work Groups:

- I: Sacred Vocal Works (1–4)
- II: Theatrical Works (5–7)
- III: Songs, Part-Songs, Canons (8–10)
- IV: Orchestral Works (11–13)
- V: Concertos (14–15)
- VI: Church Sonatas (16)
- VII: Large Solo Instrument Ensembles (17–18)
- VIII: Chamber Music (19–23)
- IX: Piano Music (24–27)
- X: Supplement (28–35)

For every volume of music a Critical Commentary (Kritischer Bericht) in German is available, in which the source situation, variant readings or Mozart's corrections are presented and all other special problems discussed.





Within the volumes and Work Groups the completed works appear in their order of composition. Sketches, draughts and fragments are placed in an Appendix at the end of the relevant volume. Sketches etc. which cannot be assigned to a particular work, but only to a genre or group of works, generally appear in chronological order at the end of the final volume of the relevant Work Group. Where an identification regarding genre is not possible, the sketches etc. are published in Series X, Supplement (Work Group 30: Studies, Sketches, Draughts, Fragments, Various). Lost compositions are mentioned in the relevant Critical Commentary in German. Works of doubtful authenticity appear in Series X (Work Group 29). Works which are almost certainly spurious have not been included.

Of the various versions of a work or part of a work, that version has generally been chosen as the basis for editing which is regarded as final and definitive. Previous or alternative forms are reproduced in the Appendix.

The NMA uses the numbering of the Köchel Catalogue (KV); those numberings which differ in the third and expanded edition (KV<sup>3</sup> or KV<sup>3a</sup>) are given in brackets; occasional differing numberings in the sixth edition (KV<sup>6</sup>) are indicated.

With the exception of work titles, entries in the score margin, dates of composition and the

footnotes, all additions and completions in the music volumes are indicated, for which the following scheme applies: letters (words, dynamic markings, *tr* signs and numbers in italics; principal notes, accidentals before principal notes, dashes, dots, fermatas, ornaments and smaller rests (half notes, quarters, etc.) in small print; slurs and crescendo marks in broken lines; grace and ornamental notes in square brackets. An exception to the rule for numbers is the case of those grouping triplets, sextuplets, etc. together, which are always in italics, those added editorially in smaller print. Whole measure rests missing in the source have been completed tacitly.

The title of each work as well as the specification in italics of the instruments and voices at the beginning of each piece have been normalised, the disposition of the score follows today's practice. The wording of the original titles and score disposition are provided in the Critical Commentary in German. The original notation for transposing instruments has been retained. C-clefs used in the sources have been replaced by modern clefs. Mozart always notated singly occurring sixteenth, thirty-second notes etc. crossed-through, (i.e.  instead of ); the notation therefore does not distinguish between long or short realisations. The NMA generally renders these in the modern notation  etc.; if a grace note of this kind should be interpreted as "short" an additional indication "[]" is given over the relevant grace note. Missing slurs at grace notes or grace note groups as well as articulation signs on ornamental notes have generally been added without comment. Dynamic markings are rendered in the modern form, e.g. *f* and *p* instead of *for:* and *pia:*

The texts of vocal works have been adjusted following modern orthography. The realisation of the bass continuo, in small print, is as a rule only provided for *secco* recitatives. For any editorial departures from these guidelines refer to the relevant Foreword and to the Critical Commentary in German.

A comprehensive representation of the editorial guidelines for the NMA (3<sup>rd</sup> version, 1962) has been published in *Editionsrichtlinien musikalischer Denkmäler und Gesamtausgaben* [Editorial Guidelines for Musical Heritage and Complete Editions]. Commissioned by the Gesellschaft für Forschung and edited by Georg von Dadelsen, Kassel etc., 1963, pp. 99-129. Offprints of this as well as the *Bericht über die Mitarbeitertagung und Kassel, 29. – 30. 1981*, published privately in 1984, can be obtained from the Editorial Board of the NMA. The Editorial Board

## FOREWORD

THE STORY OF THE REQUIEM AFTER  
MOZART'S DEATH<sup>1</sup>

After Mozart's death, one of Constanze's most pressing concerns was the completion of the Requiem. The "unknown purchaser" had already paid a deposit and was thus entitled to receive a work in its entirety. In her straitened circumstances, it must have been important for Constanze to be able to hand over the completed Requiem as a work by her husband; she had to take care not to compromise Mozart's reputation, but was also in need of the second part of the promised fee.

Who should complete the Requiem?

The first to be asked was apparently Joseph Eybler. He took over the fragment on 21 December 1791 and made a declaration: "*The undersigned hereby confirms that the widowed Mrs. Konstanzia Mozart has entrusted to him for completion the Office for the Departed which her honored husband of blessed memory began; the same declares himself willing to end it by the middle of the coming Lent and at the same time gives assurance that it shall not be copied or given into other hands than those of the honored widow. Vienna, 21st December, 1791. Joseph Eybler*".<sup>2</sup>

In 1827, however, Constanze had no recollection of this transaction; indeed, she even maintained that she had never given the fragment to Eybler, as her letter of 31 May to Abbé Stadler shows: "*That I supposedly entrusted it to Eybler for completion comes from the fact that I was at that moment (I don't know why) angry with Süßmayr, and Mozart himself had valued Eybler highly, and I thought that anyone could have finished it, seeing that the main passages were all filled out. And so I had Eybler come to me, and told him of my wish; but as he immediately turned it down with fine words, it never came into his hands. – These are truths of which I can assure you, dear friend!, as a woman of honor*".<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Information on the genesis and transmission of the Requiem fragment is given in the Foreword to Volume 1 of this double volume.

<sup>2</sup> Wiener-Neustadt [Vienna New Town], Municipal Collections, *Lit. B 1695*, 1 leaf, written on one side, with two folding lines. At the lower edge a completely obliterated entry in red crayon.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Mozart. Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*. Complete edition, published by the International Mozart Foundation, Salzburg, collected (and elucidated) by Wilhelm A. Bauer and Otto Erich Deutsch (= Bauer-Deutsch), Vol. I, Kassel etc., 1963, No. 1419, p. 492, lines 29–37. We are deliberately drawing attention here to this error on Constanze's part in order to show how cautiously one must treat statements even by those who were very close to Mozart. One must at the same

Eybler had however quite definitely received the fragment from Constanze and also started towards completing it. The traces of his work are visible in the manuscript *Cod. 17. 561 b* in the Austrian National Library, extending from the "*Dies irae*" up to the two measures appended to the "*Lacrimosa*". A comparison with other autographs of Eybler's shows that this work is unquestionably his. He must have stopped work very soon, however. Constanze must then have turned to other masters, but all of them declined. The task thus devolved upon the then 25 year-old Franz Xaver Süßmayr. It may be superfluous to repeat well-known facts here, but he was at any rate a pupil of Mozart's and had helped with the recitatives for *Tito*; it is also known that, mortally ill, the master had spoken to him about details of the continuation of the Requiem. Indefinite as these pieces of information may be, particularly on how, and to what extent, Süßmayr must have received both written and verbal indications regarding the Requiem from Mozart, it is quite certain that he finished the Requiem.<sup>4</sup>

The precise date by which Süßmayr finished his additions is not known. At the beginning of March 1792, he must at least have reached a point where the completion was in sight, for in an assurance in Constanze's name to the Prussian Ambassador at the Austrian Court, Baron Jacobi, regarding original Mozart scores loaned out to him, he made the remark "*for the Requiem 450 [florins]*".<sup>5</sup> This note confirms the sale or imminent sale by Constanze of a copy of the Requiem to the Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm III for 100 Ducats, which was the equivalent value at that time of 450 Guilders.

It must be considered out of the question that Süßmayr could have finished his work at this point or that anyone could have produced a complete copy. Eybler had taken over the fragment only on 21 December 1791; there is also no information on how much time he spent trying out solutions. It will not be far from the truth to assume that Süßmayr finished his work in the first half of 1792.

He could not write his additions directly into Mozart's autograph, for Eybler's fragmentary attempt was already there. He therefore made a new score of the Sequence and Offertory and completed the instrumentation. The Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus Dei had to be composed in their entirety. He described this state of affairs to Breitkopf & Härtel in his letter of 8 February 1800; the

take into account that 36 years lay between Mozart's death and this letter!

<sup>4</sup> Cf. below his letter of 8 February 1800 to Breitkopf & Härtel.

<sup>5</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, p. 178, first footnote.

situation is also reflected in the autograph in that the old folio numbers are replaced by new ones starting with the Sanctus. As Süßmayr also numbered the leaves of the part of the Requiem which he composed, starting with 1 at the “*Dies irae*”, the work as a whole presents us with three folio numberings:

1. Mozart, fols. 1 to 10, Introit and Kyrie,
2. Süßmayr, fols. 1 to 33 (really 34, because there two folios are numbered 5), Sequence and Offertory and
3. Süßmayr, fols. 1 to 19, Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus Dei.

In the newer folio numbering in red, these folios are numbered 1–10, 11–44 and 45–63. This Süßmayr manuscript was presented to the Count of Walsegg together with the movements, Introit and Kyrie, written by Mozart.

