

Felix Cross

161589

Graduate Research Project 3 (Thesis i)

Dr Phillip Johnston

Assessment 1

29 May 2017.

Mass Subversion: a Comparative Study of the Textual Interpretations in the
Requiems of Ligeti and Duruflé.

Abstract.

This thesis explores certain aspects of the Requiems of two twentieth century composers, Maurice Duruflé and György Ligeti. I argue that both composers use musical techniques to go beyond the liturgical requirements of the *Requiem* and make further statements, paint other pictures, even subvert the text. In Ligeti's case this is clear from the outset, however with Duruflé, the changes are far more nuanced, to the point where some question whether they are there at all. I also argue that both composers utilize techniques that can be examined through a dramaturgical prism and that this is a useful tool to explore their intentions.

There is a practical constraint in that there are only two movements of the *Requiem* that both have composed – the *Introit* and the *Kyrie*. So I will only focus on those for this study.

Table of Contents

1	Title Page & acknowledgements
2	Abstract
3	Introduction
4	The <i>Requiem</i> Mass
5	Ligeti's life and works
6	Durufié's life and works
7	The two <i>Requiems</i> : an overview
8	<i>Introit</i> – a comparative analysis
9	<i>Kyrie</i> – a comparative analysis
10	Conclusions
11	Appendixes
12	Bibliography

Introduction

This study concerns itself with the musical techniques used to interpret the meanings of text, in this case sacred texts, specifically the *Missa pro defunctis* - the Requiem Mass. It follows on from my previous thesis – “*Gesualdo’s Hidden Opera – a dramaturgical Analysis of Moro lasso*” (2017) – where I argued that the Italian Renaissance/Baroque composer used specific compositional techniques to highlight the emotional narrative of, add new meaning to, or comment on, his chosen text. I provided evidence to show that it was possible to look at non-dramatic works through a dramaturgical lens and that this would bring new insights to the creative process.

Here, I have chosen two Requiems written in the twentieth century by two composers of very different musical and religious persuasions: Maurice Duruflé (1902-1986), a devout Catholic and György Ligeti (1923-2006), a secular Jew. In this study I will explore the compositional techniques both men used to add meaning to or interpret the text, in one case conforming to and in the other subverting its original liturgical intentions.

The choice of the Requiem, as opposed to any other type of music-lyric composition, is significant for two principal reasons:

- 1 The texts are fixed, allowing for compositional comparisons
- 2 Forming part of the Roman Catholic liturgy, they have centuries of tradition that upholds a pre-determined meaning to the texts.

There is timeliness, a *zeitgeist*, to the choice of the Requiem too. Even in its brief infancy, the 21st century has dramatically highlighted the global differences and collisions between religious faith - particularly in its fundamentalist forms - and secularism, be it atheist or agnostic. The rise of secularism in the 20th century has significantly increased in the 21st (Australian Bureau of Statistics: 2016). Yet Ross notes that the 20th century “seems to have produced a more significant corpus of religious music than did the 19th century” (Hilgartner, N. 2012). Indeed the website

www.requiemsurvey.org lists 973 Requiems as being composed between 1950-1999. This is more than at any similar period at any other time.

So if religious fervour is not the cause of such compositional activity, what is? Ross's understanding is that whilst the 20th-century brought secularism, it also brought unparalleled levels of devastation through war and genocide.

“Suddenly you do have a lot of composers who are not devout, who may even be agnostic or atheist in their religious beliefs or lack thereof, nonetheless employing these texts in order to drive home a point of one kind or another. It very often has to do with violence or war,” (ibid)

Ross's argument brings us straight to such secular/sacred works as Benjamin Britten's *War Requiem*, Stravinsky's *Requiem Canticles*, (written in 1962 and 1966 respectively: with Ligeti's in 1965 this was a golden period surely) the religious music of Penderecki and Messiaen inspired by secular events and, for very different reasons, to the two composers of this study, Ligeti and Duruflé.

These two composers, born and dying just twenty years apart from each other, occupied two polar opposite positions in their respective lives in a number of ways. They were both commissioned, under rather different circumstances, to write a Requiem.

Ligeti: a secular Jew whose father and brother were both murdered in the Holocaust in Bergen-Belsen and Mauthausen. He escaped the Nazis only to find himself imprisoned by the Russian Red Army and having to endure the murderous and oppressive dictatorship of Stalin's Soviet system. In 1956 he was forced to flee to the West. After considering a *Requiem* several times, he finally wrote it after being commissioned by the Swedish Radio in 1961. The work was premiered in 1965.

Maurice Duruflé: a French conservative, strict catholic, who was commissioned to compose his Requiem by the Nazi-accommodating Vichy government. Although commissioned during the war years, he did not complete it until 1947.

Whether for secular or sacred reasons, both Duruflé's and Ligeti's interpretations of the Requiem text can be examined in ways that we might approach dramatic works such as opera or music-theatre – in other words there is room for dramaturgical analysis. I will argue that Duruflé, conformist and traditionalist, employs techniques that heighten, dramatize or bring to prominence specific texts or themes that create more depth to his narrative - just as Ligeti does. I will also argue that there is a fine and often blurred line between interpretation and subversion.

Interestingly, in June 2012 the Sydney Chamber Choir performed both Requiems as part of a concert that also featured works by Messiaen, Sculthorpe and Yezerski. However, the programme notes do not indicate any discussion of comparisons between them.

