

Sanctus—Osanna

With the *Sanctus* one has finally arrived at the part of the Requiem for which there is no Mozart autograph. Süßmayr claimed the last three movements, up to the *Lux aeterna* (where Mozart's *Te decet hymnus* and *Kyrie* fugue are re-texted and repeated)¹ as entirely his own. However knotty the issues of authenticity and questions of editorial practice have been up to this point, here these issues become the most intractable. While most modern editions accept the necessity of including these movements for a variety of reasons—however differently they implement that decision—only Richard Maunder advocates excising both the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus* from the historical architecture of the piece.

In the opening of his discussion of the *Sanctus*, he states ‘...it is improbable that Mozart intended the Sanctus to be in D major, which itself shows that no Mozart sketch for the Sanctus is likely to have existed.’² While this is of course a circular argument, he gives as his reasoning the series of key relationships from the end of the *Quam olim Abrahae* fugue to the *Sanctus* and on to the *Benedictus*. Portraying the *Quam olim* fugue as ending on the dominant of c minor rather than the much simpler and surely correct plagal cadence in g minor with a Picardy third,³ he dismisses the progression as ‘almost incredible’. However, he continues in the very next sentence: ‘It must be admitted though, that there is an example of just those changes of key in *Die Zauberflöte* where the aria “Ach ich fühl’s” in g minor is followed by the chorus “O Isis, und Osiris, welche Wonne” in D major and then by the trio “Soll ich dich Teurer nicht mehr sehn” in B flat major.’⁴ It is hard to see why such an example, written at almost exactly the same time as the *Requiem*, should be given so little weight. Furthermore, the mediant relationship that exists between the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*—D major to B flat major—is exactly what Mozart has from the end of the *Quam olim* fugue to the opening of the *Hostias*, where the G major chord moves to E flat major. Both these examples legitimize Süßmayr’s choice of keys.

Indeed, what other key could the *Sanctus* be in? Maunder cites Michael Haydn’s C minor Requiem (a model for Mozart’s work) as worthy of comparison: ‘Haydn’s ‘*Quam olim Abrahae*’, like Mozart’s is in G minor but ends with what appears to be the dominant of C minor [!]; his

¹ See Chapter 7 for a discussion of Constanze’s comment that Süßmayr did this believing it was at Mozart’s request

² Richard Maunder, *Mozart’s Requiem: On Preparing a New Edition*, Oxford University Press, 1988, p. 38

³ an argument he tries to dismiss a paragraph later

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 39

Sanctus then starts with a C major chord⁵. The attentive reader will of course notice that what Maunder is describing is a Sanctus in the tonic major, exactly as Süßmayr has it in the Requiem.

Even allowing for spoken prayers in the liturgy,⁶ after the G minor *Hostias* (with or without the Picardy third) an A major *Sanctus* would be a very long distance, and surely C major, while closer to the end of the *Hostias*, is too far from the home D minor for comfort? Furthermore, if either of these were chosen, where to go for the *Benedictus*? Except from the *Introit/Kyrie* to *Dies Irae*, no two movements have been in the same key, so an A major *Benedictus* after an A major *Sanctus* is highly unlikely. E major is surely too far from the home D minor, and F major would result in the same mediant relationship that already exists. D major would of course be possible, but then we would have three movements in a row with the same tonic: *Benedictus* - *Osanna* - *Agnus Dei*, something Mozart had studiously avoided since the *Dies irae*, when surely it was appropriate to establish the primary D minor tonality at the beginning of the work. While a C major *Sanctus* could be followed by a *Benedictus* in either F major or G major, which would in turn progress smoothly into the d minor of the *Agnus Dei*, as already discussed, a C major *Sanctus* is unlikely.

So it would seem that D major is not only the best choice, but the only for the *Sanctus*. The tonic major is also surely the best dramaturgy as the text moves from a prayer for the souls who are passing from death into everlasting life (*Hostias*) to a contemplation of the heavenly host and the glory of God that they are now experiencing (*Sanctus*). D major also allows for the brilliant participation of the trumpets and timpani surely required for this movement, and D major—if recalled at the end of the *Benedictus*—also allows the *Agnus Dei* to return to the restless tonic minor mode as the focus of the text switches again and the faithful ask God for mercy and peace.