In all probability, Süßmayr had made a first copy of the sections he had to compose from scratch before preparing a fair copy. This is suggested by Constanze’s letter of 2 June 1802 to Breitkopf & Härtel, at the beginning of which she mentioned that Süßmayr had returned Mozart’s autograph to her; that is, the fragment of the Sequence as far as the “*Confutatis*”. But towards the end she wrote: “*I must also tell you that Süßmayer, who apparently wanted to give me only Mozart’s work and believed he had no particular obligation to give me more than that, has also given me the Sanctus, in which neither a note nor a word is in Mozart’s handwriting*”.<sup>6</sup>

Süßmayr’s completion resulted in the manuscript *Cod. 17. 561 a* in the Austrian National Library, containing in a single fascicle the score of the entire Requiem in Mozart’s and Süßmayr’s own hands. This autograph is the only authoritative source for Mozart’s Requiem, for the earliest copies and their descendants were taken directly from this source, with all the errors that have crept in during during copying or printing. See on this Constanze’s correspondence with Breitkopf & Härtel around 1800 concerning the publication of the first printed score, where there are several references to faulty copies. In her letters of 6 and 13 August 1800, Constanze goes into detail on some of these errors.

From the Mozart-Süßmayr score, *Cod. 17. 561 a*, two copies were made immediately, even before the presentation to Count von Walsegg, one for Vienna and one for Breitkopf & Härtel.<sup>7</sup> These two then probably

became the exemplars for further copies commissioned by Constanze for sale to well-situated persons, as is evinced by the note in the assurance for the King of Prussia referred to above. Whether she did this with the knowledge of the still unknown purchaser can now hardly be established. According to Anton Herzog’s report, she was not entitled to do this; as was customary at the time, Count von Walsegg considered himself the only rightful owner of the Requiem he had commissioned and also paid for.<sup>8</sup> In her defence, Constanze maintained in a letter of 15 June 1799 to Breitkopf & Härtel: “*You now give me to understand that I have sinned against this unknown person: but this is in truth not so. I received the concession, on delivering the score, of giving copies to Princes, who normally would not publish them*”.<sup>9</sup> On 30 January 1800, however, she had to admit to Breitkopf: “*The proprietor and commissioner of the Requiem, whose name has been completely concealed since 1791, has made himself known to me, not – (observe my customary honesty!) – not, as it appears, to complain about you, but indeed about me*”.<sup>10</sup> Count von Walsegg was thus in fact indignant about Constanze’s passing on of the Requiem. A few lines later, Constanze’s letter informs us: “*In the meantime I can perhaps reassure you by telling you that the anonymous person in question, who is of very high rank, has indicated that he is prepared to be declare himself satisfied with a number of printed copies. But he is still talking about the 50 Ducats which were his deposit*”.<sup>11</sup>

At the same time, immediately after Süßmayr’s completion of the Requiem and before the presentation to Count von Walsegg, Abbé Maximilian Stadler must also have made his copy of the Requiem. This has its own particular story. It exists in two copies, one in the Stadt-

<sup>8</sup> Anton Herzog, *Wahre und ausführliche Geschichte des Requiem (!) von W. A. Mozart. Vom Entstehen desselben im Jahre 1791 bis zur gegenwärtigen Zeit 1839*, manuscript, Wiener-Neustadt [Vienna New Town], Municipal Collections, *Lit. B 1692*, p. 17; new printing by Otto Erich Deutsch, *Zur Geschichte von Mozarts Requiem*, in: *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, 19th year, Vienna, 1964, p. 56: “*The honorable widow Mozart and her associates may not have been familiar with the contract which her husband of blessed memory concluded with Doctor Sortschan, namely that Count von Walsegg is the sole proprietor of the commissioned Requiem; other one would not, at the same time as sending the score to the honorable purchaser, have offered, with his knowledge or agreement, a copy of the score for sale to a music dealer in Leipzig? One can imagine what impression it made on the Count when he learned that the score of this work of his had been published in print in Leipzig.*”

<sup>9</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1245, p. 246, lines 65–67.

<sup>10</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1278, pp. 309f., lines 4–8.

<sup>11</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1278, p. 310, lines 14–18.

<sup>6</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1350, p. 422, lines 25–28.

<sup>7</sup> Maximilian Stadler, *Vertheidigung der Echtheit des Mozartischen Requiem*, Vienna, 1826, p. 13.

und Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt on Main (*Mus. Hs. 211*) and one in the Austrian National Library (*Cod. 19. 057*).<sup>12</sup> These two manuscripts are so interwoven with each other that a part of the Frankfurt copy must originally have belonged to the Vienna. Stadler had given it to André on 21 August 1828; it contained the Sequence as far as the end of “*Confutatis*”. Stadler must therefore have copied Mozart’s fragment twice, otherwise he would not have been able to give that one copy away. He seems to have had only one copy of Introit and Kyrie, for which reason he did not give these to André. The Vienna copy is therefore the more complete of the two.<sup>13</sup> Stadler also made a separate copy of the Offertory. This copy, which he likewise handed over to André, from whose Mozart collection it later came in 1931 to the Austrian National Library, where it is now *S. m. 4375*, displays filled-out instrumental parts; as a consequence, it has to be asked whether Stadler had copied Süßmayr’s additions – in the process correcting the unskilful voice-leading in the strings in measure 4 of the “*Domine Jesu*” to provide the form encountered in the first printed score – or does *S. m. 4375* show us an attempt by Stadler to complete the Offertory, an attempt then adopted by Süßmayr, who in the process “spoiled” the passage in measure 4? If this is the case, although at the moment there is no evidence for it, Abbé Stadler would then be one of the other masters to whom Constanze turned with the request to complete the Requiem. *S. m. 4375* is the manuscript described by Johann Evangelist Engl in his study *Das Requiem und die Requiemfrage*, pp. 112f., based on information presented by Gustav Adolf Pressel in the *Clavierlehrer* (1881).<sup>14</sup>

After Süßmayr had completed his work, after the copies for Vienna and Leipzig had been sent off and Stadler had also finished his copies, the score was handed over to Count von Walsegg. As was his custom, he wrote a copy in his own hand, provided with the title *Requiem composito del Conte Walsegg* and ordered parts to be written out.<sup>15</sup> It was from this copy that he conducted personally in the Neuklosterkirche in Wiener-Neustadt

the first public performance, a Mass for the Departed on 14 December 1793 in memory of his deceased wife. The Count conducted the Requiem on one further occasion, on 14 February 1794, the anniversary of his wife’s death, in the church Maria Schutz on the Semmering, where he had the right of nominating incumbents.<sup>16</sup> These two performances were pre-dated by the première on 2 January 1793 in the Jahnscher Saal in the Himmelfortgasse in Vienna.<sup>17</sup>

The copy belonging to Count von Walsegg is lost, but Mozart’s original passed with rest of the Count’s music collection, to his sister, Countess von Sternberg. The music then entered the possession of his administrator, Leitner, passing then to the Countess’ official scribe, Karl Haag, from whose ownership it subsequently came to Katharina Adelpoller. With the legal advisor Nowack acting as intermediary, the Imperial and Royal Court library acquired the Mozart-Süßmayr autograph in 1838. In the meantime, the Mozart fragment had already arrived there, separated into two parts. One part, containing the Sequence up to the end of the “*Confutatis*” had been the property of Abbé Maximilian Stadler, the other, with the “*Lacrimosa*” and the Offertory, had belonged to Court Music Director Joseph Eybler. Stadler’s part entered the Court library in 1831; Eybler donated his part in 1833 and not (as is written on fol. 87<sup>v</sup>) *after his death*.

Why these two parts were in the possession of Stadler and Eybler can no longer be clarified. Perhaps they were gifts from Constanze, for originally these two parts must have formed a whole in Süßmayr’s hands, as he needed them for the completion of the Requiem. By 1802 he had returned the part which Stadler owned to Constanze. This is clear from Constanze’s letter of 2 June 1802 to Breitkopf & Härtel, where she wrote: “*Everything else [i.e. except Introit and Kyrie] done by Mozart himself and therefore written by himself is in my keeping and is my property. Süßmayer was good enough to give it to me, unexpectedly, some time ago; it had not occurred to me that he must have it. This manuscript goes as far as the end of Confutatis*”.<sup>18</sup> Regarding the other part, nothing of any kind can be discovered.

The “hand of fate” in the life of *Cod. 17. 561* can therefore be briefly summarised as follows:

1. *Cod. 17. 561 b* passes after Mozart’s death to Eybler, who writes his additions into the Sequence,

<sup>12</sup> It was primarily to Stadler’s copy in Frankfurt that Friedrich Blume referred in his study *Requiem und kein Ende* in: Friedrich Blume, *Syntagma musicologicum*, Kassel etc., 1963, pp. 718f.

<sup>13</sup> The present editor is preparing an examination of Stadler’s copies and their context.

<sup>14</sup> In: Joh. Ev. Engl, *Festschrift zur Mozart-Centenarfeier* [ . . . ], Salzburg, 1891, pp. 73–123. Cf. on this Jahn-Abert, *W. A. Mozart*, Vol. II, Leipzig, <sup>5</sup>/1924, p. 850, footnote 1.

<sup>15</sup> Herzog, op. cit., p. 18: “*So after Count von Walsegg had received the score of the Requiem, he wrote out the same, as was his custom, note for note and perfectly cleanly, in his own hand, passing the copy bit by bit to his violinist Benard for him to write out the orchestral parts.*” Deutsch, op. cit., p. 56, with the erroneous reading “*Benaro*” for “*Benard*”.

<sup>16</sup> Herzog, op. cit., p. 20; Deutsch, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>17</sup> O. E. Deutsch, *Mozart. Die Dokumente seines Lebens*, Neue Mozart-Ausgabe X/34, Kassel etc., 1961, p. 409.

<sup>18</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1350, p. 421, lines 9–13.