Much has been written about the lives of both men. For Ligeti there are four clear categories of literature:

- 1 Biographies of his life and works: such as those by Steinitz, Griffiths, Toop, Floros and Bauer.
- 2 Recorded and published extended interviews with Ligeti: these have been carried out and edited by Duchesneau & Marx, Gervasoni, Haüsler & Samuel, Satory, Szigeti, Várnai, and there is even a significant chapter entitled "*Ligeti in Conversation with Himself*".
- 3 Scholarly analyses of specific compositions: by many including Bernard, Clendinning, Drott, Iverson, Levy and Sykes.
- 4 Works that do not necessarily focus on Ligeti but set wider contexts for our understanding: here I would cite Bates, Ford and Ross.

For Duruflé there is less written – for a number of reasons, not least that he published only 14 compositions. Nevertheless, the categorization of studies on him and his work would differ from that of Ligeti:

- 1 Biographies of his life and works: mainly by Blanc, Frazier and Ebrecht.
- 2 Essays on his *Requiem*: particularly by Cooksey, Reynolds and Sprout.
- 3 Works on Gregorian chant from both musical and sacred perspectives: from Carroll, Jarjisian, sections of Dumm, and the many websites that focus on Gregorian chants.
- 4 Works on sacred music that provide a valuable background to Duruflé: the *Musicae Sacrae* of Pope Pius XII, Sprout.

For Duruflé it would be too easy to sum up his approach to his music with this quote from Reynolds – “*from his baptism to his burial Duruflé was immersed in chant*” (Reynolds, 2002, p.87). Nevertheless, Gregorian chant is not merely the spine of his *Requiem*; it is the heart and brain too – as we shall see later. His reputation as a religious conservative and traditionalist often holds him in a less favourable light, especially in the midst of a progressive creative post-war period. However, Frazier points out, quoting Gwilym Beechey in *Maurice Duruflé and his Requiem op.9*. who says: “*The overall impression of Duruflé’s work in performance is one of deep religious feeling and commitment, and it reveals a fluent creative mind that is full of sensitivity to vocal and instrumental colour*” (Frazier, 2007, p.89). Frazier comments later on the importance of the *Requiem* not only to Duruflé but also to 20th Century music, and notes that it - “*enjoys a reputation as one of the undisputed masterpieces of the twentieth century choral repertoire. The single piece most responsible for establishing his fame worldwide*” (Frazier, 2007, p.166).

Ligeti has inspired whole shelves of writings on his eventful and often harrowing life, his lack of musical affiliations and of course the exacting systems and structures with which he builds his soundscapes. Wolfgang Marx observes:

The grim reaper was, it seems, nearly omnipresent in his artistic thoughts. This may not be too surprising in the case of a composer who was not only a survivor of the Holocaust but had also a keen interest in political and religious affairs, and not only abhorred all dictatorships, totalitarianism and any suppression of free thought, but all of the consequences which devolved from such systems. (Marx, 2011, p.71)

Constantin Floros, looking for cultural clues to Ligeti's work, lets Ligeti speak for himself on his ambiguous affiliations:

My native language is Hungarian, but I am not a genuine Hungarian, because I am a Jew. At the same time, I am not a member of a Jewish religious community, so I am an assimilated Jew. But I am not completely assimilated, either, because I am not baptized. Now, as an adult, I live in Austria and in Germany, and have for a long time been an Austrian citizen. Yet I am not a real Austrian, either, only a Johnnie-come-lately, and my German speech will always retain a Hungarian coloration. (Floros, 2014, p.16)

However, this study places the *Requiems* of both composers alongside each other and asks, "what techniques did they use to interpret these words and, in the context of the 20th century, to what purpose?" Given my comments earlier concerning the religious/secular conflicts of the infant 21st century, I feel this study to be timely.

The Requiem Mass: an introduction and overview of its structure.

The Requiem Mass, also known as the Mass for the Dead (*Missa pro defunctis*) is a liturgical rite most often associated with funerals. Since Ockeghem wrote his *Requiem* in the late 15th century, the text has been set to music by several of the greatest composers in the classical canon including Victoria, Mozart, Brahms, Verdi, Fauré, Britten, Stravinsky, Penderecki and of course the two subjects of this study.

The Requiem Mass differs from the Mass Ordinary structurally in the following ways:

- The *Gloria in excelsis deo* is omitted, as it is considered to be too celebratory for the occasion.
- The *Credo* is also omitted.
- The *Agnus Dei* is altered so that whilst the phrase:

*Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi,
Lamb of God, you who take away the sins of the world,*

Remains in both, the Ordinary's lines:

miserere nobis.
have mercy upon us.

And

Dona nobis pacem.
Grant us peace.

Become:

dona eis requiem.
Grant them rest.

And

dona eis requiem sempiternam.
Grant them eternal rest.

- The *Dies irae* – a poem about the day of judgement is obligatory in the Requiem

- At the very end of the rite, the parting words, *Ite missa est* (lit. 'It is ended'), are replaced with *Resquiescant in pace* ('May they rest in peace')

A full setting of the Requiem would thus have the following structure:

Introit – Rest eternal

Kyrie – Have mercy

Dies irae – Days of wrath. This section could include:

Tuba mirum spargens sonum – The trumpet, scattering its awful sound

Liber scriptus proferetur – The written book shall be brought

Quid sum miser tunc dicturus? – What shall I, a wretch, say then?

