

MOZART'S UNFINISHED FANTASY
THOUGHTS ABOUT THE FANTASY IN D MINOR, K. 397

BY
EPHRAIM HACKMEY

Submitted to the faculty of the
Jacobs School of Music in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Music
Indiana University
May 2012

Accepted by the faculty of the Jacobs School of Music,
Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Music

Prof. Menahem Pressler, Research Director

Prof. Luba Edlina-Dubinsky

Prof. Emile Naoumoff

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The Fantasy and Its Place among Mozart's Piano Works	4
3. Structure and Thematic Material	6
4. The Current View about the Ending of the Fantasy	11
5. Mozart and the Baroque	13
6. Mozart's Possible Plans for the Fantasy	18
7. Some Optional Endings	24
Bibliography	32

List of Musical Examples

1. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 1-11	6
2. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 12-15	7
3. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 20-24	7
4. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 34-37	8
5. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 55-70	9
6. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 87-107	9
7. Mozart: Fugue Opening from Fantasy and Fugue in C major, K. 394	14
8. Mozart: Fragment of a Fugue in F major, K. 383b	22
9. Larry Palmer: Alternate Ending for the Fantasy	28
10. Mitsuko Uchida's Ending for the Fantasy	29
11. Efi Hackmey's Ending for the Fantasy, First Solution	30
12. Efi Hackmey's Ending for the Fantasy, Second Solution	31

1. Introduction

In the spring of 2010 I was invited to perform a concert for Friends of Mozart, a New York-based organization. The concert took place at Christ and St. Stephen's Church on the Upper West Side on April 7, and the program included chamber music works by Mozart: two piano trios and a sonata for violin and piano (with violinist Mayuki Fukuhara and cellist Lindy Clarke). The organizers asked me if I would play a short piece by Mozart for solo piano, and I suggested to perform the fantasy in D minor, K. 397 (385g). I was thrilled to perform this gem that I played as a young child, now as a mature pianist. I started working on the piece, and after a while decided to listen to some performances and observe how some of the great pianists perform it. I searched on YouTube and started listening to Mitsuko Uchida's performance. I liked the performance and agreed with much of the interpretation, so I kept listening to the end. Very close to the end – that is, right after m. 97, with only 10 measures left – I heard something that completely shocked me. All of a sudden the piece that I had known for over twenty years changed direction. After the dominant chord in m. 97 Uchida started playing the opening material of the piece again. The brilliant, cheerful ending in D major turned into a somber and somewhat mysterious ending based on the opening material of the piece.

I immediately decided that I have to do some research about the ending of the fantasy. After all, I heard a performance by a famous pianist who is well-known as an interpreter of Mozart's works, so I had to take it seriously and see what was behind what seemed to me like a revolutionary compositional decision. First, I looked at my new Henle score, and there, to my absolute astonishment, I found an asterisk above m. 97, and a comment below: "First edition ends here; completed on the basis of early prints".¹ I didn't understand how I could have missed it

¹ W. A. Mozart, *Klavierstücke* (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1983)

before. A later inspection of my older Henle score² revealed that indeed there is no trace of that comment there; so Henle must have added that comment at some point in between. I started looking for articles about this issue, and found Paul Hirsch's article from 1944³. In his article, Hirsch was the first to point out the fact that the first edition of the fantasy ended on the dominant chord in m. 97 (!), and it is quite certain that the last ten measures of the fantasy have been added by "another hand", in Hirsch's words⁴. So I realized that Uchida decided to continue differently from that point, composing her own ending, since the ten measures after m. 97 are not by Mozart, and since the piece cannot end on a dominant chord like it did on the first edition. While I realized that this is a very complex situation, I liked the basic concept of going back to the opening material. It felt to me as a much more satisfying way to finish the piece, and later research revealed that Uchida is not the only one who does that. I wanted to perform that sort of ending at the Friends of Mozart concert, but I was not completely happy with Uchida's specific solution for the ending. I started improvising and found several other solutions, of which I chose one to perform at the concert. I played it for my chamber music partners, who liked it very much and approved it enthusiastically. After discussion with the president of Friends of Mozart, Mario Mercado, we decided that I will perform my own ending, and so I did.

I am aware of the fact that by doing so I was walking on thin ice. We are dealing here with one of the greatest musical minds of all time, and thus it would be stupid to claim that we know what was on Mozart's mind. Whoever wrote the traditional ending that we know was much closer to Mozart in time and spirit (though according to Hirsch's article there was a lot of pressure from the publisher to finish the piece quickly, which is possibly not the best artistically). Furthermore, as Hirsch (and later articles) points out, the piece may have been intended as an introduction to a

² W. A. Mozart, *Fantasie d-moll, KV397* (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1983). It is interesting to note that the old score shows the same date as the new one; however that was the most recent date that I was able to find in both scores. The difference between them makes it clear that they have been produced in different times

³ Paul Hirsch, "A Mozart Problem", *Music and Letters* 25 (1944): 209-212

⁴ Hirsch, p. 209

fugue or a sonata, which complicates the situation even more. I am not claiming to know the answers, but I think that it is important to raise the questions. To this day, I am still shocked by the fact that as a well-informed and educated professional pianist, I only learned about this important issue about two years ago, despite the fact that it has been known at least since 1944. I studied piano literature three times: during my Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral studies, each time a multi-semester course, and yet, no one has ever mentioned the fascinating story behind the D minor fantasy, which is interesting by itself, and also as a case study of how composers work. Most pianists that I ask do not know about it. So while I was preparing for that concert in the spring of 2010, I also decided to write a paper about the fantasy, and here it is. I will discuss general aspects of the piece, give the background about its ending, and discuss Baroque influences on Mozart's music of that time (as an introduction to the very valid assumption that Mozart may have conceived the fantasy as an introduction to a fugue). Following that, I will discuss some of the endings that have been proposed for the fantasy.