Whilst one suspects that the reason behind Maunder's line of argument is really the last part of the sentence—'no Mozart sketch for the Sanctus is likely to have existed,' thus justifying his exclusion of the movement in his edition—ultimately it has the opposite effect, for B flat major is not the expected key for the *Benedictus* after a D major *Sanctus*: A major would have been the safer, 'obvious' choice, and the fact that a more adventurous relationship was chosen actually suggests exactly the possibility Maunder is trying to dismiss—a Mozart sketch.

⁵ Maunder, p. 41

⁶ The Requiem was written for liturgical, not concert, performance, and there would have been a prayer between the *Hostias* and the *Sanctus*, thus weakening even further Maunder's argument that the key relationships of *Die Zauberflöte* could be more free than those of the Requiem because of 'intervening spoken dialogue' (p. 39)

Of course, a key relationship alone is not sufficient reason to posit the existence of such a sketch: some thread of melodic material would be needed to support the suggestion. Two such hints exist: the use of the ‘Ployer’ melody in the Benedictus, and the Osanna fugue subject. The *Benedictus* melody will be discussed in the next chapter: suffice it to say here that the fact that it is in C major in the Ployer notebook, but in B flat in the *Benedictus*, suggests that if it were committed to paper for Süßmayr to find, it must have been in the lower key. The three alternatives, that it was either a lucky coincidence that Süßmayr happened to compose his own melody that was so similar to one of Mozart’s own and apply it to an adventurous key choice, or that he discovered the Ployer notebook among Mozart’s papers and scoured it for a melody to use and chose an adventurous key relationship,⁷ or, lastly, that he and Mozart had a conversation that went something like ‘I am going to use that melody from the Ployer notebook for the *Benedictus*, but only in B flat,’ all seem much less likely than Mozart scribbling down hastily a fragment of the melody, perhaps even with some of the bass line, on one of the ‘Zettelchen’ and setting it aside for later consideration when he came to that point in the final composition. The one page of sketches that has so far been discovered proves that he need to work out ideas for the *Rex tremendae* at least on paper, so it is not farfetched to propose that it is the not only movement for which he did so.

As for the *Osanna* fugues, before one even begins to tackle their content, one question has to be addressed: why are the *Osannas* fugal at all? If these movements are, as he claimed, entirely of his own composition, there was absolutely no reason for Süßmayr not to provide a homophonic setting. Given the large number of extended fugues in the rest of the work, he must have been keenly aware that any attempts of his own at counterpoint could only seem paltry by comparison.

Even more puzzling is his infamous re-use of the subject in the key of the *Benedictus*, a different key from its first hearing. If the movement truly were entirely of his own composition, there would be no need even to make the *Osannas* match. It was by no means invariable in eighteenth century masses that the *Hosannas*⁸ should be on identical themes, or that both should be fugal: in Mozart’s mature masses there are twice as many non-fugal *Hosannas* as fugal. But, where they are fugal, the key and material are the same. Only K. 262 and K. 259 have different *Hosannas*, and only K. 262 has the second *Hosanna* in a different key (the *Sanctus* is fugal, the

⁷ On the other occasions where it is known Süßmayr made use of Mozartian materials he tended to do so literally; (see Wolff p. 44-51) so surely if he had discovered the Ployer notebook his *Benedictus* would have been in C major? Furthermore, why would the Ployer notebook not be with Ployer herself? What use would it be to Mozart?

⁸ Since there is obviously no Mozart autograph, we do not know whether the spelling ‘Osanna’ rather than the more usual ‘Hosanna’ is Mozart’s or Süßmayr’s

Benedictus not). The *Hosannas* in Michael Haydn's Requiem in C minor are in the same key⁹ but to different material: only the second is fugal.