2. then to Süßmayr, who prepares a new score for his additions. Then he writes, at least for Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus Dei

3. a sketch (lost), from that

4. the fair copy (= *Cod. 17. 561 a*, fols. 45–63).

5. The movements written by Mozart, Introit and Kyrie, are combined with Süßmayr's additions to form a complete Requiem which is to be handed over to Count von Walsegg (= *Cod. 17. 561 a*).

6. Two copies are made for Vienna and Leipzig; further copies (how many?) are made for well-situated persons.

7. Abbé Maximilian Stadler makes a copy for personal use of the sections written by Mozart.

8. Count von Walsegg then receives the complete score (*Cod. 17. 561 a*) and copies it in his own hand. This copy, on which the Count names himself as the composer, is lost, along with all the orchestral parts written out from it. The autograph, however, preserved in the Count's music collection, reaches the Imperial and Royal Court Library in 1838.

9. Of the leaves of the second gathering (= *Cod. 17. 561 b*), part remains with Süßmayr, quite certainly the Sequence as far as "*Confutatis*"; the other leaves, containing the "*Lacrimosa*" and the Offertory, remain in Joseph Eybler's hands (from when?).

10. Süßmayr gives Mozart's autograph of the Sequence fragments back to Constanze before 1802. As this later enters Abbé Stadler's possession, Constanze must have given it to him.

11. In 1831, Stadler's part enters the Court Library,

12. followed in 1833 by the gift of Eybler's part, so that

13. in 1838, with the acquisition of the complete score from Count Walregg's music collection, all known autographs relating to Mozart's Requiem (with the exception of the Berlin sketch sheet; cf. Foreword to Volume 1 of 2, pp. VII f. and XI f.) are united in the Court Library: *Cod. 17. 561 a* and *b*.

That is the first "area of sources", the second originated from the two copies made from the complete Requiem and can hardly be traced. For from these two copies, more were made in both Vienna and Leipzig, leading to the

spread of the Requiem.<sup>19</sup> It is hardly realistic to attempt to ascertain how many such copies "twice removed" were made.

It was in 1800 that the first printed score was published by Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig. It was dedicated to the Electoral Prince of Saxony, Friedrich August III, and provided with a German translation by Prof. C. A. H. Clodius (Leipzig).<sup>20</sup> As the first printed edition, this score has its value, but the New Mozart Edition (NMA) is independent of it, as the perfectly legible autograph is available; it was however consulted for comparison purposes. Alone the fact that the trombone solo in "*Tuba mirum*" is there allocated to the bassoon shows that the edition is a source, albeit somewhat clouded.<sup>21</sup> The alteration of the trombone solo is known to go back to Johann Adam Hiller. He had no competent trombonists amongst his Thomas-Church pupils and therefore had the solo played on the bassoon. It is from his score that the first printed edition had adopted such a substantial change at this point.<sup>22</sup> From Constanze's correspondence with Breitkopf & Härtel it is quite obvious that the Leipzig publishers used, besides the one copy which they had

<sup>19</sup> Stadler, *Zweyter und letzter Nachtrag zur Vertheidigung des Mozart'schen Requiem* [. . .], Vienna, 1827, p. 29: "Until this work finally appeared in print, the copies were multiplied more and more and spread in Prague, Dresden, Leipzig etc."

<sup>20</sup> W. A. MOZARTI / MISSA PRO DEFUNCTIS / Requiem / W. A. MOZART'S / MASS FOR SOULS / WITH / UNDERLAID GERMAN TEXT. / PUBLISHED BY BREITKOPF & HÄRTEL / IN LEIPZIG. On the fly-leaf the dedication: TO HIS / ELECTORAL PRINCELY HIGHNESS / OF / SAXONY / THE / CONNOISSEUR AND PROTECTOR OF RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION / OUR MOST GRACIOUS LORD / HUMBL Y DEDICATED / BY / THE EDITORS / BREITKOPF & HÄRTEL. And before this an engraving: a genius hovers above a grave with Cross and Palm of Peace, while seven stars form a crown above the figure. Beside the burial mound are mourners of various ages, a child strews flowers over the mound. Mark: *Kininger del. W. Böhm sc.* These leaves are the unnumbered pages 1–5. Then follows the type-set score, pp. 6–178. There follow two unnumbered pages; the obverse reads: THE REQUIEM. / FROM THE LATIN. / TO W. A. Mozart's MUSIC / BY / PROFESSOR C. A. H. CLODIUS IN LEIPZIG. On the reverse: THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT. / PARODY OF THE REQUIEM / BY / MUSIC DIRECTOR HILLER IN LEIPZIG. Oblong folio.

<sup>21</sup> Regarding the trombone passage in the "*Rex tremendae*", see p. XIX.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. on this the correcting information in the score edition prepared by Anton André, Offenbach on Main (1826), Preliminary Report, p. VIII. In the edited score itself, however, pp. 32–34, the solo is still in the bassoon part.



received from Vienna in 1792 but had then sent back to Constanze,<sup>23</sup> copies of a different origin for their edition. Constanze was once again put in the position of being able to compare the copy she had from Stadler and Nissen with the autograph. The announcement of the impending publication of the score had made Count von Walsegg aware that he was not the sole proprietor of the Requiem, and he demanded an explanation from Constanze.<sup>24</sup> For this purpose, he passed the Mozart-Süßmayr autograph in his possession into the hands of his Vienna lawyer, Dr. Johann Nep. Sortschan, in whose offices Constanze's copy and also the already published first printed edition were compared with the original. This examination must have taken place, at the latest, in July 1800 (cf. footnote 41 below).

If it were possible to assemble all the copies made of the Requiem between 1792 and 1800, one would probably be able to divide them into two groups; this is at the moment a purely conjectural assertion, but nevertheless one that should be aired. One group would contain the change to the trombone solo already mentioned and would therefore be linked to the Leipzig performance by Hiller and the first printed edition; as copies from the printed version, they are irrelevant for questions concerning the musical text of the NMA. They have their value in a history of the dissemination of the Mozart Requiem, at best with reference with changes they reflect in performance practice with time and place.<sup>25</sup> The others could be classified as the "Viennese" or Austrian group. They must have been derived from an exact copy of the Mozart-

Süßmayr original, without alterations and retaining the trombone solo.

All the characteristics just mentioned point towards the first printing of choral and orchestral parts, which, judging by the publisher's number, must have appeared around the end of February 1812.<sup>26</sup> These parts are more faithful than the first printed score and provide us, thanks largely to the trombone parts and the thorough-bass figures in the organ part, a good picture of Viennese church music practice two decades after Mozart's death. They were consulted in all these matters for the editing of the score in the NMA. The fact that they already show familiarity with the substitution of clarinets for the *Corni di Bassetto* does not reduce their value, for the *Corni di Bassetto* parts are also included; the parts for B<sup>b</sup> clarinets are available as *ad libitum* alternatives. This development was an inevitable consequence of the disappearance of the Basset horns from the range of classical instruments. Abbé Stadler comments: "What will people do today to make a piece more generally usable? Piano reductions, quartets, entire symphonies, yes, even operas are remodelled for two instruments. And should it be then be forbidden, in the Mozart Requiem, if the Basset horns are not available, to use clarinets in their place?"<sup>27</sup> Stadler also comes to terms with the bassoon solo in the "Tuba mirum", but does add: "although with a different effect".<sup>28</sup> Such readiness to substitute instruments can be seen as a characteristic of the classical period, but could never be adopted in a critical edition.

*Cod. 17. 561*, the Berlin sketch sheet, and alongside these the first printed score of 1800 and the first printed parts of 1812, are the sources consulted for the edition of the Requiem in these two volumes of the NMA. All the numerous manuscripts and printed editions, including the printed score containing Silverstolpe's glosses,<sup>29</sup> are

<sup>23</sup> Stadler, *Zweyter und letzter Nachtrag* [ . . . ], p. 29: "I made no efforts towards having a score printed, as I had made the copy of the Requiem and Kyrie anyway, as well as the whole *Dies irae* as far as the *Lacrymosa* from the original notation, and because the widow, who had already promised me the copy which she had sent to Leipzig for printing, duly had this sent to me at a later date." This copy was later discovered in the possession of Baron Karl von Doblhoff-Dier, according to information from Stadler to Ignaz, Baron von Mosel, on 4 August 1825. (Vienna, Austrian National Library, Autograph Collection, 34/38 – 5.)

<sup>24</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1278, pp. 309f., lines 4–8: "The proprietor and commissioner of the Requiem, whose name has been completely concealed since 1791, has made himself known to me, not – (observe my customary honesty!) – not, as it appears, to complain about you, but indeed about me." These events, recorded in lengthy details, should be included in a history in its own right of the Mozart Requiem; the form of the work as it is preserved in the autograph would not be affected by any of it. We therefore dispense with a further delineation of these particulars in order to prevent "incidental events" obscuring the main developments.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. on this Istvan Kecskeméti, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Mozarts Requiem*, in: *Studia Musicologica*, Vol. 1, Budapest, 1961, fasc. 1–2, pp. 153–160.

<sup>26</sup> *Requiem / a / Canto, Alto, Tenore et Basso / II Violini, / II Fagotti, / II Corni di Bassetto o Clarinetti, / III Tromboni, / II Clarini et Timpani, / Viola, Basso e Violoncello / con Organo. / Authore. / W: A: MOZART / Vienna / Nel Magazino C: R: pr: Stamperia chimica sul Graben N° 612 / N° 1806. 37 bö. Pr: folio, 21 parts on a total of 74 leaves.*

On the four vocal parts are the publisher's numbers 1806–1812. Lithography. The ascertaining of the date of publication was possible from information generously communicated by Dr. Alexander Weinmann.

