

---

WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART

---

# REQUIEM

D minor/d-Moll/Ré mineur  
for 4 Solo Voices, Chorus and Orchestra  
für 4 Solestimmen, Chor und Orchester  
K 626

Edited by/Herausgegeben von  
Friedrich Blume

PREVIEW  
Low Resolution



Ernst Eulenburg Ltd

London · Mainz · Madrid · New York · Paris · Prague · Tokyo · Toronto · Zürich

I. INTROITUS: Requiem aeternam	1
II. KYRIE ELEISON	11
III. SEQUENZ	
1. Dies irae	25
2. Tuba mirum	42
3. Rex tremendae majestatis	48
4. Recordare, Jesu pius	55
5. Confutatis maledictis	67
6. Lacrimosa dolorosa	80
IV. OFFERTORIUM	
1. Dominus	87
2. Ubi caritas et misericordia	109
V. COMMUNION	
1. Agnus Dei (Deus misericordia)	125
2. Agnus Dei (Benedic omnia sancta)	132
3. Agnus Dei (Memento meum)	149
VI. CONCLUDING LITURGY: Lux aeterna	155

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of Ernst Eulenburg Ltd., 48 Great Marlborough Street, London W1V 2BN.*

## MOZART, REQUIEM

'Opus summum viri summi.' With this title J. A. Hiller inscribed his own copy of the Requiem, and in so doing, gave expression to an opinion which even at that early date (c. 1800) was hardly disputed. It was not left to the present generation to consider this last work of the master's, haunted by premonitions of his own death, his supreme achievement. His contemporaries realized its true worth, and no other of Mozart's great works so readily found acceptance all over the world, even in countries, such as Italy, which ignored his operas. It shows the thirty-five-year-old Mozart treading new paths in the music he engaged in the struggle with death, in comparison with his C minor Mass (1783), the Requiem being an absolutely unique instance. In every aspect it is different from every score he has composed before or since. It is the first example of a practice begun by him in his last years, of burning up his manuscripts, and the loss of them. He had written the Requiem in the style of Sturm und Drang, and the Requie in the style of Classical tradition. The former was to be used to manifest his view of the world to come—the latter, the creed and the way man is released from the consciousness of earthly existence. In point of style, the Requiem resembles 'The Magic Flute' which

immediately preceded it, but it makes far greater use of the resources of earlier music, and represents a typical art which is decisively individual to Bach and Handel.

From its own time the Requiem has been one of the most popular of all masses, and it has been performed in almost every country in the world. Its success is due to the sombre, dramatic, and tragically expressive qualities of its music, and the way in which it suggests a living death. Its interpretation calls for a certain musical gloom and severity, and its work to Mann's taste, and the way in which it encouraged him to write his famous story of the great singer, clad in grey, who came to him and the work on behalf of his late wife, and who sent him an emissary from the underworld. As is well known, this mysterious commission was later again simply explained: a certain Count Walsegg wished to have the work performed as a requiem for his late wife. Whether as has been stated, he intended to claim it as his own composition is uncertain, but it seems clear that Mozart, at that time in poor health and haunted by thoughts of death, was terrified by the appearance of the unknown envoy, whose image remained in his mind's eye and profoundly disturbed him.

PREVIEW  
Low Resolution

The romantic exaggerations connected with this incident have at all times challenged criticism of every circumstance relating to the Requiem itself. They have even led to doubts as to the authenticity of the Italian letter dated September, 1791 which, if it could be proved to have been written by Mozart, would afford deep insight into his state of mind. It runs: 'My head is in a turmoil; the vision of that unknown stranger is ever before my eyes. I see him entreating me, urging me and impatiently demanding the work. I am on working, for composition tires me less than repose. Moreover, I need no longer be afraid. I am clearly aware of my approaching end. I know that I shall have to leave this world before I can complete my art. This dirge; I must compose.'