Although the above is by no means an exhaustive survey, broadly speaking these were the options open to Süssmayr: it was more likely that the *Osannas* would not be fugal, it was not necessary for them to use the same material, and it was virtually certain that they would be, or at least end, in the same key. Yet, he did the opposite in all three categories: he chose to do a fugal setting, he elected to make the two *Osannas* match, and he wrote them in different keys. For many commentators, this is sufficient to suggest the possibility that Süssmayr can only have done so because he either knew or believed that was Mozart's wish. It is much more logical to propose a situation where there was a sketch for both a fugue in D major and a *Benedictus* in B flat major which Süssmayr used to the best of his ability, than to suggest that he simply decided on his own to take the most complicated course of action for which, in the case of the *Osanna* fugues, he knew he was technically underprepared. On the other occasions where he made what Wolff has called 'lavish use' of Mozartian materials such as the Rondo in D major for Horn K. 514, he tended to do so quite literally.¹⁰ Furthermore, the short amount of time available to him to complete the Requiem argues against any course of action on his part that was not the most expedient.

Whatever sketch there might have been could hardly have been a lot more extensive than those of the *Skizzenblatt*, so the fugue would probably not have been more than the barest bones of the exposition, a good reason for Süssmayr to stop at that point. Indeed, the famous *Amen* sketch is quite incomplete, has both corrections and many gaps and is occasionally indecipherable.¹¹ Any *Benedictus* ideas would probably have been no more extensive than the opening bar or two of the alto melody and possibly some of the bass line.

Whether or not one accepts this line of reasoning, and even if one thinks that Süssmayr's *Sanctus*, *Benedictus* and *Agnus Dei* have no Mozartian DNA whatsoever, ultimately their historical significance cannot be ignored. While it is undoubtedly correct to approach Süssmayr's musical additions critically, it is as equally uncritical to dismiss his work out of hand as it is to accept it without question. 'His' movements must stand, and be evaluated by the same criteria as the rest of the Requiem.

⁹ the first Hosanna starts in E flat, where the soprano solo's 'Pleni sunt coeli' has led, but modulates back to the home to relative minor at the end of the movement

¹⁰ see Wolff p 44-51

¹¹ see Chapter 4 for a more in-depth discussion of the *Skizzenblatt* and the *Amen* fugue

The Opening

As has often been pointed out, the soprano melody of the grand triple statement ‘Holy, holy, holy’ is a repeat of the opening *Dies irae* theme adapted to the major:



Dramatically this is appropriate, since the focus of the text is not the terror of the Last Judgment but a portrayal of the heavenly host: what better way to describe the transforming power of the Almighty than to contrast those two pictures with different versions of the same theme? Maunder is quick to point out the hidden fifths and octaves in the places where Süssmayr’s voicing of the inner parts differs from Mozart’s in the *Dies irae*, and his reference to Marguerre’s opinion that these correspondences show only ‘Süssmayr’s attempt to relate the Sanctus to earlier material’¹² are designed to support the exclusion of this movement from his edition. Just the opposite effect is achieved however, since the observations that the *Sanctus* is connected to the rest of the work in fact validates Süssmayr’s contribution—whatever the source of his inspiration. The errors in the inner voices are so easily corrected in a minimally invasive way that one wonders why Levin corrected other errors in his edition but left these alone.

Maunder is so anxious to discredit Süssmayr that in his criticism of Süssmayr’s setting of the falling first inversion chords at ‘Domine Deus Sabaoth’ he actually misquotes Mozart’s ‘welche Wonne’ from ‘O Isis and Osiris’,¹³ to make a point that doesn’t exist: the progressions are identical (with the addition of the fourth voice, since the Mozart in question is only in three):

Die Zauberflöte No. 18 b. 5-6	Maunder, Ex. 5.2 p. 42	Süssmayr <i>Sanctus</i> , b. 4
<p style="text-align: center;">wel - che Won - ne!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">wel - che Won - ne!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Do - mi - nus De - us</p>
	x	

¹² Maunder, p. 41

¹³ see Maunder, Ex. 5.2 on p. 42, where he has a D as the second note of the second tenors, not the C sharp that Mozart wrote

He is also not correct about what he calls “the parallel octave between tenor and bass in bar 5”:
 when he states that “the intervening C sharp in the bass does not really make any difference”,¹⁴ he
 conveniently ignores that the basses’ D on the second beat before the tenors’ D creates a new
 harmony, turning the tenors’ E into a 9-8 suspension (and a double suspension with the sopranos):



Even if one were bothered by it, the solution is so simple (see example on the right)¹⁵ that his
 complaint really is a storm in a teacup.

