

Wolfgang Amadé

Mozart

original text in Italian

by Luca Bianchini

www.italianopera.org/mozart.html

free translation

by Robert Newman

Luca Bianchini, *Wolfgang Amadé Mozart*, italianOpera, Milano 2011.

www.italianopera.org

CHAPTER II

PART TWO

Cibavit

THE ALLEGED TEACHING OF MOZART BY PADRE MARTINI BEFORE HIS EXAM IN BOLOGNA

«We can say that polyphony was used to sing the Eucharist as it was introduced into the liturgy of the Latin Church. The evolution of the polyphonic Ordinarium Missae was the work of the papal singers in the papal chapel in Avignon in the fourteenth century. Since that time also the texts of the Feast of Corpus's Proprium Missae are written in counterpoint. Limiting ourselves to this Mass Cibavit EOS the Introitus had already been put in polyphonic music by an anonymous composer, also by Heinrich Isaac (ca. 1450-1517), K. Senfl (1492-1555), O. Lasso (1532-1594), Blasius Amon (ca. 1560-1623), and W. Mozart (1756-91), etc.».¹

¹ Hygini Anglés, "de cantu gregoriano", sta in Hygini Anglés, *Scripta Musicologica*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma 1975, vol. 1 p.85: «La evolución polifónica del Ordinarium Missae fue obra de los cantores pontificios de la Capilla Papal de Avignon en el siglo xiv. Al llegar al siglo xv, en su segunda mitad, otra vez empezaron los compositores sagrados a cantar con polifonía el Proprium Missae, al lado del Ordinarium Missae. Desde aquella época encontramos por doquier también los textos del Proprium Missae de la fiesta del Corpus escritos con polifonía. Limitándonos a esta Misa podemos decir que el introito Cibavit eos fue puesto en polifonía ya por un anónimo del siglo xv, por Heinrich Issac (ca. 1450-1517), K. Sanfi (1492-1555), O. Lasso (1532-1594), Blasius Amon (ca. 1560-1590), O. Vccchi (1550-1605), W. Byrd (1543-1623), W. Mozart (1756-91), etc.».

CIBAVIT EOS

K.44

In his biography Hermann Abert tells us that W.A. Mozart, as an exercise before the entrance exam to the Academy in Bologna practiced counterpoint with Padre Martini by composing the motet 'Cibavit Eos' KV 44 on a Cantus Firmus.

«Wolfgang did not go in Bologna unprepared to solve the test [of the Antifona K.86]. An elaboration of the Cantus Firmus "Cibavit eos" written with childlike handwriting (K.44, Series XXIV, 31), is probably an exercise done under the guidance of Padre Martini».²

This exercise was very well done judging by its results. (In fact the music of this Motet Cibavit K.44 which Abert says was made by him in 1770 is much more correct than his version of the exam Quererere [...] K.86). The polyphony is a counterpoint "fiorito" in the three higher voices. At the Bass there is instead of a Cantus Firmus a doubling of the Bass part by the organ.

Mozart here, in the Cibavit, according to Abert is proving himself very talented in counterpoint. He says he already has knowledge of this rigorous art of late 16th century polyphony. He says the boy's genius is able to accommodate all of the oldest styles. There is certainly great rhythmic freedom throughout this his piece which becomes more agitated towards the end. At which point Wolfgang concentrates rapid passages in eighth notes, mastering rules required of all composers ever since the days of Palestrina.

Köchel registered this work as K.44 in the first edition of his catalogue which finally appeared in print in 1862, having known of the work through the original autograph of W.A. Mozart (consisting of two pages in oblong format written on both sides). The manuscript at the time being in possession of August Andre of Offenbach which was divided into two groups of ten staves).

In this work the Cantus sings the text 'Cibavit eos' and the choir responds with 'Ex adipe frumenti...' (fig.1):

² Hermann Abert, *W.A.Mozart*, il Saggiatore, Milano 1984, vol. I p. 205.

44.

Motett. »Ex adipe frumenti«

für vier Singstimmen und Bass.

Comp. * 1767. — 1765—68. Nach der Handschrift.



Autograph: Im Besitz von Aug. André in Offenbach. (1860 Juni K.) 2 Blätter mit 2 beschriebenen Seiten, Querformat, 10 zeilig. Mit mehreren Skizzen zusammengescriben.

Ausgaben: Keine.