Rex tremendae majestatis – King of awful majesty

Recordare Jesu pie – Remember, gentle Jesus

Ingemisco temquam reus – I groan as one guilty

Confutatis maledictus – When the damned are confounded

Lacrimosa dies illa – That day is one of weeping

Offertorium – the offering

Sanctus – the breaking of the bread

Benedictus – the blessing

Agnus Dei – The Lamb of God

Communion: Lux Aeterna – Eternal light

Responsory: Libera me – Deliver me

For the purposes of this study, it is useful to consider that there are broadly two types of *Requiems*. Those composed for ecclesiastical purposes, as part of the liturgy, and those composed for the concert hall. Indeed the choice of comparing these two particular composers' *Requiems* was largely based on the notion that Ligeti's was written for the concert hall and Duruflé's for liturgical purposes.

Ligeti's Life and works

The Man

György Sándor Ligeti was born in Transylvania, Romania on 28 May 1923 into a Hungarian secular Jewish family. With the rise of anti-Semitism in the 1930s he found his initial ambitions thwarted. Steinitz says: *“he originally wanted to be a natural scientist but was denied the possibility because he was a Jew”* (Steinitz, 2003, p.xvi)

From 1941-43 he managed to study at the Conservatory in Cluj, Romania, where he learnt valuable counterpoint under Kadosa.

In March 1944 the Germans occupied Hungary and annexed it to Transylvania, Ligeti's home, and began the campaign there to eliminate Jews. Though he escaped, the rest of his family was sent to Auschwitz and from there to various other camps. The Nazis murdered both his brother and father. As Steinitz starkly points out, *“Only his mother survived the Holocaust, because she had been useful as a doctor”* (ibid. p.20)

As a Hungarian-Transylvanian he was then captured by the Russians and was drafted into the Romanian army to fight Hungary and Germany, alongside the Russians. However, in succumbing to a tubercular infection, he managed to avoid battle and spent the rest of the war in hospital.

In 1945 he gained entrance to the Franz Liszt Academy of Music in Budapest and studied harmony and counterpoint under Sándor Veress, a valuable time, as he explains – *“my counterpoint studies under Veress and Farkas certainly played an important part in working out impenetrable textures of sound”* (Levy, 2013, p.205).

Life after the war under Stalin's brutal Soviet system was little better. 'Steinitz: *“Living under a dictatorship sapped one's energy, sowed distrust, stifled discussion and killed originality”* (p35). Ligeti tried to avoid Soviet censorship by composing music in folkloric styles; his *Cello Sonata* was

banned. He found himself cut off from the west and living in fear that his more radical secret compositions would be discovered. Pressures did not ease when Ligeti was made President of the Students' Union at the Music Academy; he was approached by the secret police:

and I was asked how many students there were at the Music Academy. I said about 900." Then please give us 9 names next week" – it had to be 1per cent; the communist system always operated on a quota system - nine names of openly catholic students....so Catholicism is now the enemy (not so much Protestants, Jews etc.) and suddenly I am expected to denounce people. I am supposed to name nine church musicians. (Duchesneau, 2011, p.73)

Ligeti endeavored to warn his Catholic colleagues of this purge and in doing so fell in with a circle of devout Catholics, led by the musicologist and conductor Lajos Bárdos He wasn't attracted by their faith but, as he added, *"you have to stand by those who are discriminated against, who are declared enemies. So I became part of that group, without becoming a Catholic"* (ibid. p.73). The seeds of the reason for a secular Jew composing his *Requiem* were certainly sown in post-war Budapest. When it was finally composed (after two failed attempts) Ligeti dedicated his longest and most ambitious work to date to, *"Jews, Catholics"*, and *"all people who vanish in Hungary"* (ibid. p.73)

And Wolfgang Marx adds:

Ligeti is not the only 20th-century composer to have written a requiem with this kind of 'dedication'. Like him, many had not set out to write a piece of Catholic liturgy at all, but rather wanted to make use of the well known traditional text for their personal statement about death. (Marx, 2011, p.74)

In conversation with Várnai, Ligeti touches on the inevitable path he has walked that straddles his atheism and certain religious notions.

The idea of the Last Judgment was a constant preoccupation with me for many years, without any reference to religion. Its main features are the fear of death, the imagery of dreadful events and a way of cooling them, freezing them through alienation, which is the result of excessive expressiveness. (Várnai, 1978, p.46)

In 1956, after the brutal Soviet response to the Hungarian uprising, Ligeti and his wife Vera¹ fled to Vienna and then Cologne where he met and worked with Stockhausen, Boulez and Berio at the Electronic Music Studio. Despite this, Ligeti's attention never moved away from the traditional orchestra. However, as Kievman suggests – *“his ability to create new ‘soundscapes’ with traditional instruments sprang from his electronic experiments and a desire to achieve a new sonic experience and methodology”* (Kievman, 2003, p.9).

The world, so closed to him under the Soviets, now broadened as he joined the Darmstadt summer course, the annual magnet for progressive European composers. Ligeti, however, couldn't align himself with their principles of rejection of such elements as traditional notation. He had in mind, as Kievman says: *“A music which removes structuralism in the ‘classical style’ sense (as adhered to by Stockhausen and Boulez), but does not turn its back on personal expression”* (Kievman, 2003, p.9).

In the end, the dogmatic attitudes displayed at the temple of serialism were too much and Ligeti abandoned the group. In her obituary of Ligeti, Anastasia Tsioulcas quotes him: *“I am an enemy of ideologues in the arts. Totalitarian regimes do not like dissonances”* (Tsioulcas, 2006.).

Ligeti died in Vienna on 12 June 2006.