The unexpected, highly dramatic C natural at ‘pleni sunt caeli’ has attracted roughly
 equal praise and opprobrium over the years, its supporters delighting in a *coup de théâtre*, its
 detractors bewailing a lack of taste. It is perhaps a shame that the diminished seventh chord is
 pre-empted by the bass entry, but it is an effective moment nonetheless. Levin’s version of this
 bar, first announcing ‘pleni sunt caeli’ in the altos on an A, a note common to both chords and
 thus delaying the diminished seventh chord for two beats, is ingenious.

Süssmayr’s orchestration of this opening passage shows many of his usual idiosyncracies,
 but the minim rests in upper strings in the first two beats of each of the opening three bars are
 especially strange. Surely a depiction of the hosts of heaven should feature all the instruments?

The Fugue Subject



Note how the implied harmony of the subject follows the same harmonic motion as the opening
 of the Sanctus, thus integrating the two:



¹⁴ p. 42

¹⁵ Levin comes up with the identical solution

and also how the bass of the subject outlines the opening “Requiem aeternam” motif:



The subject then, whatever its source, is well integrated both locally into the *Sanctus* and globally into the work as a whole. The tenors’ tonal answer proceeds with the countersubject in the bass, moving by step with dissonant weak beat passing notes between root position and first inversion chords.

The first problem comes in the alto entry: if, with the G sharp in the last measure of the tenor answer, we hear the D of the alto subject as the seventh of chord V^7 in A major rather than the tonic D, then we also hear the bass D at the beginning of the bar in the same way, and it is incorrectly resolved, upwards, not downwards, and also results in a second inversion on the next downbeat:



Unfortunately, the correct resolution—to the leading note—would create a parallel octave with the altos’ subject:



Clearly, if there were any kind of Mozart sketch, the bass part of this bar could not be part of it: the same problem is reproduced four bars later with the bass G under the sopranos’ entry. At first it might have seemed to Süssmayr that the quavers at the end of the subject could function as a developmental motif, a frequent contrapuntal technique, but in the end, it proved problematic, resulting in strong beat second inversion chords in bars 10 and 12, and on the downbeat of bar 13, another improperly resolving seventh, a combination of errors virtually impossible in Mozart:

(text omitted)

With the sopranos' entry, the basses drop out quite pleasingly, and the tenors' use of the countersubject proceeds smoothly. The downbeat of bar 18, after all the voices have concluded the subject, should mark the end of the exposition. Yet in bar 17 we have a redundant entry in the bass, which hints at the beginning of a counter exposition. Süssmayr is ambiguous here: the entry begins like a tonal answer in the dominant but ends as a subject in the tonic, so it could also be considered a tonic subject with altered first and third notes:

(text omitted)

Perhaps he was trying to avoid the seventh problem by having the basses enter on E instead of D, which would result in a more permissible hidden octave with the correct resolution of the altos' seventh rather than an explicit parallel, but he doesn't follow through by allowing the D in the alto part to fall: it still rises from bar 17 into 18. Changing the basses' expected G natural to an A in bar 18 also suggests the desire to emphasize A major by avoiding canceling out the new leading tone. However, it is immediately cancelled anyway by the sopranos in the next bar, so the harmonic thinking is a muddled. It is also rather suspicious that the soprano part here, after the subject is concluded, is note for note the same as the tenor part at the same point—once more using the last measure of the subject in a falling sequence. Furthermore, the continued use of that figure in sequence in the alto part from bars 18 to 21 (except for an added A on the second beat of bar 19—also an exact copy of the bass part of bars 10-13) not only takes them altos too low (Mozart never takes them below A in the rest of the work), but leaves a gap of a good deal more than an octave between alto and soprano for three beats, very unlikely in Mozart. Then they just stop singing, having sung yet another unresolved seventh.