<sup>27</sup> Stadler, *Zweyter und letzter Nachtrag* [ . . . ], p. 20.

<sup>28</sup> Stadler, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. on this C.-G. Stellan Mörner, *F. S. Silverstolpes im Jahr 1800 (oder 1801) in Vienna niedergeschriebene Bemerkungen zu Mozarts Requiem*, in: *Festschrift für Alfred Orel*, Vienna, 1960, pp. 113–119, especially pp. 116f. with Silverstolpe's account of the comparison in 1800 of the copy in Constanze's possession with the autograph, at which he was present.

second-order sources. Mozart's and Süßmayr's own manuscripts alone must remain normative, for what sense would it have had to use the copies derived from the autograph, with all their errors and omissions, when these original documents themselves are available?

This attitude must also be adopted towards Anton André's editions, although it would only be fair to concede that he committed himself with great love and enthusiasm, but most significantly with lavish financial outlay in buying up Mozart's entire musical estate from Constanze, to Mozart and his works and above all to the Requiem. His straying into errors was his bad luck, but should not detract in any way from value of the services he has rendered to Mozart. His editions of the Requiem has also made history.

\*

Now that the source situation has already been examined in sufficient detail for this foreword, Eybler's and Süßmayr's additions must be looked at more closely. They are the steps on the way to the complete Requiem.

Eybler did not finish his work. We must also say: unfortunately, for, despite the judgement spoken by Johannes Brahms, who prepared the edition for the old Complete Edition (AMA) and found that "*this relic has been disfigured by the attempts of one or two persons to fill out the score*",<sup>30</sup> one discovers that these additions have been made with a great deal of understanding for Mozart's music. Eybler was 26 years old in 1791, only one year older than Süßmayr, but he was better at "listening in" to Mozart's intentions than Süßmayr.

Even in the "*Dies irae*", this is already revealed in the relationship between winds and choir. It is thoroughly characteristic of Eybler's feeling for rhythm that he bridged over the rests in the choral parts with complementary rhythms in the winds, effectively continuing the "block-like rhythm" of the choir as if with an echo. This reinforces the choir and makes it more vivid. Trumpets and timpani are likewise more subtly employed for the intensification of effect than in Süßmayr's work. Eybler reveals himself as, so to speak, the "more intelligent" of the two.

In the use of the Bassett horns, similar tendencies are observable. While Süßmayr on the whole simply lets them run with the choir, in the process anxiously avoiding

the note g",<sup>31</sup> Eybler employs them as sounds in their own right (for the first time in measures 10–19, then continuing so), all the way up to the permissible top note g". Süßmayr did not follow Eybler's example in completing this movement, which is very regrettable, for his trumpets in measures 52 to 56 sound very much like theatrical routine, while Eybler with his fanfares raises into prominence the picture of the Judge at the Last Judgement ("*quando judex est venturus*"). Eybler's use of the entire orchestra in this movement was only to be expected: he continued Mozart's strings throughout the whole movement, and similarly wrote out the woodwinds, trumpets and timpani in the four blank staves. For the latter, he wrote opposite the staff in the margin of every page: "*in D*". With the exception of measures 42–49, the woodwind are notated throughout, giving a secure basis for judging Eybler's thoughts. This is not the case for the trumpets and timpani, which are no doubt present at the most important moments but for which there are over long stretches no indications regarding what Eybler envisaged.

In the "*Tuba mirum*", Eybler made no entries in the two staves left blank by Mozart above the trombone staves. The movement is an example of how strongly the filling-out of the remaining instruments (strings) is determined by the instrumental bass: the off-beat quarter-notes in measures 5–17, the throbbing eighth-notes in the tenor solo and then, from measure 29, the off-beat eighth-notes. These rhythms correspond to the emotions suggested by the words; it is hardly possible, however, to imagine any other way of filling these parts out. In Mozart's characteristic way, Eybler employs *divisi* violas, while Süßmayr does not. For the solo quartet, Eybler leaves the use of woodwinds open; we have to do without them, as well as trumpets and timpani, until the "*Confutatis*". This is particularly regrettable in the "*Rex tremendae*", movement in which their intended use can be almost certainly assumed. Here, and in the "*Recordare*", the staves left blank by Mozart are also left blank by Eybler. He completed only the strings; he did not get further with his filling-out.

Eybler's completing of the strings in the "*Rex tremendae*" was adopted by Süßmayr, with small deviations. It was hardly possible to imagine anything else. Eybler's use of chords in Violin II in measures 16 and 17 is characteristic of his intentions in instrumentation: they support, in the manner of winds, the choir. In the same function, Süßmayr employed the woodwinds and underlined the rhythm in the strings with trumpets and timpani.

<sup>30</sup> AMA, Critical Report to Series XXIV, Supplement No. 1, p. 55.

<sup>31</sup> Ernst Hess, *Zur Ergänzung des Requiems von Mozart durch F. X. Süßmayr*, in: *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1959*, Salzburg, 1960, p. 100.

In contrast to the “*Rex tremendae*”, Süßmayr did not take over Eybler’s string ideas in the “*Recordare*”. Eybler lets the viola share the motion of the bass-line, while Süßmayr uses them to support the vocal lines. This difference has structural and instrumental consequences for the treatment of the strings. In other passages, Süßmayr took up Eybler’s ideas again, at “*Quaerens me*” (measures 38ff.) and “*Ingemisco*” (measures 72ff.). A good example of how Eybler’s ideas occasionally show through under the surface of Süßmayr’s composition is offered by measures 46–49 (“*Tantus labor*”). There the accompanying figure derived by Eybler from the main motif of the movement and placed in Violin I is re-located by Süßmayr in Violin II because his first violins now have an independent accompanying figure of their own. In Eybler, the effect of the sixteenth-notes in measures 90 and 91 is somewhat surprising. They are no doubt intended as the expression of a broadening ritardando, as an agogic preparation for the final appearance of the recurrent main theme.

The complete instrumentation supplied by Eybler for the “*Confutatis*” is once again different from Süßmayr’s. The most striking feature must be placing of the woodwind chords above the unison in the strings. This procedure has its counterpart in the *Organo* part in the first printed edition: there are thorough-bass figures in these measures! Chords are to be played against the wild, rolling motion of the sixteenth- and thirty-second-notes. Here an essential difference from Süßmayr is revealed: he, like Mozart, has no figures here; they appear, like Mozart’s, for the first time in measure 26. Accordingly, the organ should play *tasto solo* up to this point. Two traditions of “practice” face each other here, both of them quite feasible, but in this movement Süßmayr may well be right. Since Mozart marks the entry of the organ so exactly in measure 26, he would certainly have set figures in the unison passages if he had wanted chords placed over them.

Another typical example of the difference between Eybler’s and Süßmayr’s ideas in this movement is the use of trumpets and timpani. Eybler intensifies: in the first passage (measures 1ff.) he has off-beat quarter-notes, in the second (measures 10ff.) fanfare blasts. Süßmayr does not take such pains: both passages have the same fanfare blasts sounding on the first and third quarter-notes in the measure; he treats his trumpets in a somewhat “everyday” manner, as one could already observe in the “*Dies irae*”.

Special mention should be made of Eybler’s making-up of the woodwinds from measure 26 on. He continues Mozart’s notation directly, measures 26–29, and lets the woodwind run exactly with the choir. They play when the choir sings and rest when the choir rests. Süßmayr made changes here: the woodwind enter one measure earlier

with the A minor triad and play without pause until the end of the movement. Here there should have been no choice possible other than to follow the indications by Mozart, especially since they are the only indications of this kind in the fragment. The problem surrounding this passage is also expressed in the organ. Measure 25 in Mozart has no figures, but also no *tasto solo*. For an organist of the classical period, however, a bass note without a figure, if there is no other indication, means that a triad is to be played. In measure 25 a chord of this kind, as a minor chord is required, would certainly have to have been indicated with a natural accidental. An experienced organist would of course have known from the developments in the movement so far that no chord other than a minor can be played here. As nothing is marked, one would do well to assume *tasto solo*, although all other measures with the same upwards floating broken triads in the violins show exact thorough-bass figures; there the figures are however absolutely necessary because of the chromatic harmonies. According to Mozart’s indications, the organ should enter only along with the choir.

Süßmayr changed this by having the woodwinds – and also the trombones – enter earlier, in measure 25. This change is also expressed in the organ part in the first printed edition of the parts: above measure 25 figures are placed (3–5–8). The first printed score abandons the reader at this point and shows no figures. As a result of Süßmayr’s policy of “uniformity” in this passage, a delicate but fine coloring effect has been lost.<sup>32</sup>

With the two measures added in the “*Lacrimosa*” after Mozart’s breaking-off, Eybler’s work reaches its end. He gave up and left the work to another, to Süßmayr. Before we turn to him, the pencil markings in the fragment intended to separate recognisably Mozart’s notation from Eybler’s should be discussed.

As anyone can see from the facsimile,<sup>33</sup> an unknown person (Stadler, Nissen?) has attempted to identify all notes not written by Mozart by a pencilled border. Nissen remarked in the top right-hand corner of fol. 65<sup>r</sup>, the beginning of the Sequence: *Everything that is not enclosed in pencil is Mozart’s hand-writing*. Another hand continues: *until after pagina 32*. The Critical Report of the AMA observed: “A third person (Stadler?) wanted to mark and secure Mozart’s writing with a penciled border and the addition of his name. These penciled borders are themselves extremely uncertain and

<sup>32</sup> On the use of trombones in this passage see p. XIX.