¹ György and Vera had made a marriage of convenience in 1952, having agreed to divorce soon after. However, they remarried once they arrived in Vienna.

Durufié's life and works

Maurice Durufié was born in Louviers in 1902. At the age of ten, he was enrolled at the choir school in the Cathedral of Rouen, where he was introduced to Gregorian chant, the form of liturgical singing laid out by Pope Gregory (540-604) and reconstituted by the monks of Solesmes at the end of the nineteenth century. As Frazier notes - *"For a long time Durufié had been seduced by the beauty of the Gregorian chants from the Mass of the Dead"* (Frazier, 2007, P.166). Reynolds is even more emphatic about the influence - *"from his baptism to his funeral he was immersed in chant"* (Reynolds, 2002, p.87).

In 1919 he studied in Paris with the composer/organist Charles Tournemire. He then studied at the Conservatoire National de Musique de Paris, where he won Premier Prix in composition, organ, harmony, fugue and accompaniment. Creasy notes that at this point – *"he confronted the traditions of Fauré, Debussy and Ravel"* (Creasy, 2013) These impressionist styles, combined with the simple beauty of the Gregorian chant, would be the central pillar of his *Requiem*.

In 1929 upon the death of his tutor, Louis Vierne, Durufié became the organist of the cathedral at St Etienne-du-Mont, a role that Vierne had occupied. He remained in this post throughout his career. Durufié taught at the Conservatoire and in 1953 he married one of the students Marie-Madeleine Chevalier.

Frazier notes that Durufié, along with his wife Marie-Madeleine, *"was arguably the last great proponent of the French romantic school of organ playing"* (Frazier, 2007, p.200). Frazier also notes that he was a skilled improviser but almost always used Gregorian chant as the basis for his improvisations (ibid).

In 1979 both he and his wife were seriously injured in a car crash. Maurice broke both his legs and the slow process of recovery in effect marked the end of his compositional career. He died in 1986, aged 84.

Duruflé was a humble man, insecure about his talents as a composer and aware of being out of step with contemporary musical trends. Part of the reason that he has not attained a higher profile amongst twentieth century composers is that, as Cooksey notes, “*he completed few compositions – only fourteen works have been identified*” (Cooksey, 2000 p.1). Helene Whitson, in her programme notes for the San Francisco Lyric Chorus performance of the Requiem suggests – “*Self-criticism, excessive revisions and the disappointment of being considered a conservative in a time when music was being expressed in diverse and dramatic ways, may have reduced his output*” (Whitson, 2014, p.5)

Nevertheless, when it came to the traditions of the Catholic Church, he was unequivocal and strident. In his obituary of Duruflé in 1986, Joachim Harvard de la Montagne, the Chapel Master of the Madeleine, illustrates Duruflé’s focus on Gregorian chant as the cornerstone of liturgical music with the following quotes from Duruflé in interviews with *The Organ* (Montagne, 1986):

- 1 Gregorian art has brought to such a point of perfection the liturgical chant that it would be in the order of Christian culture, a catastrophe if it disappeared. (No. 130, 2nd quarter 1969)
- 2 To want to separate Gregorian chant from the Catholic liturgy is to want to mutilate it. Its character of universality carries with it one aspect of the unity of the church. (No. 174, 2nd quarter 1980)
- 3 The day may not be distant when the Catholic Church, conscious of certain excesses imposed on it and of which it has suffered, will celebrate an immense *Te deum* the triumphant return of its liturgical chant of everlasting, sublime in its simplicity, music of all time, which was created at the beginning of VIIth century by St. Gregory the Great and by anonymous authors for the glory of God alone. (No. 174, 2nd quarter 1980)

His attitudes brought him most notably into conflict with the revolutionary and revisionist *Sacrosanctum Concilium* ruling of the Second Vatican Council in

1963. Amongst many modernising measures, it promoted the introduction of masses sung in the vernacular and the use of indigenous music. Whilst Duruflé was not entirely opposed some of the changes, he railed against the introduction of, as Frazier quotes – “*trivial musical fare into the liturgy*”(Frazier, 2007, p.219). His stance on this and against what he saw as the moves to reduce the central role of the church organ – “*grand orgue*” – in the sung liturgy, gave him a perhaps unfair reputation as a conservative traditionalist.

Duruflé was also vocal about his disillusionment with contemporary composition, both liturgical and secular. Montagne quotes him again from an interview in *The Organ*.

Are we going to a total destruction of our musical civilization? For thirty years we have only been talking about concrete, electronic, random, repetitive, experimental, electro-acoustic music, music of our time, new language, research, etcetera. Despite so much research, we do not seem to have yet found it. If this contemporary music should be that of tomorrow, why should we maintain in our conservatories the classes of writing, harmony, counterpoint, fugue and composition, which have firmly established their teaching on classical writing and traditional writing? (No. 174, 2nd quarter 1980)

All these arguments point to man whom Reynolds calls - “*a traditionalist rather than an innovator*” (Reynolds, 2002, p.118). He was, like Ligeti, a man for whom rules were a significant factor in his work. But whereas Ligeti created his own, minutely detailed, compositional rules, Duruflé inherited his from his strict faith. Frazier argues that Duruflé’s ‘*profound Catholicism*’ (Frazier,P30) led him to follow the rules concerning the performance of Gregorian chant, set down by the monks of Solesmes, whilst Reynolds shows that even when he moves away from those rules he does so with a deliberation and within a structure that still holds them at the core of the piece (Reynolds, 2002, p...). Indeed, I will argue that, as Reynolds has suggested, there is evidence in his *Requiem* score suggesting this was the case and that in doing so he was, in his own small way, being risky, political, perhaps even subversive.