The suspicion that copying rather than invention is taking place is compounded by the fact that, in addition to the borrowed soprano part, when the tenors enter with a second redundant entry in bar 21 it is in exactly the same relationship to the basses as their first entry at the opening of the fugue. Yet, rather than continuing into a complete counter exposition or development

section, as is implied by these fifth and sixth entries, this last entry remains incomplete, and movement comes quickly to a close by means of a very brief five bar coda. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that, when he ran out of things to copy, Süßmayr abandoned all attempt at counterpoint and brought the movement to a conclusion as swiftly as possible. Surely, given the relatively short homophonic setting of the *Sanctus*—only ten bars—a more extended *Osanna* fugue would be strongly suggested? After the longer *Benedictus*, a truncated fugue might perhaps make sense, but here it seems too slight. Given that there is no need for the *Osanna* to be fugal at all, and given the technical errors and poor construction, the *Osanna* has the air of someone trying to realise an incompletely understood plan as best he could.

The final puzzle is the astonishing way Süßmayr chose to orchestrate the fugue. One can imagine either simply forgetting to write *con trombone* over the vocal parts—indeed, Mozart himself never indicated as much at the *coro* entry in the *Requiem aeternam*—or deciding that the long quaver passages well tax many a trombonist if the tempo is particularly sprightly, let alone muddy the texture considerably. The altos' high C sharp and D at the end of the movement must have been really alarming, given that, according to Albrechtsberger, the alto trombone should not be taken above C because C sharp and D were 'schwer':¹⁶



But the absence of the basset horns is very difficult to understand, especially since the bassoons are used to double tenor and bass, as one would expect from Süßmayr. Additionally, the melodic contour of the soprano line seems almost to have been chosen not to exceed the range of the basset horn.¹⁷ The absence of all woodwinds would be valid as an artistic choice, (and perhaps too rare in Süßmayr's instrumentation of the rest of the work), and it might have made sense, if he wanted to omit the basset horns, to have both bassoons play in unison with the bassi, but to have only the lower two voices supported by wind instruments and not the upper two seems at best eccentric. The fact that both trombones *and* basset horns are used in the second *Osanna* compounds the mystery, and almost makes one wonder if they were orchestrated by the same person. While there are instances of parallel passages being orchestrated differently in the

¹⁶ Albrechtsberger, p. 440 (see also general discussion in Chapter 6). However, this prohibition also proves problematic for certain passages in the *Quam olim Abrahae* and *Ne absorbeat* fugues, where the altos have several instances of high D.

¹⁷ Levin avoids the soprano range issue in his re-working of the fugues by asking the basset horn players to change instruments to clarinet in A for the *Sanctus*, back to basset horn for the *Benedictus*, and then another exceedingly quick change—only five bars for the second player!—back to clarinet for the *Osanna* allowing much less time than was Mozart's custom. The sopranos in his reconstructed fugue are therefore free to go to the high A.

Benedictus,¹⁸ it is difficult to imagine a situation in which the two *Osannas* should not match. Süssmayr either didn't see the need to make such passages correspond, or, with three major commissions for his own music to contend with in early 1792,¹⁹ he simply didn't have time to see that they did.

If Süssmayr's orchestration is wrong, what would have been more correct? Beyer adds the basset horns to Süssmayr's bassoons but omits the trombones, holding them in reserve for the last eight bars. However, his tenor trombone entry two bars before the final tutti leads to a confusion of roles:²⁰ why single out that one fugal entry above all the others? Would it not have been better to bring in all three trombones at the same time, six bars from the end, where his basset horns and bassoons stop their doubling and also function as part of general tutti? Except for the early trombone entry, Beyer's seems a sensible solution, allowing the orchestration to have structural significance by augmenting only the final phrase. Levin doubles with both winds and brass, falling into the same trap as the orchestrators of the *Kyrie* fugue, where everything is one colour and the independence of the sections of Mozart's ensemble is lost.

The current edition avoids the over doubling of the *Kyrie* fugues, uses the bassoons *a 2* with the orchestral bass until the last six bars, where the trombones also enter to reinforce the final *tutti*, and holds the basset horns until the last fourteen bars, where they double, *a 2*, the stretto entry of the altos and sopranos before they too join the final wind chorus.