<sup>33</sup> Facsimile edition of the parts of *Cod. 17.561* written by Mozart: *Mozarts Requiem. Nachbildung der Originalhandschrift Cod. 17561 der k. k. Hofbibliothek in Wien in Lichtdruck*, Vienna, 1913, edited and elucidated by Alfred Schnerich.

*imprecise; very often the 'Moz.' has been crossed out again, erased, etc.*"<sup>34</sup> This is true in every sense. For this reason the demarcation in the present Volume 2 of 2 (Section A, pp. 3–33), distinguishing with large and small print the writing of Mozart and Eybler, has in many cases taken a different course to the old pencil markings mentioned above as a result of a very detailed caligraphic examination. Exact details of these decisions are to be found in the *Kritischer Bericht* [Critical Report, available in German only].

Joseph Eybler gave up his attempt to finish Mozart's Requiem. We can only speculate on his reasons for doing this, but we can conclude from what he left us in the fragment that he was without doubt capable of continuing the existing notation in Mozart's sense. With the sections that had to be composed new it was a different story. Eybler shied away from this task. The two measures added to the soprano in "Lacrimosa", standing alone in the middle of this page in the score, are like a symbol of this retreat.

Since other masters, as it was said, would not dare a continuation, the task finally fell to Franz Xaver Süßmayr, at that point a 25-year-old pupil of Mozart's. He was just about to become (1792) deputy music director at the Imperial and Royal National Theater.<sup>35</sup> No uniform view regarding his capabilities as a composer prevails in the literature. He made a name as a composer both of church music and of operas and *Singspiele*. As he died as early as 1803, it is hardly possible to reach a conclusive judgement on him.

The completion of the Requiem represents a special case within his creative work. Here the success depended not on Süßmayr's composing following his own ideas but on his ability to feel his way into Mozart's thought processes. He had to forget his own way of writing and become "someone else". With all due caution, the editor concurs with the opinion that Süßmayr succeeded in this in his completion of the Requiem. In his short life, this was a unique event, and, because it was unique, comparisons with his other works can be drawn only to a limited extent. In his church compositions, he shows

himself to be familiar with all the requirements for this genre.<sup>36</sup> On this basis, he could dare to take on the completion of the Requiem, especially as Mozart had spoken to him about it, had communicated his plans to him and, further, Süßmayr and Mozart had tried the completed sections through together.<sup>37</sup> On top of that, someone had to be found, the work had to be finished to satisfy the unknown client. So Süßmayr stepped into the breach. Posterity will remain in his debt for ever, for "*the sketches alone [ . . . ] would never have risen to the vivid plasticity of the completed work. This merit and the strong presence of the final creation are more eloquent tokens of Süßmayr's achievement than the undeniable weaknesses of his faint-hearted hand. The little that Süßmayr contributed as his own invention was well able to adapt itself modestly to the already existing material, so that it was not too garishly conspicuous in its wonderful setting. In such exceptional surroundings, it was inevitable that traces of faintness and routine were to be seen in his proficient, though straight-laced, artisan-like fantasy*".<sup>38</sup>

The question of Süßmayr's share in the Requiem has to seek an answer in those reports by contemporaries which must be considered authentic. They are the following:

1. Süßmayr's letter to Breitkopf & Härtel of 8 February 1800,
2. the corresponding information communicated by Maximilian Stadler in his *Vertheidigung* [ . . . ] of 1826 and
3. two letters from Constanze to André and to Breitkopf & Härtel in 1800 and 1802.

Breitkopf & Härtel had turned to Süßmayr on 24 January 1800 with the request that he explain to them how much of the Requiem came from him and in the process to disclose what was by Mozart. Süßmayr answered on 8 February 1800 with the well-known letter:<sup>39</sup> "*Your kind communication of 24 January caused me the greatest pleasure, since I saw from the same that you attach too*

<sup>34</sup> AMA, Critical Report to Series XXIV, Supplement No. 1, p. 55.

<sup>35</sup> On Süßmayr as a church composer, cf. three recent publications: Johann Winterberger, *Franz Xaver Süßmayr, Leben, Umwelt und Gestalt*, Dissertation, Innsbruck, 1946; Walter Wlcek, *Franz Xaver Süßmayr (1766–1803) als Kirchenkomponist*, Dissertation, Vienna, 1953; Henry H. Hausner, *Süßmayrs kirchenmusikalisches Werk*, in: *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum*, Year 12, 1964, double issue 3/4, pp. 13–18; based on Winterberger and Wlcek.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the dissertation by Walter Wlcek.

<sup>37</sup> Süßmayr in his letter to Breitkopf & Härtel, 8 February 1800; see below. Of course, it seems he did not always grasp the direction of Mozart's thoughts immediately, as is shown by the remark quoted by Constanze to Stadler "*Ah – there the oxen are struggling uphill again; you're a long way from understanding that*". (Cf. Foreword to Volume 1 of 2, p. XII, footnote 22.) It should however be borne in mind that Constanze did not always speak flatteringly of Süßmayr.

<sup>38</sup> Bernhard Paumgartner, *Mozart*, Zürich, 1940, p. 593.

<sup>39</sup> Jahn-Abert, *W. A. Mozart*, Vol. II, Leipzig, <sup>5</sup>/1924, p. 1020, "*after the original*".

*much importance to the respect of the German public to wish to mislead them by works that cannot be completely laid to the account of my deceased friend Mozart. I owe too much to the teaching of this great man to be able to tacitly allow a piece which is predominantly my work to be published as his, because I am firmly convinced that my work is unworthy of this great man. Mozart's composition is so unique and, I allow myself the liberty of maintaining, unattainable for the majority of composers that any imitator, particularly if attempting to pass off his work as Mozart's, will cut a worse figure than that raven which decked itself with peacock feathers.*

*That the completion of the Requiem, which provided the occasion for our correspondence, was entrusted to me came about as follows. The widow Mozart could no doubt see that the works left behind by her husband would be sought after, death overtook him while he was working on this Requiem. The completion of this work was therefore given into the hands of several masters; some of them could not take on this work because of the overwhelming pressure of their business, but others did not want to compromise their talent with the talent of Mozart. Finally, this business came to me, because it was known that, during Mozart's lifetime, I had often played and sung through with him the pieces already set to music, that he had very often discussed the elaboration of this work with me and had communicated to me the aspirations and reasons for his instrumentation. My only wish is that I may have been successful in working at least in such a way that the knowledgeable can here and there find in it some traces of his unforgettable precepts.*

*For the Requiem complete with Kyrie – Dies irae – Domine Jesu Christe, Mozart had fully completed the 4 vocal parts and the thorough-bass with its figures; in the instrumentation he had however only now and again indicated the motif. In the Dies irae, his last verse was qua resurget ex favilla and my work was the same as in the first pieces. From the verse Judicandus homo reus etc. onwards, I fully completed the Dies irae. The Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus were written completely new by me; only that I allowed myself, in order to give the work more unity, the repetition of the fugue of the Kyrie at the verse cum sanctis etc.*

*It would be most pleasing to my heart if I have been able to be of some small service to you through this communication."*

In the first paragraph, we note that Süßmayr speaks of himself with modesty and expressly points out that his work "*is unworthy of this great man*". As the next sentence shows, he was fully aware of the distance between the sections composed by himself and those by Mozart, and at the end of the second paragraph his wish is

that "*I may have been successful in working at least in such a way that the knowledgeable can here and there find in it some traces of his [Mozart's] unforgettable precepts*". In all these words, no presumptuousness is detectable; on the contrary, one forms the impression that Süßmayr wanted to prevent his work being published as Mozart's. But precisely this must have been Constanze's original intention, so that it should be generally believed that the whole Requiem was by Mozart.

The first sentence in the third paragraph contains an obscurity resulting from the subordinate clause referring to the instrumentation. The principal clause, "*For the Requiem [. . .] with its figures*", is correct. As was his custom, Mozart had written out in full the vocal parts complete with the thorough-bass. It is equally true that he had only suggested the instrumentation, but this applies only from the "*Dies irae*" onwards. Süßmayr ought to have pointed out that the Introitus and Requiem had been written out complete in their final form by Mozart. He forgot this here, and he is again somewhat unclear in speaking about the "*first pieces*" in the next sentence, by which we should understand, however, those of the Sequence and not of the whole Requiem. All further information is clear and is confirmed in full by Maximilian Stadler 26 years later.

He reports:<sup>40</sup>

*"The first movement of the Requiem, with the fugue, and the second, Dies irae to Lacrymosa, are largely instrumented by Mozart himself, and Süßmayr did not have to do much more than what most composers leave to their copyists. Süßmayr's real work began with the Lacrymosa. But here again Mozart had written out the violins himself; Süßmayr only brought it to an end from the judicandus homo reus. In precisely the same way, in the third movement, Domine, Mozart had written out the violins in his score wherever the voices were silent; but where the voices interrupt he indicated here and there, with clarity, however, the motifs for the instruments. Before the fugue quam olim, he gave two-and-a-half measures to the violins for them to perform alone. In the Hostias, he wrote the violins out for the two measures before the voices enter; in the memoriam facimus for eleven measures, with his own hand. After the completion of the Hostias, nothing more is visible from his pen than what is recorded above: quam olim da capo. Here the Mozart score ends in the original manuscript."*

If one compares both reports, it is apparent that Stadler confirms Süßmayr and furthermore adds some details. Regarding the first two sections, Introit and Kyrie fugue, Stadler's statement is likewise not quite clear. Like

<sup>40</sup> Stadler, *Vertheidigung* [. . .], Vienna, 1826, p. 12.