2. The Fantasy and Its Place among Mozart's Piano Works

The Fantasy in D minor, even if left unfinished by the composer, is one of Mozart's well-known and most popular pieces for the piano. It is less demanding in terms of pianistic technique relatively to most of his other works for the piano (using the word "technique" in the simplistic sense of the word), and thus it has become one of the first serious pieces by Mozart that a young piano student plays, sometimes in early childhood. Almost every professional pianist has played it at some point of their life, as well as many amateur pianists. But in addition to being "manageable", the fantasy is a true masterpiece of the highest rank, a work of the deepest emotion and expression.

The key of D minor is not to be ignored – it is very significant in Mozart's works. D minor is the key of monumental works including Don Giovanni and the Requiem (another unfinished work of very different dimensions and very different reasons of incompleteness). Thus for Mozart it was a key of utmost drama. Mozart's output in minor keys constitutes a small part of his works in terms of quantity (there are many more works in major keys), but definitely not in terms of quality. Only two symphonies in minor keys, two piano concertos and two piano sonatas. Of those, the D minor piano concerto, K. 466, stands out as a highly dramatic work (another notable piece in D minor is the string quartet, K. 421). Overall, Mozart's works in minor keys are very concentrated emotionally, as if he had to squeeze all of his tragic feelings in those relatively few pieces; he does not use the minor often, but when he does, he is very effective. Interestingly, among the independent, or "miscellaneous" works for piano (i.e. not sonatas or variations), there seems to be a higher concentration of works in minor keys, as if this was a place where Mozart felt that this type of expression is more appropriate. Those include, in addition to the Fantasy in D minor, the great Fantasy in C minor, K. 475 (1785)¹; the Rondo in A minor, K. 511 (1787); and

¹ The Fantasy K. 475 was composed as an introduction to the Sonata in C minor, K. 457, but since it was composed separately and is much more often performed separately (at least in our days), and since it is so

the Adagio in B minor, K. 540 (1788); all masterpieces of the highest rank, even among Mozart's works.

The Fantasy in D minor is earlier, and it is assumed to have been composed in Vienna in 1782. It is close in Köchel number – and presumably in time – to the Prelude (Fantasy) and Fugue in C major, K. 394 (1782); the (originally unfinished) Fantasy in C minor, K. 396 (1782);² and the Suite (also unfinished), K. 399. It is important to note the Baroque influence on the choice of genres here, and this will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

complete by itself, I count it with the independent works for that purpose. This is well reflected by the fact that they were assigned two separate Köchel numbers

² Another independent piece in minor. See discussion in chapter 5

3. Structure and Thematic Material

The fantasy as we know it includes three main sections of different lengths, with completely different thematic materials, tempo indications and characters: the Andante (mm. 1-11), or introduction; the Adagio (mm. 12-54), or the main body of the fantasy; and the Allegretto, in D major (mm. 55-97, or mm. 55-107, to include the traditional ending).

The Andante (Example 1),¹ introductory in character, creates a very special atmosphere as the piece begins to unfold. The unique arpeggios, supported by the long, held bass notes create a somewhat romantic, almost pedally feel (though I personally avoid over-pedaling this section); but as we will see later this may in fact be a result of Mozart's perception of Baroque music. The Andante section ends on a low, empty dominant which is the single low A in m. 11, with a fermata above it and followed by a fermata rest.

The image displays a musical score for the 'Andante' section of Mozart's Fantasy in D minor, measures 1 through 11. The score is written for piano and consists of four systems of music. The first system is marked 'Andante' and 'p'. It features a bass line with long, held notes and a treble line with arpeggiated figures. The second system continues the arpeggiated pattern. The third system shows a more active treble line. The fourth system concludes with a single low A note in the bass line, marked with a fermata.

Example 1. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 1-11

¹ The music examples are taken from Mozart, *Miscellaneous Works for Piano; Urtext of the New Mozart Edition* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2005)



Example 2. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 12-15

After this long break, the second section, Adagio, begins. This section is the main body of the fantasy, with the Andante serving as introduction. The Adagio section is very dramatic, and even tragic. It consists of two (and one may argue three) main themes that come back in different keys. The first of those (Example 2) – the primary theme of the piece, is a weeping theme, with longer singing lines continued by, or commented by short sighs of quiet pain. After another somewhat long break, the second theme announces itself (Example 3). The first part of that theme (m. 20-22), with its insisting, repeating notes and chromatic descending Phrygian progression in the bass octaves, sounds like the voice of the destiny; the second part (m. 23-27), again separated by a rest, is full of sighs, that become more and more agitated, until they end abruptly with a crescendo into a rest, which is the very long fermata rest in m. 28, right before the next appearance of the first theme in A minor in m. 29. Indeed Mozart's use of rests in the fantasy is as dramatic as his use of notes.

Example 3. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 20-24

Example 4. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 34-37

One of the interesting features of the Adagio section is the two improvisatory and fierce Presto sections that interrupt it. Those sections are unbarred, a practice that may suggest the influence of C. P. E. Bach's keyboard fantasias.² There are two of those: one between the repeat of the first theme in A minor and the repeat of the second theme (Example 4); and one between the repeat of the second theme and the final, concluding appearance of the first theme in D minor. Essentially after m. 29 each appearance of the themes is separated by a Presto section, that instead of a long rest, functions as a brilliant, free cadenza that prolongs the ending of the previous theme before the next theme appears again.