Anmerkung. Wurde mir (Juni 1860) durch das Autograph bekannt. — Der Anfang (die Intonirung) lautet: »Cibavit eos«, worauf der Chor: »Ex adipe frumenti« fortfährt.

(fig.1)

From his examination of its handwriting Köchel concluded that Wolfgang must actually have composed this motet around 1767, i.e. several years before his trip to Italy although subsequent studies soon became more detailed in identifying the precise location and date of its composition as being Bologna, the church of San Domenico [?] on October 6th, 1770 (fig. 2):



(fig.2)

Later, Wyzewa and Saint-Foix had no doubts about the date and place.

« Bologna, in late September or early October 1770. Antiphon: Cibavit eos, for soprano, alto, tenor and bass with organ accompaniment. The autograph of this Antiphon does not carry any data, but its resemblance to the Antiphon Querite, which served as a Mozart test piece for October 9, 1770, in front of the Accademia Filarmonica of Bologna, can leave no doubt [?] on the origin and date ».

The fact is the setting of the Antiphon 'Quaerere' which musicologists Wyzewa and Saint-Foix have published on p.100 of their celebrated biography is not actually by Mozart, as they say, but by Padre Martini !:



(fig.3)

We have already seen in Chapter 1 the same erroneous attribution spread from one biography to another on the Bologna examination itself. And here these two pillars of French musicology have also confused Mozart with the work of Martini.

Not realising these two different religious works, KV44 and KV86 (which they listed with the numbers '99' and '100' are very different).

It is a plain fact the motet 'Cibavit' KV.44 has nothing to do with the antiphon 'Quaerere' K.86. Yet Wyzewa and Saint-Foix say their n. 99 (KV.44) is similar to n. 100 (KV.86). This somehow allowing them to locate and date the music. And yet only a few pages later, when dealing with their item n. 100 (K.86) they write that it is a test piece distinct from n.99 (KV44) being even more musically rigorous and an exam piece. The Cibavit [...] KV.44 with its many quavers in fact run free everywhere, except in the low part: But they write, "We have said, about the previous number [K.44], the conditions that were imposed to the young Mozart to compose a song [K.86], which he had to write in a few hours the day of his admission test before the lofty Academy of Bologna. Shorter than n. 99 [KV 44], who had served as a preparatory exercise, this improvised piece [sic] reflects a more simple approach, with such an appearance that can only be explained by the emotion of the little postulant».³

Because both pieces are said to be 'similar' and yet are in reality 'distinct' (sic) Saint Fox Wyzewa show (at least to their own satisfaction) both must have been composed in 1770. The first being KV44 (free style in character) with another piece preparatory to it, KV86, of a more academic character.

³ Théodore de Wyzewa e Georges de Saint-Foix, *Wolfgang Amédée Mozart: Sa vie musicale et son œuvre*, Perrin, Paris, 1912, vol. I p. 328: «Nous avons dit, à propos du numéro précédent, quelles conditions ont été imposées au jeune Mozart pour la composition de ce morceau, qu'il a eu à écrire en quelques heures, le jour de son épreuve d'admission dans la savante Académie bolonaise. Plus court que le n° 99, qui lui avait servi d'exercice préalable, ce morceau improvisé est aussi d'un travail plus simple, avec une apparence de raideur qui doit s'expliquer par l'émotion du petit postulant».

« Having learned what was the nature of the test to which he would have been submitted, the young boy, probably under the guidance of P. Martini, wanted to be expert in a style that looked the same as the one he should have to deal with, and just a few days before the competition he therefore wrote that piece which consists in the n. 99 [K.44: Cibavit eos]. The work imposed on petitioners was to set to music a liturgical text for four real voices of a song chosen at random from the Gregorian antifonarium book while keeping as possible its rhythm and its harmonic sequence of notes that accompany the chant. To this general program were usually added (as we learn from a letter of Leopold Mozart, all sorts of prescriptions and special requirements that forced the author to observe the laws of harmonic chant, making the composition of the piece extremely difficult) but at the same time giving to the composition a religious aspect, and at the same time having a scholarly aspect. Mozart complied with all these things in this preparatory exercise, as he would do later in his piece for the test. The work n. 99 [K.44] is even larger and has a more powerful character than the Antifona Quaerere [...], which is explained by its peace of mind and by the more time the child would have at his disposal. The four-part counterpoint (the organ doubling the Cantus) is conducted by a skilled hand, without ever taking the form of Canon or Fugue, even if the final Alleluia has a number of imitations with a more pronounced rhythm than the rest of the piece ».⁴

But these two different compositions (K.44 and K.86) are not required to obey harmonic sequences as was claimed by Wyzewa and Saint-Foix, but are of a modal system. There are in fact four modal categories which serve as references, all of them derived from Gregorian chant, each category of which is divided into plagal and authentic Modes, from the eight medieval modes.