Süßmayr, he lumps them together with the Sequence and says only that they were “*largely instrumented by Mozart himself*”. Neither he nor Süßmayr emphasise the fact that Mozart wrote the entire Introit and Kyrie fugue himself. It seems almost as if no essential difference was seen at the time between the complete working-out of Introit and Kyrie and the indications for the Sequence. A composition for which the full number of measures, the choral parts and the thorough-bass were already written out was considered to be “finished”, even if not “complete” in our sense. The occasional indications of instrumentation in the Sequence were sufficient to enable completion: Süßmayr did not have more to do “*that what most composers leave to their copyists*”. It seems that carrying out an already suggested instrumentation was not seen as a particular achievement; almost anyone could take care of that. That this opinion was valid – in contemporary eyes – is underlined in the next sentence, where Stadler says that Süßmayr’s “*real*” work began with the “*Lacrimosa*”. As “*real*” work we have to understand the composition of the sections which Mozart had not indicated or sketched. If we make at least one attempt to see this through the eyes of these men, it is possible to understand their attitude to the completion of the Requiem; this is in no way identical with our attitude. We detect a certain “generosity” in the employment of the instruments, or even in the use of given accompanying motifs. If one did not have the instrument specified by the composer for a particular passage, one then simply played another. The main concern was that the musical substance itself was preserved. In this context, one should compare the substitution of a solo bassoon for the solo trombone in the “*Tuba mirum*” or the substitution of clarinets for Corni di Bassetto. Stadler considers this all quite legitimate and refers to the arrangement practice of his contemporaries, where they depart even further from the original for the precise reason that they are in fact “*arranging*”.<sup>41</sup> Today we have a different attitude and justly demand absolute faithfulness in timbre; we cannot therefore be content with only suggestions for instrumentation. For us, a composition is “finished” when every detail has been written down.

One should further note that Stadler once again speaks of Mozart’s having fixed the violin parts for both the “*Lacrimosa*” and the “*Domine Jesu*”. In his efforts to provide adequate foundations for his “*Vertheidigung*” [“*defence*”], Stadler describes very precisely where Mozart “*had himself*” written the violins in the “*Domine Jesu*”. The final sentence of the quotation above defines unambiguously the limits of Mozart’s own handwriting and is in perfect agreement with the facts. If Stadler had only taken a few words to state clearly that the Introit and Kyrie were entirely by Mozart, his report would have

been faultless. But, as it is, his report still leaves a gap which requires supplementary information.

This supplementary information is provided by two letters from Constanze to Anton André (26 November 1800) and to Breitkopf & Härtel (2 June 1802). They originated at some date after the comparison of her copy with the original in Dr. Sortschan’s office on 6 August 1800,<sup>42</sup> but are nevertheless the earliest written evidence for the facts of the matter.

In the letter to André we read that “*The anonymous in the original [sc. Mozart’s complete autograph] has everything prior to the Dies irae. From that point on, Mozart had written only the Dies irae, Tuba mirum, Rex tremendae, Recordare and Confutatis in all main voices, and in the middle voices little or nothing at all: these had been written by another, and, to avoid two different handwritings becoming mixed up, the latter also copied Mozart’s work*”.<sup>43</sup>

Breitkopf & Härtel heard from Constanze in 1802 “*that everything as far as the beginning of the Dies irae is by Mozart alone and that this, his manuscript, is in the hands of the anonymous client, as I saw for myself last year*”.<sup>44</sup>

Regarding the question of how Süßmayr then carried out his work, Stadler again provides the simplest and clearest answer: “*One should however not believe that Süßmayr did the filling-out of the instruments in this [sc. Mozart’s autograph of the Sequence]. He created his own score, very similar to Mozart’s; he first of all copied into this, note for note, what was contained in Mozart’s original, then he followed most precisely the directions given for the instrumentation, without setting a single note of his own on top, composed himself the Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus Dei. In this way the work was completed*”.<sup>45</sup>

According to this, Süßmayr made two kinds of addition:

1. filling out the instrumentation of the fragment (Sequence and Offertory) and

<sup>42</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1304, p. 363, lines 3–4, Constanze to Breitkopf & Härtel on 6 August 1800: “*I have now had a comparison made by a knowledgeable person between your edition of the Requiem and the original.*”

<sup>43</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1322, p. 387, lines 31–37.

<sup>44</sup> Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1350, p. 421, lines 7–9. Constanze was wrong: it was not “*last year*”, but in fact two years previously. She is occasionally not quite reliable in her letters, as is shown by the mention in the same letter of the flute in the “*Tuba mirum*”.

<sup>45</sup> Stadler, op. cit., p. 12f.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. pp. XI, footnotes 27 and 28.

2. additionally composing the missing movements (Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus Dei).

Since Eybler had written his additions, as already detailed, in Mozart's autograph itself, Süßmayr had to make a new score for himself. But when he also wrote out the Offertory again, in which Eybler had not made any additions, it was no doubt for the reason that the client should not notice differences in the hand-writing; then he added the instrumentation. Stadler repeatedly emphasises that Süßmayr kept exactly to Mozart's directions; in saying this, he wishes to say that Süßmayr had taken up all of Mozart's motifs and made use of them, and not that their development in detail was approximately what Mozart would have done. Only at the beginning of the Offertory ("*Domine Jesu*") was there no indication by Mozart; this remains the case until the two-and-a-half measures of Violin I at "*Quam olim*". The new disposition of the Süßmayr score handed over to Count Walsegg, *Cod. 17.561 a*, is also visible in the three sections of the manuscript, each beginning with a fol. 1.<sup>46</sup>

During the copying of Mozart's autograph, Süßmayr made a number of errors of notation, although it is possible that he may have made deliberate changes here and there. They occur at the following points:

"*Tuba mirum*", measure 22, thorough-bass: the last two eighth-notes f#.

"*Rex tremendae*", measure 12, alto: second eighth-note c'.

"*Domine Jesu*", measure 4, alto: the second eighth-note in the second half of the measure is an f#, an error by Süßmayr, connected with the inelegant contours of the violin lines. In Stadler's copy (*S. m. 4375*), this passage is corrected to the form in which it appears in the first printed score. The first printed parts, on the other hand, have a Janus double-countenance: in Violin I the improved Stadler version appears, while in Violin II the Süßmayr form is given. In the Vienna copy, this has been changed in pencil to give Stadler's improved version.

Measure 18, tenor: Süßmayr changed the last eighth-note from f' to e'. He thus blurred Mozart's carefully considered voice-leading, which avoided the augmented second going into the next measure.

Measures 43 and 60, alto: sharpening of the rhythmic profile from quarter-note and two eighth-notes to a dotted quarter-note and two sixteenth-notes.

"*Hostias*", measure 9, choral bass and thorough-bass: third quarter-note b<sup>b</sup> instead of Mozart's first-inversion

seventh chord. Measure 52, thorough-bass, second quarter-note g. This results in a diminished fifth, which does not correspond in any way to the octave leap written by Mozart. It is, however, strange that this diminished fifth is already visible in Stadler's copies and in the first printed parts. From there it has managed to maintain its place, despite the facsimile, until recent times; Friedrich Blume, with his new edition for Eulenburg (1932), was the first to remove it.<sup>47</sup>

The relatively small number of divergences from Mozart show that Süßmayr was making an effort to copy faithfully. Further slips of the pen in the course of his completion work will be noted in the *Kritischer Bericht*; they are also indicated by footnotes at the relevant points in the present score (Part B, pp. 37ff.).

The movements composed completely by Süßmayr will probably always remain a problem for Mozart scholarship. Perhaps electronic methods will at some stage be able to help in identifying Mozart's ideas for the Sanctus, Benedictus and Agnus Dei. But even then it will not be possible to establish whether the Mozartian ideas in Süßmayr's work resulted from "inner sympathy" – in memory of his master – or whether Mozart himself communicated them to him or perhaps left them to him in sketch form, effectively "prescribing" their use, exactly as it was suggested to him that he repeat the Kyrie fugue for the final "*Cum sanctis tuis*".<sup>48</sup>

As one can easily imagine, a wide field opens up here for stylistic investigations and for suggestions for further additions and improvements. The studies already published by Handke, Fischer, Martin and others indisputably deserve recognition for their contributions to research on Mozart's Requiem, but a single sketch sheet in Mozart's hand for one of the movements "composed new" by Süßmayr would reveal far more, simply because it would communicate Mozart's ideas to us in black and white. But, as this is not the case, scholarship is faced with an insuperable barrier and must be satisfied with Süßmayr's work, of which Johannes Brahms said with brevity and pith that "*He copied Mozart's framework painstakingly and completed it with equal amounts of diligence and piety*".<sup>49</sup> The NMA is therefore willing to adopt the terminology of a "traditional form" in which

<sup>47</sup> Edition Eulenburg No. 954.

<sup>48</sup> Constanze to Breitkopf & Härtel, 27 March 1799: "As he saw death approaching, he spoke with Mr. Süßmeyer, currently Imperial and Royal Music Director, and asked him, if he should in fact die without completing it, to repeat the first fugue, as is customary anyway, in the final piece [...]" (Bauer-Deutsch IV, No. 1240, p. 234, lines 23–26).

<sup>49</sup> AMA, Critical Report on Series XXIV, Supplement No. 1, p. 55.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. p. VIII above.