The Allegretto section, in D major, creates a significant contrast to the rest of the piece. This typical Mozartian Allegretto is one of sheer joy – however that is a kind of joy that is very sensitive, and for me personally does not resolve completely the anguish of the Adagio. After the introduction of the main theme of the Allegretto (Example 5), a more lively section with quick sixteenth-note accompaniment leads to another unbarred cadenza,³ that leads back to the main

² See Christopher D.S. Field, et al. "Fantasia." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/40048> (accessed March 7, 2012). In the article about the 18th century fantasia, Eugene Helm discusses the rhapsodic and improvisatory sections in C. P. E. Bach's keyboard fantasias, and his approach of 'free' fantasia, one which is unbarred and not 'composed in meter'. He further writes that while Mozart's Fantasy K. 475 is barred throughout, "K397 is closer to the C.P.E. Bach style, containing unbarred sections."

³ This cadenza, however, is more 'standard', like in the third movement of the sonata K. 333

Example 5. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 55-70

Allegretto theme in m. 87 (See Example 6 from now on). This time, after four measures the theme continues with orchestral chords on the tonic chord of the first inversion in m. 91. Those chords start a progression that ends on the low-registered dominant-seventh chord in m. 97, in *piano*, followed by a fermata rest. This is where, as mentioned in the introduction to this essay, Mozart stopped writing; however all the editions that I have seen continue with the same, traditional ending, with various degrees of explanation.

Example 6. Fantasy in D minor, mm. 87-107

The traditional ending (mm. 98-107, Example 6) repeats the Allegretto theme an octave lower, in *pianissimo*, with a minor alteration, and then brings it back to the original register with the support of long chords in the bass that lead to the end of the piece, underlying a very strong harmonic progression. The final measures conclude with orchestral chords of the tonic and dominant, in way of a triumphant, orchestral ending. Most importantly, the traditional ending continues the Allegretto, in D major, with the Allegretto theme. Aesthetic discussion of the traditional ending will follow later in the essay.

4. The Current View about the Ending of the Fantasy

As I mentioned in the Introduction, it was only in 1944 – roughly a century and a half after Mozart’s death and the publication of the fantasy – that a scholar questioned the authenticity of the final 10 measures of Mozart’s fantasy. In his short but important article, “A Mozart Problem” (see footnote 3 on p. 2, and Bibliography), Paul Hirsch sheds light on many aspects of the ending of the fantasy. As Hirsch writes, the first edition of the piece, published by the ‘Bureau d’Arts et d’Industrie’ in Vienna in 1804, includes only 97 measures, and in that edition the piece ends of the dominant-seventh chord of m. 97 (see the bracket added by the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe in Example 6). Furthermore, the title of the piece in that edition is ‘Fantaisie d’Introduction’, and underneath the title it adds ‘Morceau détaché’.¹ In other words, it seems that the piece was meant as an introduction to another piece, and that piece, or the ending, is missing (certainly the dominant-seventh would not be the way to end the piece). The fantasy was published again in 1806 – only two years later – by Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig, with the traditional ending that we know. Hirsch details his theory of what happened with the autograph, what Constanze did with it, and how Breitkopf & Härtel laid their hands on it, and it seems quite certain that this ending was composed at some point between 1804 and 1806, probably right before the publication by Breitkopf & Härtel of the seventeenth book of their ‘Œuvres de Mozart’. Hirsch suggests that this may have been done by “the cantor of St. Thomas’s Church, August Eberhard Müller, an intimate friend of Gottfried Christoph Härtel’s, who was doubtless concerned in the edition of the ‘Œuvres’ and at that time produced a series of vocal scores of Mozart’s operas.”²

Later scholarly research reaffirms Hirsch’s conclusions. By now, there is a broad consensus that the last ten measures (mm. 98-107) of Mozart’s Fantasy in D minor, K. 397, are not by Mozart. I am calling those ten measures ‘the traditional ending’ in this essay. As I mentioned in

¹ Hirsch, P. 209

² Hirsch, P. 211

the introduction, by comparing two different editions by Henle – an old one and a current one – it seems that they added an asterisk with an explanation of the issue at some point; however their explanation is very vague. The current New Mozart Edition³ (Neue Mozart-Ausgabe, or NMA; the music examples in this essay are taken from NMA) goes much farther than Henle, and puts the title as “Fantasie in d (Fragment)”. The word “fragment” is also very prominent in scholarly articles about the fantasy. In the current NMA, there are two asterisks between m. 97 and m. 98, on both sides of the staff, and a very visible bracket, with the comment “Mozart’s fragment ends here. The completion of the final bars was probably supplied by August Eberhard Müller”. Another addition is the fermata on the rest on the second beat of m. 97 that originates from the first edition of the piece.

The word fragment is a little strong for my taste, and it can imply many different things. Mozart left a large amount of fragments – those are only the remaining ones – including quite a few fugue fragments that will be discussed in the next chapter. I think that a distinction should be made between a short fragment and an unfinished piece. A fragment of 4, or 8, or 12 measures may have been a failed attempt that Mozart decided to abandon; however any account of the fantasy in D minor must recognize it as a true masterpiece of the highest rank. And as such, I think that we must assume that Mozart left it unfinished for other reasons – whatever they were – and that he planned to either finish it, or more likely, to add a piece that follows the fantasy, possibly a fugue.

³ Mozart, *Miscellaneous Works for Piano; Urtext of the New Mozart Edition* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2005)

5. Mozart and the Baroque

Mozart's move to Vienna in 1781 enabled him to get to know, perform and study the works of Haydn, as well as the works of the great composers of the North German Baroque – particularly Bach and Händel. Mozart was exposed to the music of Bach and Händel through his acquaintance with the Baron Gottfried van Swieten in Vienna.¹ Van Swieten possessed an impressive collection of Bach scores, including the *Art of Fugue* and the *Well-Tempered Clavier*. As Mozart describes in his letters, he visited the Baron's house every Sunday, where Bach's music was performed constantly. During that time Mozart also arranged some of Bach's fugues for string quartet, for performances by a string ensemble at van Swieten's house. Moreover, since van Swieten's copy of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* included only the fugues without the preludes, Mozart probably composed new preludes for them.² During that time Mozart also copied, for purposes of study, fugues and canons of some of the great masters of the 17th and 18th century.³ Mozart's admiration for Bach's music continued for the rest of his life. Incorporation of polyphonic writing in his works became a very important aspect of his mature style.