Neserhöhe, where the manuscript of the Requiem was found, was the residence of Count Anton von Wartberg, who had engaged Mozart to compose a requiem mass for his wife. The count had given Mozart a sum of money to cover his expenses, and the composer had accepted it without any protest. However, Süssmayer told the court, Berlinig & Haertel, the publishers of the Requiem, whom Mozart's widow, Constance, had entrusted with the task of completing the requiem, were aware that the 'Sanctus,' 'Benedictus' and 'Agnus Dei' were entirely his own work. But this statement was doubted at the time, for

Süssmayer, though admittedly a talented musician, was not above the average level of the Viennese school. Consequently, the question of his participation in Mozart's composition was much discussed during the nineteenth century, and is still a matter of dispute. Supporting evidence in the form of an autograph score and a copy of the musicological examination of the sketch gradually came to light. In 1880, Dr. Süssmayer's son, Dr. Carl Süssmayer, published a sketch of the Requiem problem. At the beginning of 1912 the main points of the sketch may be summarized. The sketch contains 12 movements, numbered 1 to 12. The main movements are: 1. 'Requiem aeternam' (with its variations); 2. 'Tuba mirum'; 3. 'Rex misericordie'; 4. 'Ricordare'; 5. 'Confutatis'; 6. 'Lacrimosa'; 7. 'Dirige'; 8. 'Agnus Dei'; 9. 'Benedictus'; 10. 'Sanctus'; 11. 'Hosanna in excelsis'; 12. 'Oratione'. The first movement, 'Requiem aeternam,' with its variations, 'Tuba mirum,' 'Rex misericordie,' 'Ricordare,' 'Confutatis' and 'Lacrimosa,' as well as the 'Dirige' and 'Agnus Dei,' are entirely by Mozart; the orchestration was finished by Süssmayer, ostensibly from Mozart's detailed sketches. Among these movements, the 'Lacrimosa,' alone, is incomplete in the autograph score. It goes only as far as bar 9. Joseph Eybler tried to add two more bars, but they were not included in Süssmayer's arrangement. Handl's excellent, though not entirely incontrovertible, research shows that at least half of it was scored by Mozart. This tallies with Constance Mozart's report that the movement

PREVIEW  
Low Resolution

was sung at the master's bedside. Stissmayer's alleged composition of the 'Sanctus,' 'Benedictus' and 'Agnus Dei' has, however, been disproved with a high degree of probability by Handke. According to his findings, the first part of the 'Sanctus' is entirely by Mozart, except for the orchestration. The 'Pleni sunt' is based on Mozart's sketches, but the execution betrays an inexperienced hand. The 'Osanna' may have been sketched as far as bar 15; but the remainder is free and is clumsily carried out. The 'Benedictus' which, as Handke says, 'in beauty of expression and well-ordered linear expansion reveals the image of Bach in Mozart's soul,' clearly concludes the master's hand as far as bar 18 and between bars 21-22. The orchestration of this section may also be ascribed to him. Between bars 41-50, only the vocal parts and the figured bass are present. The instrumentation of these parts was probably determined by Süssmayer who, middle-aged, had lost his powers of composition. These movements were probably composed during the last year of his life, about 1791. The 'Sanctus' and 'Benedictus' by Mozart, though unequal in their mastery in its instrumentation and in the development of many of the features of the whole work. In the 'Agnus Dei,' 'Lux aeterna,' the 'Te Deum' from the First Movement reappears, as does the Kyrie-fugue

in the concluding 'Requiem' of this section. This is obviously only a makeshift and is hardly in accordance with Mozart's intentions. That, although the Requiem as a whole lacks the crowning glory of creation by Mozart himself, it is to a very great extent the work of Mozart.

Two considerations are in opposition to this view. One is the fact of partial authorship of the 'Sanctus' part of the 'Requiem' by Mozart. The other is the circumstance of the 'Sanctus' and 'Benedictus' in the same movement. The arrangement of the 'Sanctus' and 'Benedictus' implies that the 'Sanctus' was sketched before the 'Benedictus' was composed. This would contradict all the evidence pointing to Mozart's authorship of the 'Sanctus' as a general rule. A sketch was completed in the month of June set down a note on paper. Under the outer circumstances existing at the time, the Requiem was composed in illness, haste, and agitation, which have caused an exception of this kind. Constance had no knowledge of any posthumous sketches beyond a few scraps of paper covered with notes. There is, however, no justification for alleging that Stissmayer appropriated movements elaborated by Mozart in order to claim their authorship for himself.

There seems to be no means of resolving the many doubts and obscurities which still remain after all the foregoing facts and arguments have been considered. With the material at our disposal we may

PREVIEW  
Low Resolution

conclude, at any rate provisionally, that with exception of the reappearance of the initial movements at the conclusion of the work, and of a few occasional patchings, the composition is Mozart's own; and that the instrumentation, except in the first two movements, is fragmentary and doubtful.