Mozart's Requiem has come down to us incorporating Süßmayr's additions; included in this term, however, are also those passages in which errors on Süßmayr's part were corrected at a very early date in the first printed edition of the score (cf. the footnotes in the score). If Süßmayr's completion work had been really been so poor, his contemporaries would not have shown so much respect for Mozart's last work.<sup>50</sup>

Süßmayr uses, as did Mozart, 12-staff paper and adopts the same score disposition: *Violini* (1st and 2nd lines), *Viola*, 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti*, 2 *Clarini in D.*, *Tympani in D.*, *Canto*, *Alto*, *Tenore*, *Basso*, *Organo e Bassi*. This is the order generally employed. The notation

<sup>50</sup> Cf. on this Blume at the beginning of the Foreword to his edition of the Requiem for Eulenburg: "*Opus summum viri summi*" – this is the title which J. A. Hiller set above his copy of Mozart's Requiem, and with that he gave expression to an judgment which was at that early point (around 1800) unopposed in the musical world. We today are not the first to see in the master's final work, permeated by the shudders of a presentiment of death, the highest of his achievements. This was already felt by his contemporaries, who honoured the Mass for the Departed as such, and none of Mozart's other great works was received [. . .] so rapidly over the whole world."

The Leipzig *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* [General Musical Journal] of 1 October 1801, column 3f., responded as follows to the publication of the first printed edition of the score: "That Mozart's composition for the Requiem is unique and that anything similar would be beyond the reach not only of the majority but of perhaps all composers now alive is the firm belief of the present writer. That not everything in the precise form in which it is now to be found can have flowed from Mozart's pen is proved by, amongst other things, the occasionally very faulty instrumental accompaniment. One should look at e.g. p. 45, measure 6; pp. 104 and 5; but especially p. 114, measures 4–5; p. 116, measure 4; p. 119, measure 1; p. 120, measure 3; p. 130, measure 1, and several others. That the completion of this work was entrusted to and carried out by Mr. Süßmayer, who was already acquainted with Mozart's ideas, had frequently spoken to him about it and therefore perhaps could also simply write down many a thought he had retained, was of course in any case better than having it pass into the hands of an admittedly good composer who would, however, perhaps have been less familiar with Mozart and his ideas. [. . .] Incidentally, that a large part of the instrumental accompaniment has to be attributed to Mr. Süßmayer is no doubt true; but the products of Mr. Süßmayer's creativity previously known to us cause us to view this assertion most critically." Despite this somewhat damping remark, the final comment is: "Be that as it may, one owes Mr. Süßmayer deep thanks for every, be it ever so modest and insignificant, contribution to the completion and, as a consequence, the publication of this masterpiece [. . .]"

for the trombones, however, necessitates additions, resulting in a change in the order. The instrumental specifications for the individual movements are therefore as follows:

"*Dies irae*": As above, in the left margin beside the staves for tenor and bass, 3 *Tromboni*.

"*Tuba mirum*": As in Mozart's notation, a consequence of the reduced scoring on the first five pages (fols. 15<sup>v</sup> to 17<sup>v</sup>), 2 staves blank at top and bottom respectively, on page 6 (fol. 18<sup>r</sup>) 2 staves blank at the top and 1 staff at the bottom; from there until the end 1 staff blank at top and bottom respectively. The instruments are specified as follows: *Violini* (3rd and 4th staves), *Viola*, 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti*, *Trombone Solo* (in tenor clef), *Basso Solo*, *Basso*. Precisely as in Mozart's score, the organ (and its employment) remain unmentioned. That the two other trombones have to stay silent is communicated by a direction in the top left-hand corner: *Trombone Alto e Trombone Basso tacent*.

"*Rex tremendae*": From this movement on, all twelve staves are required. *Violini* (1st and 2nd staves throughout), *Viola*, *Corni di Bassetto* (written in another hand), *Fagotti* (in another hand), 2 *Tromboni*, *Trombone di Basso*, *Canto.*, *Alto.*, *Tenore.*, *Basso.*, *Organ* [!] *e Bassi*. The trombones in staves 6 and 7, however, have to yield their place to the *Clarini* and *Tympani* as early as measure 6; in the margin (fol. 20<sup>r</sup>) we read: *Tromboni colle Parti*. The shortage of staves forces Süßmayr to interweave the notation of trumpets, trombones and timpani in measures 15 to 17.

"*Recordare*": *Violini*, *Viola*, 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti* (each of the woodwind, as in Mozart, has its own staff), *Canto Solo*, *Alto.Solo*, *Tenore Solo*, *Basso.Solo.*, *Organo e Basso.*; no "tacent" for brass and timpani.

"*Confutatis*": Violins and viola not specified, 2 *Fagotti*, 2 *Tromboni* (above and below the staff: *Tenore.*, *Basso.*), 2 *Clarini in D.*, 2 *Timpani D.*, *Canto*, *Alto*, *Tenore*, *Basso*, *Basso ed Organo*. In measure 6, the entry of the *Corni di Bassetto* is notated in the staff allocated to them, the bassoons, as always, one line below. In measure 10, however, the score is already forced into a new order: 2 *Tromboni* (in the *Corni di Bassetto* staff), *Tromb:[one] di Basso* (in the bassoon staff); for the now staffless bassoon, a new directive is issued: *i Fagotti si scrivano colle parti cantanti*. In measures 16/17, the woodwind have returned their staves. From measure 15 onwards, the 3 *Tromboni* find their place in *Clarini* and *Timpani* staves.

"*Lacrimosa*": Strings and choir are not specified; the word "organo" is also missing. The instruments named



from the 4th staff down are: *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti* and for the next two staves: 3 *Tromboni*, 2 *Clarini*, *Timpani* (the wind parts are once again pressed together). As a consequence, the trombones are instructed to play *colle parti* or *col B.[asso]* respectively from measure 8 on; measure 11: *Tromboni con le parti*, which applies until measure 14. In measure 19, the trombones are written out again, and in measure 21, with the entry of the trumpets and trombones, they are again referred to *colle parti*; this applies then until the end.

“*Domine Jesu*”: *Violini*, *Viole*, *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti*, 3 *Tromboni* (at the staves for trumpets and timpani), *Canto*, *Alto*, *Tenore*, *Basso*, *Organo e Bassi*. The exact notation of the trombone parts is replaced at measure 44 (“*Quam olim Abrahae*”) by the direction *i 3 Tromboni colle parti*.

“*Hostias*”: Strings, choir and organ are not specified. Explicitly named are only: 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti* (the woodwind as in “*Recordare*” on one staff each). At the beginning of the bassoons is written *senza Tromboni*.

*Sanctus*: *Violini*, *Viole*, 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti*, 2 *Clarini e Timpani in D*, *Canto*, *Alto*, *Tenore*, *Basso*, *Organo e Bassi*. There is no reference to trombones anywhere in the course of the movement.

*Benedictus*: *Violini*, *Viola*, 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti*, *Trombone d'alto* (staff 6), *Trombone di Tenore* (staff 7), *Canto*, *Alto*, *Tenore*, *Basso*, *Organo e Bassi*. In the left margin there is a remark written obliquely: *i Clarini in B si trovano alla fine* (= fol. 64<sup>r</sup>). In measures 18 to 21 and 50 to 54, the two trombone staves accommodate in the customary notation all three trombones. At the beginning of the *Osanna* fugue, use of trombones is explicitly called for: *Tromb[one] Ten.[ore]*, with rests for the alto trombone and the *Trom[bone] di Basso*. The tenor trombone is notated in full in the measures 54 to 57 (end of page, fol. 52<sup>r</sup>), at which point a “*colle parti*” is implied wordlessly by oblique strokes drawn above the staff.

*Agnus Dei*: The usual designations: *Violini*, *Viola*, 2 *Corni di Bassetto*, 2 *Fagotti*, 2 *Clarini in D*, *Timpani*, *Canto*, *Alto*, *Tenore*, *Basso*, *Organo e Bassi*. Between the staves for trumpets and timpani, the trombones are indicated: *i 3 Tromboni colle parti*. This instruction applies to the whole movement until “*Lux aeterna*”, except for those passages where the trombones are written out, as in measures 16/17, or directed to rest by *senza Tromboni* (measures 25–33, 42–49).

In the “*Lux aeterna*”, which, like the *Kyrie* after the *Introitus*, follows immediately on the *Agnus Dei*, there is no reference at all to the trombones.

The preceding comments will have clarified Süßmayr’s notation of the whole work and, concomitantly, the use of the trombones. The NMA has incorporated the entire content of these observations and has followed, wherever the trombones are required to play “*colle parti*”, the first printed parts. These reflect best the church music practice in Vienna around 1800. One problem, however, was not taken into account in this: it happened occasionally that the short note values defining the rhythms in the vocal parts were amalgamated into longer values. This must have varied, however, depending on the locality and performance practice.

A particularly convincing passage exemplifying this practice is found in measures 6 and 7 of “*Rex tremendae*”, which appear in the NMA for the first time in the form Süßmayr wanted. These measures originally had this form on fol. 20<sup>r</sup> of Süßmayr’s manuscript:<sup>51</sup> opposite the staves for trumpets and timpani appears as usual the remark *Tromboni colle Parti*. If one does not look at this more closely, one would let the trombones join in the dotted rhythm of the choral parts. But this is not what Süßmayr wants: above the soprano staff, three horizontal dashes are visible, indicating the three quarter-notes; in addition, the dotted eighth-notes in alto and tenor and also the the first three eighth-notes in measure 7 are marked with vertical strokes corresponding to the three dashes; in addition, the bass trombone is written out, an octave lower, in the choral bass in fine quarter-notes. On this basis, the trombones are not to play the choir’s rhythm, which is sufficiently supported by the trumpets and timpani. Instead, they are to reinforce the dotted eighth-notes in the choral parts with their quarter-notes. Since the first printed score schematically follows the *colle parti*, this passage has until now never been played correctly. The first printed parts are alone in rendering the original intention and thus confirm this reading of Süßmayr’s autograph.