«The sixteenth-century counterpoint is based on the modal system. The sacred repertoire in fact, referring to the much to Gregorian chant, assumes its characteristics and its melodic trends ».⁵

⁴ Théodore de Wyzewa e Georges de Saint-Foix, *Wolfgang Amédée Mozart: Sa vie musicale et son œuvre*, Perrin, Paris, 1912, vol. I pp. 326 e 327: «99. - *Bologne, fin de septembre ou premiers jours d'octobre 1770.*

Antienne : Cibavit eos, pour soprano, alto, ténor et basse avec accompagnement d'orgue. L'autographe de cette antienne ne porte aucune date : mais sa ressemblance complète avec l'antienne Quaerite, qui a servi de morceau de concours à Mozart, le 9 octobre 1770, devant L'Académie philharmonique de Bologne, ne peut laisser aucun doute sur son origine et sa date. Ayant appris de quelle, nature allait être l'épreuve qu'il aurait à subir, le jeune garçon, probablement sous la direction du P. Martini, a voulu s'essayer dans une tâche toute pareille à celle qu'il aurait à traiter; et c'est donc quelques jours avant la date du concours qu'il aura composé le n° 99.

Le travail imposé aux postulants consistait à mettre en musique, pour quatre voix réelles, un texte liturgique pris au hasard, dans l'an-tiphonaire grégorien, en y conservant, autant que possible, le rythme et la suite harmonique des notes accompagnant le même texte dans le plain-chant. A ce programme général se joignaient, comme nous l'apprend une lettre de Léopold Mozart, toute sorte de prescriptions et de défenses particulières qui, obligeant l'auteur à observer les lois harmoniques du plain-chant, rendaient la composition du morceau extrêmement difficile, en même temps qu'elles achevaient de lui donner une allure à la fois religieuse et scolastique. Et à tout cela Mozart s'est entièrement conformé dans son exercice préparatoire, comme il allait le faire ensuite dans son morceau de concours. Le n° 99 est même plus étendu, et d'une exécution plus poussée que l'antienne Quaerite, ce qui s'explique par le loisir et l'aisance supérieurs dont l'enfant a pu disposer. Le contrepoint des quatre voix (la basse de l'orgue se réduisant toujours à doubler celle du chant) est conduit d'une main habile, sans d'ailleurs revêtir jamais la forme régulière du canon ou de la fugue ; encore que Y alléluia final nous présente une série d'imitations d'un rythme plus accentué que le reste du morceau».

⁵ R.Dionisi e B.Zanolini, *La tecnica del contrappunto vocale nel cinquecento*, Suvini-Zerboni, Milano 1979, p. 5.

The fact the vocal parts of the 'Cibavit' and those of the Querite are in imitation according to the antique style is not reason to say they are 'similar'. Nor can one understand how these two scholars were able to deduce from their fleeting similarities, the environment, location, year, the month and even the day between late September and early October 1770 which they attribute to it being made by W.A. Mozart. To these two biographers Mozart in circumstances conducive to composition more favourable (as Mozart at the time had no concern for the later examination) is said to have produced a piece better done than the exam Antiphon which is wrongly attributed to Mozart (actually by Martini) !

The following is the Antiphon 'Cibavit eos' attributed to Mozart (for 4 voices and organ accompaniment) as published in the Breitkopf edition (fig.4):

The image shows a page from a musical score. At the top, it reads "ANTIPHONE „Cibavit eos“ für 4 Singstimmen und Orgel von W. A. MOZART. Köch. Verz. N° 43. Serie 24. N° 21." The score is written for Soprano, Alto, Tenore, Basso, and Organo. The lyrics are: "Ex a - di - po - fra, non - ti, si - ba - vit eos. Ex a - di - po - fra, non - ti, si - ba - vit eos. Ex a - di - po - fra, non - ti, si - ba - vit eos. Ex a - di - po - fra, non - ti, si - ba - vit eos." The organ part is written in the bass clef and consists of a simple accompaniment.