The present revised edition of Mozart's Requiem is based on the following: the autograph score (Facsimile print, cf. note on p.IV); the complete edition of Mozart's works by Breitkopf & Härtel, Series XXVI, 1, together with the Revision Report written by Brahms; and the score by Breitkopf & Härtel (first edition c.1800). The deviations of the prints from the autograph are astonishingly numerous. In many cases the reading of the autograph has been maintained. The majority of all these deviations would constitute a complete reconstruction of a few of the movements. The summary here given is based on the autograph, and is intended to give the reader a clear idea of the changes made. It must be clearly understood that the changes are not always correct, whenever it is possible to ascertain it always concern the bassoon, and never a solo cello. In fact, however, the change is intended and it is always strictly prescribed by Mozart. In all other passages, a misunderstanding of the change of clef in the figured bass has caused a change in the instruments.

3. In the 'Kyrie,' Mozart's manuscript shows that he intended 'eleison' to be sung as a word of four syllables, and he leaves no doubt as to the distribution of the syllables among the notes.

4. In the 'Tuba mirum' (pp. 56-57, 61-62), the readings of the bass and Viola are widely divergent. There is no definite reading.

5. In 'Oratione' (pp. 63-64) the bassoon has a different reading.

6. In 'Confitebor' (pp. 65-66) the bassoon and the bassoon continuo have a different reading. The reading of bassoon continuo is not correct. The bassoon, in the bassoon continuo, the lower part of which consists as in the bassoon, in the upper part, which earlier prints read as if it were written in bassoon, is now read in bassoon continuo.

7. In 'Agnus' (pp. 67-68) the bassoon and bassoon continuo have a different reading which have already found their way into the printed edition. Unfortunately for practical use, they may possibly be incorrect according to the autograph, have now been removed.

8. In 'Sancte' (pp. 69-70) there are also many incorrect dynamic markings (forte, dim.). Further details must be omitted. It need hardly be said that, in places where no autograph exists for reference, Süssmayer's intentions, as established by the first printed edition, were decisive for the revision. The aim throughout has been, not to produce an arbitrary reconstruction of Mozart's supposed intentions, but to give the purest possible reading of his own parts of the work by following the autograph; and by interpreting the remaining parts according to the best traditions.

## MOZART, REQUIEM

„Opus summum viri summi“ — das ist der Titel, den J. A. Hitler über seine Abschrift des Mozartischen Requiems setzte, und er verlieh damit einem Urteil Ausdruck, das schon damals (gegen 1800) in der musikalischen Welt unbestritten war. Nicht erst wir Heutigen sehen in dem von Todesahnungen durchschauerten letzten Werk des Meisters das Höchste, was er geschaffen hat. Schon die Zeitgenossen fühlten es und würdigten die Totenmeuse so, und kein anderes der großen Werke Mozarts hat so schnell in der ganzen Welt auch in Ländern, die sich seinem Tod verschlossen (wie Italien), Eleganz gefunden. Dabei zeigte es um den 35-jährigen mit dem Sterben ringendem Komponisten auf ganz neuen Bahnen, wie der C-Moll-Messe (K. 626) im Jahr 1791 in seiner großen, endgültig Unvergleichlichkeit Teile für zuviel katholische und zuwenig protestantische Massenmusik enthielt, die einen periodisch wiederkehrenden Rhythmus aufwiesen, der an die alten Säkular- und Dogma erinnerte. Es handelte sich um eine Kombination von der Engst und der Weite, die sich ausdehnen und befeiern — auch unmittelbar in diese Weite einzuholen. Silbermann sieht die Personen in der Nähe der ihr ja auch zentralen beschriebenen „Zauberflöte“, doch war über diese hinweg ergriffen sie die Mittel der Alteren Musik und erweist sich

**Resolution** als eine Kunst, auf die Nach- und Handel entscheidend einflussreicht haben. Mozarts Requiem ist bis zu den heutigen Tage immer von einem düsteren Nimbus umgeben, als wenn es die anderen Werke der großen Komponisten wieder die Glorie jenseitiger Welten in dener Hütte gewesen wären. Und so kann man das Werk nicht ohne die Teilnahme eines Geistes, der von dem Meister selbst überzeugt ist, dass es dazu gänzlich genügt, die Todesangst des Menschen in einer künstlerischen Gestaltung zu einer Ewigkeit zu erhöhen. Ein gesiegelteres Geist, der das Werk im Auftrag eines Herrn der Finanzen schuf, und der wie ein Schrecken aus dem Jenseits erschien. Bezeichnenderweise erhält sich die Bestichtung später nicht mehr auf: Der Graf Walringg will das Werk als Seelenkunst für seine gesuchte Glutin aufführen — ob er die Absicht hatte, sich selbst als den Komponisten auszugeben, wie behauptet wird, das sei dahingestellt. So viel aber ist an der ins Legitime gehobenen Begebenheit wohl sicher wahr, daß der kränkliche und ohnehin von Todesgedanken heimgesuchte Mozart, erschreckt durch das Auftreten des geheimnisvollen Boten, die Gestalt vor Augen behielt und sie von ihr erregt blieb. Die romantischen Überreibungen, die sich an den Vorgang geknüpft haben, forderten von jeher die Kritik an allen mit der Totemesse zu-