The Requiem.

Duruflé was commissioned by the French Vichy government in 1941.

Frazier tells us that in the late 1930s France began to award commissions to composers under the following banner: “*Extraordinary commissions to living artists and composers of music towards combating unemployment*”

(translated by Sprout in “Music for a ‘New Era’: Composers and National Identity in France, 1936-46”). When Germany invaded France during World War II, the Nazi-accommodating Vichy government continued the scheme.

Frazier notes:

“Because the Vichy government took music seriously for its propaganda value, it generally restricted its awards to composers who upheld the conservative, antimodernist, and pro-catholic sentiments of the regime.” (Frazier, 2007, p.156)

Duruflé was amongst the first batch of commissions awarded. The story of this Vichy commission only came to light in 2000, as Frazier notes. This has resulted in earlier commentators and musicologists accepting that the piece was commissioned soon before the time it was submitted – in 1947. However, even after the revelation the subject was avoided. Reynolds, writing in 2002, claims in passing that Duruflé was commissioned by his publisher, *Durand*, then moves straight on to his comprehensive analysis. But it is a matter of some significance, as Frazier adds – “*The Requiem is, moreover, the most famous work of all the 103 works commissioned under the program between 1938 and 1945. And it is the only one that remains in the repertory today.*” (*ibid*). However, there is no suggestion at all that Duruflé was in any way a collaborator and Frazier pains to point out that the composer was “*simply trying to make an honest living under desperate economic and political circumstances.*” (*ibid*). He quotes Miriam Chimènes, from her book, “*La Vie Musicale sous Vichy*”, in which she covers Duruflé’s commission. She says – “*As in all circles, a minority resisted, a minority collaborated and the majority accommodated*”. (Frazier, 2007, p.162). Duruflé his *Requiem* to the memory of his father.

The Two Requiems: An overview.

The Texts:

Duruflé sets the following sections:

Introit

Kyrie

Domine Jesu Christe

Sanctus

Pie Jesu

Agnus Dei

Lux Aeterna

Libera Me

In Paradisum

Whilst Ligeti only uses four sections:

Introit

Kyrie

De Die Judicii

Lacrimosa

(These final two sections are usually together as the *Dies Irae*)

There are many reasons for this anomaly; principally that Duruflé had a liturgical purpose for his work and, as such, it needed to be complete in order to serve its religious purpose. Ligeti intended to write a complete *Requiem* and, as Nordwall points out:

 this was still his intent when he reached the third movement, the *Dies irae*. This however soon turned out to be a movement of too great dimensions for an Ordinary Requiem Mass; the two preceding movements, the *Introit* and the *Kyrie*, became a sort of introduction, and there was room left only for the simple epilogue of the concluding *Lacrimosa*. (Nordwall, 1966 p.109-10).

Ligeti would of course go on to write a further section of the *Requiem - Lux Aeterna* – just a year later, but it was never intended to ‘slot’ into this work. He describes the four movements graphically, as Steinitz reports:

brutal surgery on a splendid silk: the material is carefully smoothed and stroked (“Introitus”), crumpled and unravelled (“Kyrie”), completely destroyed and torn like a cobweb (“Dies irae”) and, finally, the pieces are tentatively rejoined (“Lacrimosa”). (Steinitz, 2003, p....)

However, it would be inappropriate to spend time on sections that are not set by both composers. For the purposes of comparative analysis therefore, this study will confine itself only to the Introit and Kyrie.

The meanings of *Introit* and *Kyrie*

The *Introit* is the opening of the mass – it comes from the Latin for “Entrance” and is traditionally sung or chanted upon the priest’s entrance to the church. The text varies according to the type of mass to be celebrated. The word “*Requiem*” (Rest) is the first word of the *Introit* to the mass of the dead, and masses, like ecclesiastical writings such as hymns and papal edicts, are known by their incipit (their first words in Latin). Hence we use the term “*Requiem*” for this type of mass.

The phrase “*Kyrie eleison*” comes from the Greek meaning Lord have mercy and is said to pre-date Christianity. During the liturgy of the mass it is said three, six or nine times as antiphon and response. Traditionally, as a composed musical piece, it takes the form ABA¹.

Orchestration of both *Requiems*:

Durufié

Baritone, mezzo-soprano

Chorus (in later versions a men's chorus replaced some of the solo passages and a children's choir replaced sopranos in the opening measures of the *In Paradisum*).

Version 1

1 piccolo flute, 2 flutes, 2 oboes, 1 cor anglais, 2 clarinets, 1 bass clarinet, 2 bassoons, 4 horns, 3 trumpets, 3 trombones, 1 tuba, 4 timpani, cymbals, bass drum, tam-tam, 1 celesta, 1 harp, 1 organ, violins I, violins II, violas, v.cellos,, double basses.

Version 2

Harp, 2 trumpets, 4 timpani, organ, violins I, violins II, violas, v.cellos,, double basses.