Mozart's compositions from his early years in Vienna demonstrate clearly the influence of his thorough study of Bach's music. One of the best examples of that is his Prelude (Fantasy) and Fugue in C major, K. 394 from 1782 that was probably composed around the same time as the fantasy in D minor. In a letter to his sister Nannerl, Mozart talks about the background for the composition of the Fantasy and Fugue in C major (Vienna, April 20, 1782):

¹ One of the most interesting accounts is in the article by Warren Kirkendale, "More Slow Introductions by Mozart to Fugues by J. S. Bach?", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 17 (Spring 1964): 43-65. Kirkendale discusses van Swieten's persona in more depth, as "one of the most influential Viennese patrons of music at the end of the eighteenth century." He further elaborates on van Swieten's association not just with Mozart but also with Haydn and Beethoven

² See the Kirkendale article

³ See Erich Hertzmann, "Mozart's Creative Process," in *The Creative World of Mozart*, ed. Paul Henry Lang (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963): 17-30. In p. 26 Hertzmann mentions that "We still possess his autograph copies of a fantasia by Froberger and a canon by Byrd."

. . . Baron von Swieten, to whom I go every Sunday, gave me all the works of Händel and Sebastian Bach, to take home with me (after I had played them for him). When Constanze heard the fugues, she absolutely fell in love with them. . . Well, as she had often heard me play fugues out of my head, she asked me if I had ever written any down, and when I said I had not, she scolded me roundly for not recording some of my compositions in this most artistic and beautiful of all musical forms and never ceased to entreat me until I wrote down a fugue for her. So this is its origin. . . In time, and when I have a favorable opportunity, I intend to compose five more and then present them to the Baron von Swieten, whose collection of good music, though small in quantity, is great in quality.⁴



Example 7. Mozart: Fugue Opening from Fantasy and Fugue in C major, K. 394

The fantasy and fugue in C major is a very sophisticated and elaborate piece. It is hard to tell whether Mozart wanted to write both the fantasy and the fugue strictly in Baroque style, but the fugue subject (Example 7) is indeed quite convincing as a Baroque fugue subject; however the harmonic language in parts of the fugue sounds much later. The manner in which the counterpoint matches the subject is a little too systematic for my taste, and I personally feel that for Mozart this was not just an artistic composition, but also an exercise in counterpoint. In this fugue, Mozart employs rhythmic augmentation and diminution – techniques that are considered among the most elaborate in Baroque fugues, and appear in only a few of Bach’s fugues from the *Well-Tempered Clavier*. The fantasy is a somewhat unusual piece, that for the most part sounds neither like Baroque music nor like Mozart’s music. Some Baroque influences are evident, though. Those include the use of arpeggios that are similar to those in J. S. Bach’s *Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue*, and are also unbarred, reminding of C. P. E. Bach’s fantasies. The opening of the C major fantasy (Adagio) sounds like a festive overture, followed by a long improvisatory Andante that

⁴ Emily Anderson, *The Letters of Mozart and His Family* (London: Macmillan, 1938)

uses insisting repeated notes of various speeds as a background for oddly shaped melodic lines based on scales and arpeggios. The Andante is interrupted by a Piu adagio section that includes dramatic chords in French overture style that are interrupted and then continued by the above mentioned unbarred arpeggios that move mostly between diminished seventh chords. The fantasy ends on the dominant in m. 60, thus preparing and creating the expectation for the fugue to start. This is contrary to Bach's custom to end the prelude or fantasy on the dominant as a preparation for the fugue; Bach's introductory pieces tend to end on the tonic. But as mentioned before, van Swieten's copy of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* did not include the preludes, and thus it seems that Mozart may not have been fully aware of Bach's practice. Ending on the dominant may be an influence of the suite overture, an influence that is present in other aspects of the fantasy in C major as mentioned above.

During that period, Mozart also composed the Suite, K. 399 – a keyboard suite in Baroque style that he left unfinished. The suite includes a completed Overture, Allemande and Courante, and a few measures of the opening of a Sarabande. Similarly to the Fantasy and Fugue in C major, the suite follows Baroque practice in terms of form and general rhythmic and tonal procedures within the movements, however the tonal language is definitely not stylistically Baroque; moreover, the different movements are all in different keys, which is probably an influence of the classical sonata. Similarly to the Fantasy in C major, the Overture ends on the dominant, as a preparation for the Allemande. The other unfinished fantasy of that period – the Fantasy in C minor, K. 396 – is less related to our discussion here. Mozart is known to have written only the exposition, and the rest of the piece was completed by Maximilian Stadler, some say based on autograph materials that he may have possessed.⁵ In any case it is a true masterpiece that, in my opinion, surpasses by far both the Fantasy and Fugue K. 394 and the Suite K. 399.

⁵ See Mario R. Mercado, *The Evolution of Mozart's Pianistic Style*, (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992), p. 99

The above mentioned Baroque-influenced pieces are probably not among Mozart's most popular works, the suite being unfinished, and the others probably being harder to listen to. However even less known is the fact that Mozart left numerous unfinished fugue fragments, most of which are from this period. Many of those are beautifully reproduced in the current edition of Mozart's "Miscellaneous Works for Piano" by the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe, that also includes illuminating information in the Preface. The fragments come in all lengths; some include only a fugue subject, some include a complete fugal exposition (or an outline of the exposition without all the parts), and some include longer parts of fugues. Most of the fragments date from 1782 – right after he entered van Swieten's circle in Vienna – and thus they may have served as exercises in counterpoint for Mozart as part of his study of Bach's fugues. Particularly interesting are the six fragments of a fugue in E minor. Those represent several attempts by Mozart to work on a fugue that seems like the most stylistically Bachian of all the other fugue fragments.⁶ There are also two earlier fragments, from 1773 (Mozart was only seventeen) and 1776/77, which are very different in style; as well as a much later fragment, apparently from the late 1780s.