sammenhängenden Umständen heraus. Sie haben dazu geführt, daß auch die Echtheit jenes italienischen Briefes vom September 1791 bezweifelt wird, der, wäre er bestimmt von Mozart geschrieben, Gute Eindrücke in die Seele des Meisters gestanzen würde. Dort heißt es: „Mein Kopf ist voll Unruhe, das Bild jenes Unbekannten steht mir unerhörlich vor Augen. Ich sehe, wie er mich blüht, mich drängt und ungeduldig von mir die Arbeit fordert. Ich fahre fort, weil das Komponieren mich weniger umstrengt als die Ruhe. Übrigens brauche ich mich vor nichts mehr zu fürchten. Ich fühle es deutlich, daß die Stunde schlägt, daß ich am Ende bin. Ich höre auf, ehe ich mich meins Konzerts erfreuen könnte. Das Leben wird mich so schön... Das ist mein Grundsatz, ich darf ihn nicht umstossen.“

Dennoch war es Mozart, der sich selbst gönnt, sein „grünes Leben“ zu verhindern. Wie weit seine Hoffnung da war, kann man daran erkennen, daß er die anderen Komponisten, die Geist, Geschick und Erfahrung im Dienste der Musik zu Diensten standen, mit großer Schärfe kritisierte. Er schrieb: „Diejenigen, die sich auf die Komposition von Opern und Sinfonien konzentrierten, waren nur auf die äußerliche Anmut und den Reiz des Werks ausgerichtet, ohne zu haben Sinn und Verstand, ohne die Fähigkeit, die ganze Idee eines Werks zu begreifen. Dieser Behauptung kann ich nicht zustimmen, denn Sinfonien sind zwar ein gutes Talent und

stand auf der durchschnittlichen Höhe der damaligen Wiener Schule, aber nicht mehr. So wurde denn im 19. Jahrhundert die Anteilfrage viel diskutiert. Und da man sich dabei lediglich auf die autographen Partituren und auf die musikalisch-historischen Untersuchungen von Süßmayr<sup>1)</sup> stützte, neigte sich allmählich die Waagschale. Die moderne Zirkulation der Partituren mit neuen Noten, die die Stände der Partitur und die Instrumentierung der Sinfonien leicht veränderten, ließen die Meinung zu „nein“. Danach wurde die Autorschaft Süßmayrs, die er in seinen Autobiographien „Tuba“ und „Lacrimosa“ in „Recordare“, immer „Jens“ mit „Süßmayr“ verwechselte, in Frage gestellt. In Süßmayers handschriftlichen Notizen sind in Siegeln und handschriftlichen ganz von ihm verfassten Notizen die Partituren des „Lacrimosa“ von Süßmayr, angeblich nach dem Vorbild Mozarts. Unter diesen Notizen steht das „Lacrimosa“ in der handschriftlichen Partitur nicht vollständig. Es fehlt dort nur bis Takt 9, zwei weitere Takte hat Josef Eybler anzufügen versucht; sie sind aber nicht in Süßmayers Bearbeitung übergegangen. Die ausgezeichneten, wenn auch methodisch nicht hinzuftlehbaren Untersuchungen von Handke<sup>2)</sup> haben wahrscheinlich gemacht, daß das „Lacrimosa“ von Mozart vollendet und, wenigstens zur Hälfte, auch instrumentiert war. Das stimmt mit einem

<sup>1)</sup> Sonderausgabe, Musicae Briefe, Bd. II Nr. 249.

<sup>2)</sup> Vgl. R. Auerl, Mozart, S. 540ff. und 109ff., ebenfalls ausführlicher Literaturnachweis; R. Handke, Zur Lösung der Benedictus-Frage usw., Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft, S. 108ff.; Phototypisches Paket mit den Autographen (Nationalbibliothek Wien), herausgegeben von A. Schnirich, 1914.