Version 3

Organ, v.cello solo

Ligeti

Soprano, mezzo-soprano

Chorus (s,m-s,a,t,b: no less than 120 singers)

3 flutes (2nd&3rd also piccolo 1&2), 2 oboes, English horn (also 3rd oboe), 3 clarinets (2nd also bass clarinet, 3rd also contrabass clarinet; one clarinetist also plays clarinet in Eb), 2 bassoons, contrabassoon; 4 horns, 3 trumpets, bass trumpet, 3 trombones (1st: tenor; 2nd: tenor-bass; 3rd: contrabass), contrabass tuba; percussion (3 players): bass drum, side drum, tam-tam (very large with deep tone), tambour de basque, whip, suspended cymbal, xylophone, glockenspiel; celesta (a player for the celesta is not absolutely

essential; it can be played, if need be, by the xylophone or glockenspiel player), harpsichord, harp; strings (minimum number of desks: 12 – 12 – 10 – 8 – 6. It is preferred, however, that a larger string group be used.)

In addition, in a 'preface' to the score, Ligeti writes precise instructions to the following members of the orchestra: flutes, bassoons and contrabassoons, trumpets and trombones, harpsichord and strings, with an extra note for contrabasses. After this heads instructions to the orchestra and chorus on barring in the score, "*senza tempo*" sections in the 3rd movement and how to deal with caesuras. He then gives exacting notes for the chorus on intonations, dynamics, breathing, articulation of the text and musical articulation.

The Composing of the *Requiems*

Durufié

I will use Leslie Sprout's book "*The Musical Legacy of Wartime France*" to give evidence that Durufié's *Requiem*, although a liturgical piece, contained elements that were nationalistic in the face of the German occupation. The pastoral, impressionist nature of the *Introit* certainly portrays the idea of the land, the countryside, of hope, within its ecclesiastical framework.

Durufié's dealing with the Solesmes rulings of two-note and three-note phrasing.

The *Requiem* received its first performance on national radio on 2 November 1947 – All Souls Day; it was performed on stage for the first time less than a month later on 28 December at the Palais de Chaillot.

Ligeti

Ligeti had intended to compose a *Requiem* twice before - Steinitz notes that – "of all the creative ideas that had been germinating during his time in Hungary, this one had been in his mind the longest" (Steinitz, 2003 ...), but he abandoned the task both times. Steinitz suggests that a visit to Madrid's Museo del Prado in 1961 was inspirational for not only his *Requiem* but also

his later opera, *Le Grand Macabre*. In this gallery were two particular paintings: Breughel's '*The Triumph of Death*', which Steinitz describes as a – "*merciless and horrific canvas*" and Bosch's "*exotic and grotesque fantasy*", "*Garden of Earthly Delights*".

Wolfgang Marx quotes Ligeti's explanation that he wanted to write a Requiem:

which was related to everybody, Jews and Catholics....all the tens of thousands of people who vanished in Hungary.... I was part of a kind of private resistance movement and this was where my urge to compose a requiem originated. (Duchesneau & Marx, 2011, p. 73)

He finally began writing it in 1962 after being commissioned by the Swedish Radio. It was first performed in Stockholm in 1965. Nordwall describes the impact it had – "*For weeks afterwards the music critics of the newspapers continued to refer to the performance and, as one of them remarked, "for a while all other music seemed impossible."* (Nordwall 1966, p. 111)

He wrote much of the early drafts in the warmth of Vienna's coffee houses (it wasn't until 1973, at the age of 50 that he could afford a grand piano). It took him little time to write the Introit but nine months to complete the Kyrie; involving up to twenty-voiced polyphony, it was, as Steinitz notes – "*the most complicated polyphony Ligeti had ever composed*" (Steinitz, 2003, p....).

Musically he seems to have been preparing for this for some time. Nordwall quotes Ligeti describing his two 'sister' works, the orchestral *Atmospheres* (1961) and *Volumnia* written for organ (1961-2), as being - "*a sort of instrumental Requiem*" (Nordwall, 1969, p.23).

Analysis 1: Introit

Structural overview

In Duruflé's *Introit* the inherent ABA form is very clear: antiphon, the verse, the antiphon. Reynolds notes that – “*The formal structure of Duruflé's Introit is modelled after the tripartite form of the original chant*” (Reynolds, 2002, p.91).

Whilst Ligeti also follows the ABA structure of the *Introit* text, he is also concerned with a linear journey too. “Steinitz calls it “*a transformation from the purgatorial darkness of Requiem aeternam (eternal rest) to the lustrous glow of lux perpetua (eternal light)*” (Steinitz, 2003,)

The Introit of the Requiem Mass begins with the antiphon:

Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine,
Eternal rest give unto them, O Lord.
Et lux perpetua luceat eis
And let perpetual light shine on them.

This simple statement sets the tone for the whole rite; this is a mass for the dead, the liturgical purpose of which is to ask God to grant the souls of the dead everlasting peace and to be bathed in His eternal light.

Duruflé's Antiphon

Duruflé begins with the clarinets, bass clarinets, bassoons, cellos and contrabasses playing the chord D minor. There is a soft pulse provided by contrabasses and some of the cellos. He gives violas a semi-quaver *moto perpetuo* pattern, also in D minor, gently undulating within the span of the chord.

Bars 2-5: tenors and basses sing “*Requiem aeternam*” using the notes of the Gregorian chant in F major. Now, admittedly this is a very closely related key to D minor but it creates enough of what Cooksey calls – ‘*modal ambiguity*’ (Cooksey, 2000, p.14) to tell us that, yes, we are clearly within the world of the

liturgical chant, history and tradition, but the violas and the pulse of the strings gives a strong sense of movement, of journey perhaps?