It seems then, that Mozart was preoccupied with fugues during this period. However his enthusiasm about polyphonic writing and about J. S. Bach's music never ended. Other examples include the fugue for two pianos in C minor, K. 426 (December 1783), and the fugue for organ in G minor, K. 401 (probably 1773).⁷ But even more importantly, contrapuntal and fugal writing became an important part of Mozart's writing, something that he saved for moments of climax. Examples of that can be found much later; those are countless, and they include, among others, the famous fugato section in the finale of the *Jupiter* symphony, and in a very different way, the

⁶ See NMA, *Miscellaneous Works for Piano*, p. 141-143; and the Preface, p. XX

⁷ Regarding the fugue in G minor, Wolfgang Plath writes in the introduction to NMA (*Miscellaneous Works for Piano*) that while the fugue has been attributed in the past to 1782, more recent analyses attribute it to Salzburg, most likely as early as 1773. I am not sure how that would work with Mozart's letter to Nannerl above in which he tells Constanze that he had never written down a fugue, but that is probably not that hard to explain. This beautiful, archaic, fairly long and well-crafted fugue was composed by Mozart except for the last few measures that were probably completed by Maximilian Stadler

combination of three independent dance tunes in three different meters in the first act of *Don Giovanni*.⁸

And with that knowledge about Mozart at the time that he composed the fantasy in D minor, let us turn back to the fantasy and discuss Mozart's possible plans for it, and our performance options today.

⁸ And see very interesting discussion in Erich Hertzmann's article mentioned above. Hertzmann discusses Mozart's relative difficulty in composing polyphonic music; in many cases the polyphonic sections of pieces were the only ones that were fully sketched by Mozart, while in the less polyphonic sections he only sketched the melody and bass lines. The ballroom scene of *Don Giovanni* was worked out on sketch leaves, like other polyphonic sections

6. Mozart's Possible Plans for the Fantasy

The D major ending of the fantasy – possibly provided by August Eberhard Müller (see Chapter 4) – has never been seriously questioned until Paul Hirsch's article of 1944. As Hirsch writes, if Müller was indeed the one who wrote it, "this otherwise rather dry musician did by no means a bad piece of work in this case, and nobody since the year of 1806 has ever seriously found fault with it."¹ That is, no one doubted the authenticity of the ending for 138 years. Hirsch adds two very interesting criticisms of the ending, both of which were written before his article, and thus before it was known that the ending was not authentically by Mozart. The first is by Otto Jahn (1813-1869), who writes that the ending is not completely satisfying and makes the whole work appear as a "presage for something greater."² The second is by Georges de Saint-Foix (1874-1954), who according to Hirsch "was struck by the fact that there is something rather abrupt about it."³ This is of course open to discussion, and of course all the great pianists of all times have played that ending, and they still do. However, personally I agree with the above mentioned opinions as I find that mm. 98-107 are just not at the same compositional level of the rest of the piece. I feel that the very fine Allegretto by Mozart loses its elegance right away when those measures start. Moving the theme an octave down might work in some contexts, but the alteration on the fourth measure of the theme (m. 101 of the piece) does not sound organic, and the long, low chords in mm.102-104 sound unduly heavy. There is a sense of sophistication that is lost with those chords. Obviously it is easy to say and hard to write an ending, and as I said before, whoever wrote this ending, whether Müller or someone else, did a good work. But of course, it is not easy to match Mozart.

As mentioned before, the original title of the piece in its first edition was "Fantaisie d'Introduction", a title that seems to derive from Mozart. Scholars have mentioned two options

¹ Hirsch, P. 211

² Hirsch, P. 212

³ Hirsch, P. 212

for a piece to follow the introduction: a fugue, like in the Fantasy and Fugue in C major, K. 394; or a sonata, like in the Fantasy and the Sonata in C minor, K. 475 and K. 457. Another option is that “Fantaisie d’Introduction” is just a type of title, and that Mozart would have written an ending to the piece and left it as an independent piece. I personally think that the fugue theory sounds like the most probable one. The fantasy in D minor is at such a high level of refinement and perfection in any possible way, that I find it hard to believe that Mozart just left it like that, waiting for completion; however, I can accept that he may have seen it as complete as far as the fantasy section is concerned, and left the writing of the fugue for later. Or that, alternatively, a suitable fugue did not come to him easily, or he wrote a fugue that was lost. I support the fugue theory over the sonata for several reasons. First, the time of composition. The Fantasy in D minor was composed in 1782, the year that we discussed before in connection with Mozart’s Baroque explorations (in the preface to NMA, Wolfgang Plath mentions that Alfred Einstein called 1782 the Viennese “year of fugue” for Mozart). The sonata in C minor K. 457 was composed in 1784, and the fantasy K. 475 was composed in 1785, which is much later (a year for Mozart is like a decade for someone else). In this context, there is an interesting discussion in a lengthy footnote to Hirsch’s article – footnote 12 that seems to be by the editor of *Music & Letters*, Eric Blom:

. . . The Fantasy in C minor, K. 475, written in 1785, is later in date than the C minor Sonata, K. 457 (1784) to which it became attached, apparently at Mozart's own wish, since the two works were published together in 1785 as ‘Fantaisie et Sonate’, dedicated to Mile. Thérèse de Trattnem. It seems to me that if Mozart had planned a similar twin-work in 1782 there would have been a sonata in D minor (or possibly in D major, since the D minor Fantasy ends in the major) already in existence to which he could have appended the Fantasy by a similar afterthought. But there is none anywhere in the neighbourhood of the Fantasy, so far as we know. On the other hand there is the C major Fantasy and Fugue, K. 394, almost next door in Köchel, although it must be said that in the Einstein edition it is separated more widely, the two new numbers being 383a and 385g respectively. . .⁴

As I just mentioned, I fully support the argument of the proximity of the time of composition of the Fantasy, K. 397 to the Fantasy and Fugue, K. 394 as a reason to support the fugue theory.