If Süßmayr shows here a consciously differentiated sense of sonority, there is another place where this is missing. The place in question is measure 25 of the “*Confutatis*”.<sup>52</sup> In discussing Mozart’s fragment, we have already referred to the fact that this passage gives occasion for doubts. Mozart has the woodwind entering at measure 26, so that the rising chords in measure 25 serve as a kind of “up-beat”. Not only, however, does Süßmayr transfer the entry of the woodwind, but also that of the trombones, to measure 25, thus coarsening Mozart’s original balance of sound. Here only the most delicate tone production in performance can prevent the wind sound becoming too forceful and too “abrupt”.

<sup>51</sup> See the facsimile on p. XXII below.

<sup>52</sup> See p. XIII above.

The doubling of choral parts with the trombones was taken for granted in church music in the Viennese classical period, especially in a Requiem, in which one would not wish to be without the solemn sound of these instruments. They are at the same time of help to the choir. If they are played with corresponding “discretion”, they are not too heavy for the choir and are in every sense suitable for doubling the coloraturas in the choral parts. The use of the trombones will then not be felt to be too “fat”<sup>53</sup>.

The use of an organ in work like a Requiem is similarly a matter of course, as a rule also in passages where no thorough-bass figures are provided. Only the express direction *senza organo* or *tasto solo* calls for its resting or playing without chords. The NMA has therefore made up the thorough-bass figures from the first printed part wherever they are missing. This applies to:

“*Rex tremendae*”: from measure 6,

“*Lacrimosa*”: measures 8 and 22–24,

“*Domine Jesu*”: measure 72 to the end,

“*Hostias*”: in its entirety and the end of the repeated

“*Quam olim Abrahae*” fugue from measure 83 on.

For the “*Recordare*”, use of the organ for the four-voice passages of the solo quartet can be assumed.<sup>54</sup> The role of the organ in the “*Confutatis*” has already been discussed in the context of Eybler’s additions (page XIII). This passage is an example of possible problems in playing the thorough-bass on the organ, particularly in measure 25 with the *tasto solo* suggested for the NMA: this instruction reflects Mozart’s intentions, in the organ part at least, even if Süßmayr’s instrumentation disregards them. Süßmayr places, following the rules, triads in the form of wind parts above the unfigured bass note.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. on this Bruno Walter’s view, quoted in Henry H. Hausner, op. cit., p. 16: “*Süßmayr was a good musician, but I have no respect for his orchestration. Süßmayr repeatedly lets the alto trombone play along with the choral alto, the tenor trombone with the tenor and the bass trombone with the basses. I have cut the trombones in these places in order to lighten the heavy weight of the orchestration.*” This opinion is in complete opposition to church music practice in Mozart’s time. Süßmayr did not really need to “orchestrate”, this was simply how one played. The best proof of this is that the trombones were often not written out at all, but were simply instructed to play with the vocal parts. Only a “*senza tromboni*” – or a verbal directive from the choirmaster – rescinded this doubling.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Foreword to Volume 1 of 2, p. XIV.

\*

In the same way as the NMA has completed and unified the thorough-bass figures,<sup>55</sup> the visual appearance of the score has also been brought into conformity with the editorial principles of the NMA, as is visible in the disposition of the edited score, the designations of the instruments and the modern clefs for the choir. The set text corresponds in orthography and punctuation to the *Graduale Romanum*, Tournai, 1961. The articulation follows Süßmayr’s autograph; in cases of doubt, Mozart’s version was the final authority, given that it was present in the fragment. In analogous cases, the marks were compared and Mozart’s preferred form taken into account.

The volume editor is aware of the fact that Mozart’s last work still contains problems concerning many details and stimulating various speculations; some of these will probably never be solved definitively and will remain puzzles for ever. It is relevant to point out, however, that in cases of doubt the editor was helped not only by a precise study of the originals but also by the practical experience he gained during his training as a choir-boy with Dominik Josef Peterlini in Vienna.

The scores presented by the NMA for Mozart’s Requiem will be the starting point for new research. As far as the defining of the individual texts is concerned – Mozart, Eybler, Süßmayr – we may be permitted to claim the credit for transmitting readings corresponding to the manuscripts and which are thus, from the scholar’s point of view, definitive.

\*

The requirements of both scholarship and practice have also played a role in determining the form of publication chosen by the NMA for Mozart’s Requiem. The first aim was that all notation by Mozart himself should be rendered reliably and faithfully: the Introit and Kyrie in their entirety and all subsequent movements in the fragmentary form in which Mozart left them. This was fulfilled by the first part of the double volume. The second part contains the additions: first of all Mozart’s fragment with the additions by Joseph Eybler shown in small print, followed by the completion by Süßmayr – the whole Requiem in the “traditional” form known since the first printing of the score in 1800 (cf. p. XVIII) combined with the results of more recent scholarship for the purposes of the NMA. The division into two sections in a double volume has the advantage that on the one hand Mozart’s text appears in volume on its own without any

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Foreword to Volume 1 of 2, p. XIII.

additions, while the two separate publications facilitate comparisons between the individual scores.

Of the conclusions contained in volume 1 of 2, the following are relevant for the use of volume 2 of 2, especially section B (i.e. the Requiem in the “traditional” form), and are therefore repeated here:

Introit and Kyrie are written completely in Mozart’s hand, in the trombone parts only the introductory chords in measures 7 and 8; from there on, the trombones from the first printed parts have been adopted. Mozart’s share of the work in the Sequence can be established by a direct comparison of the sections A and B of the present volume 2 of 2.

In the Offertory, the following was written by Mozart:

“*Domine Jesu*”: Choir and instrumental bass in their entirety. The thorough-bass figures were present only in measures 23 to 28; they have otherwise been adopted from the first printed parts. Measure 43, 2nd half of the 3rd quarter-note until the 1st quarter-note of measure 46 in Violin I (introduction to “*Quam olim Abrahae*”), measure 66 to 78 (conclusion) in Violin I and measure 66, from the 2nd eighth-note until measure 71, 1st quarter-note in Violin II.

“*Hostias*”: Choir and instrumental bass in their entirety. The thorough-bass figures are absent altogether and were made up from the first printed parts. Measures 1 and 2 in Violins I and II and Viola, measures 44 to 54 (conclusion) in Violin I and measure 44 from the 1st quarter-note to measure 45 in Violin II.

\*

It would not have been possible to reach the aims outlined above for the editing of Mozart’s Requiem without help of many kinds, for which the most sincere thanks are expressed here: to the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin (in particular to the director of the Music Department, Dr. Karl-Heinz Köhler); to the Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt/Main; to the Austrian National Library, Vienna; to the Music Archive of the monastic foundation Schotten in Vienna; to the Music Archive of the Peterskirche, Vienna; to Prof. Dr. Otto Erich Deutsch, Dr. Wilhelm A. Bauer, Prof. Dr. Karl Pfannhauser and Dr. Alexander Weinmann (all in Vienna); also to Mr. Otto Schneider, Piesting, Lower Austria; further, to Dr. C.-G. Stellan Mörner, Stockholm; H. Baron, London; Dr. Heinz Eibl, Eichenau, Upper Bavaria, and Istvan Kecskeméti, Budapest; very special thanks are due however to the Editorial Board of the NMA for many a valuable piece of advice.

Vienna, Autumn, 1964

Leopold Nowak



Facs. 1: Austrian National Library, Vienna, *Cod. 17. 561 a*: folio 11<sup>v</sup> (1<sup>v</sup>) = from the “*Dies irae*” in Franz Xaver Süßmayr’s handwriting; cf. Volume 2 of 2, pages 64–65, measures 9–17.

A page of handwritten musical notation for the 'Rex tremendae' section. It features several staves of music. The top three staves contain complex piano accompaniment with dense sixteenth-note patterns. Below these are three vocal staves with Latin lyrics written in a cursive hand. The lyrics include: 'Rex tremendae majestatis Rex tremen - dae majesta - tis Rex tre -', 'Rex tremen - dae majesta - tis Rex tremen -', and 'Rex tremendae majestatis Rex tremen - dae majesta - tis Rex tre -'. On the left margin, there is a small note: 'Tambor solo Patti'. At the bottom of the page, there are some numerical annotations: '17-8 = 14-10 - 13-8 = 16-5 = 3-185'.

Facs. 2: *Cod. 17. 561 a*: folio 20<sup>f</sup> (9<sup>f</sup>) = from the “*Rex tremendae*” in Franz Xaver Süßmayr’s handwriting; cf. Volume 2 of 2, pages 84–85, measures 6–9.

Facs. 3: *Cod. 17. 561 a*: folio 35<sup>r</sup> (24<sup>r</sup>) = beginning of the Offertory (“*Domine Jesu*”) in Franz Xaver Süßmayr’s handwriting; cf. Volume 2 of 2, pages 118–119, measures 1–6.

Facs. 4: *Cod. 17. 561 a*: folio 47<sup>v</sup> (3<sup>v</sup>) = beginning of the Benedictus in Franz Xaver Süßmayr’s handwriting; cf. Volume 2 of 2, pages 155–156, measures 1–5.