Also, the melody line is not an exact copy of the original chant and we shall see this throughout the piece – Duruflé wants his cake and he wants to eat it too. He wants the authenticity of the Solesmes rules, but he also wants to paint a picture – he is an impressionist. He has created what Reynolds calls – “a sombre atmosphere appropriate to such a text” (Reynolds, 2002, p.91)

Fig1 shows the original Gregorian chant and Duruflé’s re-working of the rhythmic shape.

Fig1.

The image shows a musical score for two staves. The top staff is labeled 'Greg. Ch.' and contains a Gregorian chant melody with the lyrics 'Re. qui aeternam dona eis Domine'. The bottom staff is labeled 'Duruflé' and shows a re-orchestrated version of the same text: 'Re. qui aeternam dona eis Domine'. The Duruflé version features a more rhythmic and melodic line compared to the original chant.

Duruflé gives just an “â” sound to the soprano and alto parts, with a simple, short chord progression beginning and ending on D minor, in canon to the male voices, from bars 5-8. They are supported by the introduction of violins I&II. Placed during the male voice rest between *aeternam* and *dona*, this is nothing dramatic, just a little colour; so far, so gentle.

In bars 13-19 Duruflé continues in much the same vein for the next line; again, he alters the rhythmic phrasing of the chant (see *fig 2*). This time the soprano and alto “â” is sung alongside the male voices, its modal contours suggesting a canon again, but it’s illusory. However, a beat before they come in, a C# in the horns lifts them to D major; a *tutti* crescendo and the whole piece is brighter; just as the men are singing “*luceat*” – “light”. Duruflé is not above a bit of word painting if it helps to tell his story.

Fig2.

The image shows a musical score for two staves. The top staff is labeled 'Greg. Ch.' and contains a Gregorian chant melody with the lyrics 'et lux per-pe-tua luce-at ei-is'. The bottom staff is labeled 'Duruflé' and shows a re-orchestrated version of the same text: 'et lux per-pe-tua lu-ce-at ei-is'. The Duruflé version features a more rhythmic and melodic line compared to the original chant.

Ligeti's Antiphon

Ligeti however, is coming from a rather different place. Like Duruflé he only gives a brief instrumental start before the vocal business begins. *Tenuto* trombones 1&2, even at *pp*, set a mood of darkness with a dissonant collision of low G and F#. This also serves the four bass singing parts their first notes for “*Requiem Aeternam*”, which they sing, in the octave below C₃ at *pp* on bar 3.

From bars 3-14 and 17-26 (*Requiem aeternam luceat eis, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis.*) each of the four bass parts only sings two notes in their pitch sequence:

B1: G, A

B2: G, Ab

B3: F#, G

B4: F#, E#

The voices start at *pp*, as Ligeti prescribes - “*as though from afar*” (Ligeti, 1997, p.4) they don't rise above *p*; the instrumentation only plays supporting notes that are both functional and that set a dark tone for the opening. We can't really make out the words but Ligeti is clearly not interested in a literal understanding. When he does want us to know the meaning of a word or phrase, he makes it very clear, as in bars 14-16 when 2 bass soloists sing “*Domine*” (Lord); one on D#, the other C#. They have no accompaniment and, although Ligeti gives them the instructions, ‘*molto tenero e tranquillo*’, this is clearly a dark and dissonant Lord.

Contrabass, bass clarinet, contrabass clarinet and bassoon enter at bar 17 to add more low, murky texture, whilst still supporting the voices. The end of the antiphon at bar 26 is gently washed with cellos and basses playing a chromatic cluster, at *ppp*, of eight different notes. Ligeti tells them to “*change bow unobtrusively*”. We could go in any direction from here....

THE VERSE

The *Introit* continues with the 'verse':

Te decet hymnus, Deus, in Sion,

To Thee is due A hymn, O god, in Zion

Et tibi reddetur votum in Jerusalem

And to thee shall be paid a vow in Jerusalem

Exaudi orationem meam

Hear my prayer

Ad te omnis caro veniet.

All flesh shall come before you.

Durufié's Verse

Durufié has let his "â"-singing sopranos and altos continue and together with the horns, wind and strings, the moment returns to F major. The violas are still in their semi-quaver pattern. After a brief *dim.* and *rit.* It returns to *tempo* with no strings, just oboe and clarinet playing their own continuous quaver patterns. Cleverly, he gives the trumpets a quaver pattern starting on a semi-quaver, thus placing it against the beat, in between the oboe and clarinet. It allows us to continue to hear the semi-quavers the now missing violas were playing –it keeps the momentum but with a new texture. On bar 26 he gives the sopranos "*Te decet hymnus, Deus, in Sion, et tibi reddetur votum in Jerusalem*". But in doing so he transposes it up a major third. However, it is now in a minor mode (A) instead of the original F major – and of course the intervals are rather different. There is the, by now familiar, interplay between the minor and its relative major and, as Reynolds points out – "*the use of such median modulation is common in Durufié's harmonic language*" (Reynolds, 2002, p.91). The adherence to the original chant completely vanishes as he alters the melody of the word "*Jerusalem*". This is a more radical interpretation of the chant as the minor interval gives a more warm and sympathetic tone to the line – "*To Thee is due a hymn O God in Zion and to thee shall be paid a vow in Jerusalem*".

The light wind and brass accompaniment matches and supports the voices, with the quaver-driven rhythm giving the whole section momentum. The effect is of a summer breeze – and when the flutes take over the oboe, clarinet and trumpet lines, it could all float away were it not for the slightly weightier altos now singing in E minor - “*exaudi orationem meam ad te omnis caro veniet*”.