⁴ Hirsch, P. 212, footnote 12

However I personally have a hard time with Blom's other argument. There is just one case in which Mozart attached a fantasy to a sonata, so I find it hard to argue that if the sonata was written first in that instance, that has to be the practice in all other cases, if any. If Mozart wished, he could have composed a fantasy and then compose a matching sonata.⁵

There is, however, another argument in favor of the fugue theory – beyond the time of composition – that I find much stronger. And that is the way in which the fantasy in D minor ends, in comparison with the C major fantasy from K. 394. The fantasy in D minor was ended by Mozart, just like the one in C major, on the dominant, followed by a fermata, as demonstrated in Example 6 (I am referring to the manner in which it was ended by Mozart, before the traditional ending was added). As I discussed in chapter 5, Mozart ended the fantasy in C major on the dominant, contrary to J. S. Bach's practice, possibly because of the missing preludes in van Swieten's copy of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, and possibly just because he wanted to and thought that it would be more effective to create an expectation. But whatever the reason was, it makes sense to predict that if he ended another fantasy on the dominant, and that fantasy was followed by a fugue, he had probably planned to attach a fugue to the fantasy in D minor rather than a sonata. That also makes sense in terms of the scope of the work – a fugue following an “open” introduction makes sense, while a long three-movement sonata that follows an open ending would be too long to be prepared with a single breath right before. It would thus make more sense in the case of a sonata to end the fantasy on the tonic and have a longer break, which is exactly what Mozart did with the fantasy and sonata in C minor. The unavoidable result of that, though, is that the fantasy and the sonata are rarely played together, and the fact is that a fantasy as an introduction to a sonata did not become a common practice later.

⁵ It is also worth mentioning that there was, in fact, a sonata in D major in existence – the sonata K. 311 from 1777. I assume that Blom was looking for a sonata that was composed around the same time as the fantasy, and that is what he means when he writes that “there is none anywhere in the neighbourhood of the Fantasy”

And that opens a whole new discussion: which fugue might follow the extraordinary fantasy in D minor? Which fugue could follow the low dominant-seventh chord in m. 97 of the fantasy? Of course, composing a fugue that would be suitable to Mozart's sublime fantasy is a task that no one would dare to undertake. However scholars have discussed several ideas. Larry Palmer suggests transposing the fugue in C major from K. 394 a whole step up to D major⁶. I find this idea very problematic. What happens to the concept of organic connection between the movements of a musical work, as conceived by the composer? Mozart matched the Fugue in C major with the Fantasy in C major, which is a very different piece than the Fantasy in D minor, and it does not seem to me that the Fugue in C major (transposed) works very well after the fantasy in D minor. Another option that was discussed – not as a way to resolve the performance issue but as a scholarly assumption – can be found in the same footnote that I mentioned above, the one by Eric Blom in Paul Hirsch's article. Blom goes on and writes:

. . . there are a good many unfinished fugues in the catalogue, all dating from this very period, and of course Mozart may have begun even more of them than anybody can tell. But perhaps speculation need not go so far: there is an unfinished fugue listed by Einstein as 383b and tentatively dated by him "Spring 1782", which may very well apply also to the D minor Fantasy, although he places it somewhat later in the list. Was not the Fantaisie *d'introduction* very likely designed as an introduction to that fugue?⁷

As I mentioned in chapter 5, the current NMA includes the fugue fragments, and I am including here the Fragment of a Fugue in F major, K. 383b as Example 8. Blom continues and argues that while Einstein designates the fugue fragment as being in F major, it has previously been designated as being in D minor; and he further claims that the key is ambiguous in the fragment, which may well be felt in D minor and thus be a natural continuation of the fantasy. I have to disagree on that one. The fragment K. 383b really does sound in F major. The C-sharp in m. 1 does not sound like the leading tone of the key, but rather as a local leading tone to the sixth

⁶ Larry Palmer, "Mozart and the Harpsichord: *An Alternate Ending for Fantasia in D minor*, K. 397", *The Diapason* 97 (November 2006): 20

⁷ Hirsch, P. 212, footnote 12

scale degree, that quickly dissolves while the theme continues in sequence, mostly with C-naturals that sound like the fifth scale degree of F major. Moreover, the fugue subject does not

The image displays three systems of musical notation for a fugue in F major, K. 383b by Mozart. The first system is marked 'Allegro' and shows the beginning of the piece in 6/8 time. The second system starts at measure 6 and includes fingering numbers (6, 7, 7) above the notes. The third system starts at measure 12. The notation includes treble and bass staves with various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and accidentals.

Example 8. Mozart: Fragment of a Fugue in F major, K. 383b

seem to work well after a dominant-seventh chord of D, like the one in m. 97 of the fantasy. Starting on a natural C right after that chord sounds extremely not stylistic and unnatural.

It seems, then, that while assumptions and solutions can be suggested, as of now we do not have a matching fugue by Mozart to follow the fantasy, although it seems to me that following the fantasy with a fugue would have been a very good solution. But by comparing the ideas suggested by Blom and Palmer, another important question enters our discussion: would it make more sense to have a fugue in D minor or in D major? And if we were to finish the piece without a fugue – would it be more desirable to finish in D major – like the traditional ending – or in D minor? Each option can be supported, and we will never know Mozart’s intentions. The traditional ending continues in major and ends rather quickly after m. 97 which is Mozart’s last. He does, then, a good job in terms of “not interrupting” and not changing too much the

impression of the piece from the point that Mozart left it. However, the question arises what this type of solution does to the impression of the piece as a whole. Would we want to retain anything from the dramatic Adagio section, and thus go back to D minor?