The two *Osanna* Fugues

The differences in orchestration are not the only ways in which the two *Osanna* fugues diverge. A comparison between the two is shown at the end of the chapter, where the top two staves show the first *Osanna*, the middle two that movement transposed note for note to B flat major, and the bottom two the second *Osanna*. The *Sanctus* fugue has six entries of the subject, the first four in rising pitch order, Bass, Tenor (tonal answer), Alto, Soprano (tonal answer), with two redundant entries in the Bass (subject, altered) tenor (tonal answer). The *Benedictus* is slightly more succinct, with only five entries (four-part exposition and one redundant entry) before an almost identical coda.

¹⁸ The Adagio bars that conclude both the *Kyrie* and *Cum Sanctis* fugues—when surely it would have been both easiest and most expedient merely to copy what was already written—are also different.

¹⁹ The opera "*Moses, oder der Auszug aus Ägypten*" (May 4th), a *Te Deum* for Emperor Franz Joseph II, and a ballet for the Nationaltheater (August 8th)

²⁰ Beyer, p. 114. The tenor word underlay is also very awkward in this passage

The difference in key brings necessary changes. While it might have been possible to transpose the first fugue down a major third, that would consign all the voices to the bottom of their range: transposing up has much better results as far as register is concerned, but necessitates a complete re-voicing. The tenors open, followed in turn by the altos and sopranos, all of which can be achieved by simple transposition. The final entry, originally in the sopranos, must now be accomplished by the basses. If transposed literally, this would entail bringing in the basses above the tenors' minim E flat. Süßmayr's solution to this problem is a considerable improvement on the original: starting from bar 11 he writes a new tenor countermelody, based on the countersubject, which rises by step to provide the root of the chord under the sopranos' high G on the 'cel' of 'excelsis' (this measure is actually a transposition of bar 16 of the *Sanctus* fugue) and allows the bass entry (tonal answer) to be the root of the chord. These measures are much less cluttered than the original, but they are not without their problems: there is an uncharacteristic unison doubled third between the altos and tenors on the last beat of bar 11, dropping an otherwise three-voice texture to two parts, which in turn emphasizes the hidden fifth between the same voices on the next beat. Neither does Süßmayr solve the problem of the rising seventh in the altos from bar 13 to 14.

Bar 14 is basically a transposition of bar 18 of the *Sanctus* fugue, but with the very unfortunate addition of a parallel fifth between the sopranos and altos over the bar line from bar 14 to 15. In bar 17, instead of entering on the root of chord V as he did in the *Sanctus*, Süßmayr brings in the tenors on B flat instead of C: it is now the only seventh in the texture, so there isn't the harmonic ambiguity of the equivalent place in the first *Osanna*. However, there are some new problems: in addition to a hidden octave between the altos and basses over the bar line, there is an unfortunate doubled third between soprano and tenor on the downbeat of bar 18, which emphasizes the jump to a hidden fifth on the next beat, and the rising soprano line leads to another doubled third on the next downbeat. These errors, taken individually, are not necessarily significant, and in four-part counterpoint are occasionally unavoidable,²¹ but together and over a distance of only five beats, they are highly undesirable.

Repeating the *Osanna* fugue in a new key was not a simple task. It involved considerable work for which, from the new errors that were created, it seems that Süßmayr was at best under-equipped. The differences in construction of the two fugues, however, show that he was not without understanding of counterpoint, since several alterations required by the change of key are

²¹ There are, for example, eight instances of hidden fifths or octaves between internal voices, or internal voices and the bass in Mozart's choral parts in the *Requiem aeternam*.

improvements to the D major version, and one can only sympathise with him that he too often introduced new errors in the process.

Given the known Mozartian provenance of the melody for the *Benedictus*, the possibility cannot be ruled out that it was actually the B flat major fugue that Süßmayr undertook first: in some ways it is better than the D major version. If there were such a sketch on the same leaf as the *Benedictus* melody, given that on rough sketches Mozart often did not use clefs or key signatures, it could simply be that this is what Süßmayr saw, and did not know to what clef or therefore key to assign it.²²



Given that he must have been keenly aware that any fugue he wrote couldn't help but be compared unfavourably with the fugues already in the work, Süßmayr must have had compelling reasons to make the attempt. The only explanation that would seem to make sense is that he knew, or suspected, that it was Mozart's intention.