(fig.4)

In 1991, the recording company Philips recorded this same work as part of the Complete Mozart Edition among the religious pieces in Box XX. Music critic Alfred Beaujean reported for its liner notes, «this Introitus was probably composed in late September or early October (1770), perhaps

as a preparatory exercise, under the supervision of Padre Martini, to the Antifona Mozart would have to compose in strict style on October 9th to be admitted to the Accademia Filarmonica»⁶.

Beaujean shares with Wyzewa and Saint-Foix the same position, without citing the source. Beaujean, however, adds the new news, that the autograph is preserved at the Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek.

So Beaujean shares the same view on this piece as Wyzewa and Saint Fox without citing any source. Beaujean, however, provides the news the autograph is preserved today at the Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek. But the same Beaujean, argues along the lines of a much earlier essay⁷ by one Hellmut Federhofer made in 1958 (which the former does not even mention) on a series of issues related to the attribution of smaller works in Mozart's church music because he now tells us there is doubt about the Mozartean authenticity of KV44. In fact the first to have finally realised Mozart had copied the 'Cibavit' from the music of another composer was musicologist Ernst Hintermaier in a critical essay⁸ of 1991 (a work which clearly seems to have escaped Beaujean). And yet Beaujean's conclusions on the work were re-adopted by NMA themselves in their 'Critical Edition of the Works of Mozart' when they published 'Cibavit eos' as KV44 (KV3 73u) agreeing that it was NOT by Mozart. Also saying Wolfgang had merely copied from an Introitus composed by Johann Stadlmayr who lived (1575-1648), a German born in Munich and active in Salzburg before and after 1600. Mozart's 'autograph', which is really nothing more than a copy of that work, dates in reality from the eve of his trip to Italy when Wolfgang was still in Salzburg. Studies of the handwriting of this supposed 'autograph', as proposed by Köchel in his first edition of 1862 indicate the documents were written in Salzburg about 1769. That was certainly not the year of composition itself because in fact Cibavit K.44 as originally produced by Stadlmayr, was of course in late Renaissance style. Its style is full of counterpoint. So the piece first created around 1600 is not at all comparable with the second work already shown to have been made for Mozart for the exam by Martini in 1770. KV44 was also written in a totally different era and the two works were written in different places under completely different circumstances.

This fact is ignored by Wyzewa and Saint Fox who merely noted both had both been composed above a Cantus Firmus. (Obviously, if that yardstick is a rule then all compositions of Church Music

⁶ Alfred Beaujean, *Philips Complete Mozart Edition*, Philips, 1991, cofanetto XX p. 103.

⁷ Hellmut Federhofer, "Probleme der Echtheitsbestimmung der kleineren Kirchenmusikalischen Werke W. A. Mozarts", "Mozart-Jahrbuch", Bärenreiter, Kassel 1958, pp. 97-108.

⁸ Ernst Hintermaier, "Zur Urheberschaft des Introitus Cibavit eos KV 4 4 (73u), Mozarts Missglückter Transcriptionsversuch einer mensural notierten Music", "Mozart Jahrbuch", Bärenreiter, Kassel 1991, pp. 509-517.

since the Late Middle Ages to the Late Renaissance should be attributed to the same author. An absurdity, in fact).

The antiphon in the case of KV.44, had not been used at random.

This Introitus, belonging to late sixteenth century church style, was originally composed on a liturgical text deliberately chosen to serve Stadlmayr to musically solemnize a ceremony. This work was as said copied directly by Mozart who wanted to copy a style older than at least one hundred and fifty years.

The evidence of KV.44, (beyond perhaps a general and brief interest in early music) certainly does not prove Wolfgang carefully prepared for his examination of Bologna, nor that Padre Martini helped the student with exercises, nor even that Martini ever taught him in a class. It demonstrates instead -

1) Wolfgang copied it, maybe to practice when he was in Salzburg (without mentioning Stadlmayr) and

2) that a whole series of others have uncritically attributed it to him.

In the Motet K.44 there is no trace of either Mozart nor of Martini.

Therefore it remains for the Miserere K.85 (for three voices with organ accompaniment to test the dependence of Mozart in 1770 by the Philharmonic counterpointist. This Miserere is one of the two songs Abert says were provided to Wolfgang in preparation for his examination in Bologna.

In another section of the chapter 2 (from Part III) analysis of these compositions, according to Abert, show the influence of schooling after the examination by Martini in Bologna from the Mass KV. 115 onwards.

A separate section in this first chapter will focus on the Mozartean pieces Abert says were influenced by Ligniville and which are known to have been in circulation around the Florentine period, i.e. around April 1770.