We could, of course, look for an answer in Mozart's other works in minor keys; however that does not offer a clear-cut solution. The great piano concerto in D minor does end in D major, with a "happy" ending, but the works are so different in scope and character. The first movement of the concerto still ends in D minor. Other Mozart works in minor – particularly all the great works in C minor – end in minor. That includes the piano concerto K. 491, the sonata K. 457 (the first and third movements in both cases) and the fantasy K. 475. Looking at shorter works, the Rondo in A minor, K. 511 ends in minor, and the Adagio in B minor, K. 540 ends in B major; however that is a very subtle major, an extended, tender Picardy third at the end of the piece. Choosing between a major or minor ending is, of course a matter of taste, but one should try to be unbiased and really think about Mozart's "fragment" as ending in m. 97. It is interesting to note that the last chord that Mozart wrote in m. 97 is exactly the same (except for the note duration) as the chord in m. 54 – that is, the last chord of the Adagio right before the D major Allegretto. Same spacing, same register, same notes – and the register is somewhat unusual as a way of leading into the Allegretto. Thus when that same identical chord comes back in m. 97, it gives me the feeling of a potential turning point, as if the whole Allegretto section was interpolated between those two chords. The chord in m. 97 also comes in *piano* after two *forte* chords, followed by a fermata, all of which, I think, call for something different. I personally find it more effective to go into the minor, but this will remain open to speculation forever.

7. Some Optional Endings

In my explorations so far, I found only a few alternate endings to the fantasy. All of them use the same principal, in that after the fermata in m. 97 they go back to the Andante material from the beginning of the piece; or in other words, m. 98 looks and sounds just like m. 1. It seems to me that the first who brought this innovative idea was Mitsuko Uchida, but I cannot be completely sure about that. As of now I do not know of a pianist of her stature who performs an ending other than the traditional, but I was able to find other suggested endings. Her original recording was in 1983, but I would like to start the discussion of this issue with an interesting review in the Gramophone magazine of her live recording from 1991:

The quality of perception serves Uchida well in the D minor Fantasia which she completes in her own way. The original score breaks off at bar 97: Breitkopf completes the piece briefly with a ten-bar extension of the closing Allegretto; but Uchida, following the formal layout of the C minor Fantasia, rounds it off with a return to the Andante. The arpeggios and passagework are made into the air which the central aria breathes, as a circle of light encloses the whole. It is an intuitive and totally convincing solution.¹

The reference to the C minor Fantasy is interesting, and it appears again with a more detailed explanation in Larry Palmer's article from 2006:²

. . . I turned to Mozart's additional published keyboard fantasias, and noted that the forth *fantasia* (K. 475) concludes with a return to its opening measures. So, why not follow that dominant seventh chord in K. 397 with a return to the arpeggiated chords of the beginning? For me, this has proved to be a more satisfying musical solution. . .
[Discussion of Larry Palmer's proposed ending will follow.]

Indeed the Fantasy in C minor, K. 475 does end with a return to the opening material, and I also find that this is a satisfying solution for the D minor fantasy. However, one must bear in

¹ *Gramophone*, CD Review of "Mozart. Mitsuko Uchida Live in Concert," April 1993: p. 90, by H. F.

² Larry Palmer, "Mozart and the Harpsichord: *An Alternate Ending for Fantasia in D minor*, K. 397", *The Diapason* 97 (November 2006): 20

mind some crucial differences between the two. The arpeggios in the Andante of the D minor fantasy are a sort of introduction, while the main theme of the piece comes in the Adagio section that follows. On the other hand, the opening of the C minor fantasy already forms the main theme of the piece, and thus the repeat of it in the end concludes the piece by going back to that theme, with countless changes. And that happens after a much longer piece with many extremely contrasting sections, as opposed to the simpler layout of the D minor fantasy. So I personally object the comparison as a fully-satisfying reason, while I generally support the solution. But in the case of the D minor fantasy, it is, indeed – as the Gramophone review says – a way of surrounding the main body of the piece with the Andante, once as an introduction, and for the second time as an afterthought.

Another issue that is worth discussing is why should we go back to the Andante and not the Adagio? After all, the Adagio includes the main themes of the piece, and that could suggest that going back to it would be a more satisfying solution. However, I believe that while the piece is rather short, the possibilities of the Adagio theme have been mostly exhausted by Mozart; the last appearance of the main theme starting in m. 45 sounds very final, especially from m. 50, where the anxious sighs originating in m. 18 are broadened, leading into the Neapolitan chord of m. 52 and eventually to the cadential chords of m. 54. I find it hard to imagine another return to that theme after that. At the same time, the Andante section from the beginning of the piece does leave room for exploration.

Once we take m. 98 as m. 1, the main task is how to end the piece on the tonic rather than on the dominant, as Mozart ended the Andante section in m. 11. This is a similar challenge to forming a second part of a period, or antecedent-consequent pairing, in which the first half ended on the dominant, and the second half should end on the tonic; but on a larger scale. There are many ways of doing that, and that is the main difference between the different solutions. Both Uchida and Palmer use Mozart's Andante precisely all the way through m. 8, and then follow it

with a cadential six-four in m. 9, or m. 106 of the piece. Palmer (Example 9, p. 28) proceeds with a short cadenza and closes on a D minor tonic. Uchida (Example 10, p. 29) resumes the opening figuration for four measures, extending the dominant pedal of the cadential six-four, through a five-four chord, to a dominant-seventh chord with the opening figuration; then she closes the piece in D major, as an extended Picardy third, using the figuration from mm. 9-10 of the piece – the closing figuration of the Andante. Her solution is 15 measures long, compared with 11 measures of Mozart's opening Andante. I think both solutions are fine, however my strong feeling is that the cadential six-four does not work so well after the diminished-seventh chord of the second half of m. 8 (VII⁷ of V); it works in other cases with the same harmonic progression, but with this figuration it does not sound right to me. In addition, while I have gotten used to it with time, I am not convinced by Uchida's Picardy third.