The above discussion covers the music Süßmayr wrote for the fugues. The debate about whether they are too short is a lively one, and generally not resolved in Süßmayr's favour: 'The developments of the two *Osanna* fugues are far too brief';²³ 'the ridiculously short continuation'²⁴; 'Süßmayr hurries to the close'²⁵ are recent, but representative. Beyer was the first actually to contemplate proposing a remedy.²⁶ His edition presents two different endings, an 'Erste Schluss', Süßmayr's ending (though with Beyer's revised orchestration) and Beyer's own 'Zweiter Schluss' which adds six newly composed bars 'in an attempt to let these movements come to a rest in a more organic manner. They are based on the formula of a repeated reinforcing cadence which is quite customary in Mozart's music.'²⁷ Although quietly presented in Beyer's characteristically modest way, these bars are revolutionary in that they place the insertion into a

²² the tenors' opening statement as Süßmayr wrote it in the *Benedictus* fugue would of course be in the tenor clef, but a sketch, if it were just the subject and not an exposition like the *Amen* fugue on the *Skizzenblatt* could just as easily refer to a violin part

²³ Beyer, p. 20

²⁴ Maunder, p. 46

²⁵ Levin, p. XIX

²⁶ see Beyer's score, p. 114–115

²⁷ Beyer, p. 20

historical document of historically informed, but newly composed music firmly within the permissible methods of the modern editor.

Pandora's box was opened. Most modern re-finishers have used this starting point as a justification for the addition of music of their own devising to the all movements that Süssmayr claimed as his own, from the *Lacrymosa* onwards. In a very real sense, their work has Beyer's 'Zweiter Schluss' as its ancestor, even Maunder's, because excision is also a modern intrusion, perhaps a greater one. Whilst it would be challenging to argue that a Mozart fugue on this subject would not have not contained a development section, altering the proportions of a musical structure by means of the grafting on of new material in order to make it 'more Mozartian' is fraught with problems. Duncan Druce, for example, adds so much of his own invention that in places it almost amounts to a kind of trope.²⁸ Michael Finnissy goes even further: 'I imagined Mozart in the present day, working to complete the Requiem, looking back across the centuries which have passed since his death. I asked myself what composers, musical genres and historical events would have influenced him since 1791—this helped me shape my work.'²⁹ Finnissy's, like Druce's, contains much beautiful music of impeccable craftsmanship, but it surely stretches the meaning of the term 'edition' beyond the breaking point. Their motivation is a love of Mozart, but their goal is not, as Ernst Hess put it, 'to bring Mozart's last relic into a worthy form—as far as that is possible for any human being who is not Mozart'³⁰ from an historical perspective.

That is Levin's goal, and in the *Osanna* fugues he stays close to Süssmayr's proportions, providing both a new countersubject and a succinct nineteen bars of development that include modulations, sequences and stretti. The present edition is similarly proportioned, adding a modulation to the relative minor with entries for alto, bass and soprano in that key before a series of sequences returning to the tonic with a canons between soprano/tenor and alto/bass. Stretto entries for each voice in the tonic prepare for the final cadence. The result is more satisfying than Süssmayr's, and offered in the spirit described by Wolff: 'knowing it is only an attempt and that it will not be the last.'³¹

²⁸ Druce, *Mozart: Requiem*, Novello (1993)

²⁹ see 'Southampton composer completes Mozart Requiem'
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-15751924>, accessed 3rd February 2015

³⁰ see Beyer, p. 8

³¹ Wolff, p. 52 n. 131

Sanctus

Sanctus transposed to B flat

Benedictus

1: missing passing note

2: A simplified, new T line

3: doubled unison third and large jump hidden fifth between A&T second inversion avoided

4: rising 7th in A

parallel 3s in original cause parallel fifths when inverted

(=Bass)

- 5: parallel 5th between S&A
- 6: doubled third (S&T) and hidden octave between A&B
- 7: hidden 5th S&T
- 8: doubled third S&T

(free re-voicing)

(=Tenor)