While I am still debating how I would like to finish the piece, I am including here the solution that I played at the concert that I mentioned in the Introduction (Example 11, p. 30), as well as another solution that I thought of at that time when I was trying out many solutions (Example 12, p. 31). After a lot of thought, I decided to divert from the original Mozart a measure-and-a-half earlier than Uchida, on the second half of m. 7. In my first solution I go chromatically up with the bass in mm. 7-8, rather than down, and then when I land back on the tonic I add a strong cadence, leading to the minor tonic with the closing Andante figuration. This solution is 12 measures long. My other solution, which keeps the original length and outline of Mozart's opening Andante (I am mentioning it only for analytical reasons, I do not think that the length should be maintained), transforms mm. 7-8 (or 104-105) to complete a full authentic cadence and thus enable a landing on the minor tonic in m. 9 (or 106).

The only other solution that I have encountered so far is the one that I heard on the recording by pianist Mehmet Okonsar. His ending is more far-going. He continues the opening figuration throughout, avoiding the figuration of mm. 7-8 altogether, and through a chromatic bass

progression (with a similar diminished third to the one in my second ending, Example 12, m. 104) leads to a minor tonic with a reminiscent of what I called the closing Andante figuration.

As I said in the introduction, I do not claim to have solutions to this complicated issue of completing Mozart's great masterpiece. My main goal in this essay was to explore the background and to understand better this beautiful gem in the piano literature. I think that it is important to raise awareness and create a stimulating discussion of the piece, its ending, and Mozart's intentions. Those intentions, however, will never be known for certain.

Andante

The musical score is written in D minor (one flat) and 3/4 time. It is marked 'Andante'. The piece consists of four systems of two staves each. The first system begins with a triplet in both hands. The second system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The third system includes a section for the right hand (RH) marked '(freely)' and a section for the left hand (LH). The fourth system concludes with a final chord in the right hand and a double bar line with '(II)' below it, indicating a repeat or second ending.

Example 9. Larry Palmer: Alternate Ending for the Fantasy

From Palmer's article "Mozart and the Harpsichord: *An Alternate Ending for Fantasia in*

D minor, K. 397", *The Diapason* 97 (November 2006): 20

The image displays a musical score for Mitsuko Uchida's Ending for the Fantasy, consisting of five systems of music. Each system is written for piano and includes a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature is one flat (B-flat major or D minor), and the time signature is common time (C). The score begins at measure 98. The first system (measures 98-100) features a treble staff with a melodic line of eighth notes and a bass staff with a triplet of eighth notes followed by a dotted half note. The second system (measures 101-103) continues the melodic line in the treble and the eighth-note accompaniment in the bass. The third system (measures 104-106) shows the melodic line moving to a higher register and the accompaniment becoming more active. The fourth system (measures 107-109) features a more complex melodic line with some chromaticism. The fifth system (measures 110-111) concludes the piece with a final melodic phrase in the treble and a sustained bass note. The score ends with a double bar line and the word 'FIN' written vertically below the bass staff.

Example 10. Mitsuko Uchida's Ending for the Fantasy

Transcribed from Recording by Efi Hackmey

The image displays a musical score for a piano piece, specifically the ending of a Fantasy by Efi Hackmey. The score is presented in four systems, each with a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The key signature is one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is common time (C). The first system, starting at measure 98, features a treble staff with a melodic line of eighth notes and a bass staff with a triplet of eighth notes. The second system, starting at measure 101, continues the melodic line in the treble and the triplet in the bass. The third system, starting at measure 104, shows a more complex melodic line in the treble with slurs and a bass line with slurs and ties. The fourth system, starting at measure 107, concludes the piece with a final melodic phrase in the treble and a bass line that ends with a whole note chord.

Example 11. Efi Hackmey's Ending for the Fantasy, First Solution

98

101

104

106

Example 12. Efi Hackmey's Ending for the Fantasy, Second Solution

Bibliography

Books and Articles

- Anderson, Emily, ed. *The Letters of Mozart and his Family*. London: Macmillan, 1938.
- Field, Christopher D.S. et al. "Fantasia." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/40048> (accessed March 7, 2012).
- Gramophone*. CD Review: "Mozart. Mitsuko Uchida Live in Concert." April 1993: p. 90. By H. F.
- Hertzmann, Erich. "Mozart's Creative Process". *The Creative World of Mozart*, ed. Paul Henry Lang (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963): 17-30.
- Hirsch, Paul. "A Mozart Problem". *Music and Letters* 25 (1944): 209-212.
- Hutchings, Arthur. *Mozart: the Man, the Musician*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.
- Kirkendale, Warren. "More Slow Introductions by Mozart to Fugues by J. S. Bach?". *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 17 (Spring 1964): 43-65.
- Mercado, Mario R. *The Evolution of Mozart's Pianistic Style*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992.
- Palmer, Larry. "Mozart and the Harpsichord: An Alternate Ending for *Fantasia in D minor*, K. 397". *The Diapason* 97 (November 2006): 20.
- Solomon, Maynard. *Mozart: a Life*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.

Scores

- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Miscellaneous Works for Piano; Urtext of the New Mozart Edition*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2005.
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Klavierstücke*. Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1983.
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Fantasia d-moll, KV397*. Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1983.

Recordings

- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Piano Sonatas: No. 11 in A major K. 331, No. 12 in F major K. 332; Fantasia in D minor, K. 397*. Mitsuko Uchida. Philips Digital 412 123-1 PH, [1983]. Compact disc.
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Fantasy in D minor, K. 397*. In "Mehmet Okonsar Live Salt Lake City." 1996. Compact disc.