Ligeti’s Verse

Ligeti, on the other hand, introduces “*Te decet hymnus, Deus, in Sion*” with strings and horns playing a dense but gentle (*ppp*) cluster of notes, containing C,D,D#,E,F#,G,G#,B. One of the notes it doesn’t play is F, which is exactly the note all the altos, tenors and basses enter on three bars later at *pp*. One horn plays it, but enters at the same time (whilst a second horn plays E).

This tricky but homogeneous start immediately breaks into a dense micropolyphony. Within each of the three plaits (in the *Introit* we never get more than three out of the five possible plaits – sop, mezzo, alto, tenor, bass - at any one time) are four strands and each has its own line. Thus we now have twelve individual lines and each has just two notes (the 4th bass part deviates slightly from this). These create a dense cluster of the following notes:

Alto: 1-Ab/Bb; 2-Gb/Ab; 3-G/Ab; 4-G/F#

Tenor: 1-G/F; 2-F/Gb; 3-F/E; 4-E/D#

Bass: 1-E/D; 2-Eb/D; 3-D/C#; 4-Eb/Db/C

Only horns (F-*mp*, E-*ppp*) and then trumpets (Ab-*ppp*, G-*p*) accompany the voices. Again, it is impossible to understand any of the words, however, in bar 33, for the phrase “*Deus in Sion*” only the altos sing, bringing some clarity to the phrase. For Ligeti, it’s an interesting choice of phrase.

Tenors and basses return on “*et tibi reddetur*” and all save the tenors drop out for “*votum in Jerusalem*” sung *a cappella*. Yet this is not for us to understand the words, it’s Ligeti leading us into a false sense of safety; for there is a sudden shift as the bass and contrabass clarinets play low B and A – *ppp* but

disturbing all the same. Almost immediately as 2 solo bassists sing “*exaudi orationem meam*” on those two notes from somewhere near the bottom of their lungs. This is another phrase Ligeti wants us to understand clearly, but never have the words “hear my prayer” sounded so sinister. Wolfgang Marx paints a picture of the mood – “*The fearful dying soul does not move upwards but appears to gradually sink further into despair*” (Marx, 2011, p.75).

Which is interesting a) because so far his words of clarity amount to “Lord, hear my prayer”² (this from an atheist) and b) because the next line “*Ad te omnis caro veniet*” – “All flesh shall come before you” might be the sort of line a composer would be tempted to over-dramatize. But Ligeti is the consummate dramatist – as I hope I am showing – bringing musical subtext to lines that create new understandings.

Durufié’s Antiphon Return.

Durufié returns us to the D minor of the opening to give us a sense of home. The violas are back with their semiquaver patterns and the clarinets and horns fill out the wash of the chord. On bar 41, sopranos and tenors return for “*Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine*”. However much this sounds like a continuation of the Gregorian chant, it really isn’t. In fact it resembles no chant set out by the Solesmes monks. “*Requiem aeternam*” is sung on the note C, bringing a softer, minor 7th feel and the line ends on A, confirming the D minor. The result is ethereal, beautiful and quite far from the more austere affects of the chant. For the final line of the *Introit*, Durufié has the full orchestra in play: *cors anglais*, horns, harp violins all on quavers, with violas and bassoons keeping the semiquaver momentum; cellos and basses keeping a velvet pulse. He uses all four sections of the chorus. Again he is ambiguous with the modes by pedalling A under the sung chords of D minor and F7. Then by a gentle route of D minor, E minor and Bb he guides us home to F major. This movement is 60 bars long; dynamically, it begins at *pp* and only rises to *f* at bar 50 for a brief moment before returning to its original

² Floros suggests that – “*these moments act like signals evoking associations of existential exigency, of death, judgement and prayer.*” (Floros, 2014, p.103)

level at the end. It is a most tender of *Introits*.

Ligeti's Antiphon Return

At bar 50 and 51 Ligeti returns to the dense clusters and introduces two new voices: solo soprano and mezzo, to sing "*Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine*". Initially supported by nine solo violins and the chorus, these two suddenly find themselves floating alone in a low register for two bars before flutes come in to help. The soloists gradually rise, slowly at first, awkward step-by-uneven step in counterpoint, with the mezzo rising faster towards the end, in the following pitch sequence:

Sop:	C#	C	B	C#	D	C#	D	C#	D	E	D	Eb	F
	Re-	qui-	em	ae-	ter-	nam	do-	na	e-	is	Do-	mi-	ne
Mez:	A#	A#	B	A#	B	A#	B	C#	D#	C#	D#	E	F#

Just as they reach "*dona*", trumpets play a C and the chorus of mezzos and altos return on that note at *ppp*, providing an aural penumbra around the B and D of the soloists. Inevitably they break immediately from this unison and into their micropolyphonic cluster to sing "*dona eis*". This time however, it's not quite as dense; the final notes from all eight singers are: A,Bb,B,C,C#,Eb.

But this stop is just for two bars to let the soloists reach their own ending alone: it is a further moment of textual clarity, again the word "*Domine*", and with the two singers jarringly misaligned, he offers up a stressful and disturbing Lord.

Into the final stretch and, as with Duruflé, Ligeti is not above a little word painting when it comes to "*et lux perpetua luceat eis*". We are now in the world of everlasting light so enter the sopranos. They join the mezzos and altos, flutes and clarinets for the most ethereal moment so far. Like floating souls the voices hang high, then drop, swoop, rise, always floating, to take us to "*perpetua*". A horn plays a helpful A and suddenly all the voices sing in unison – of course it is only for a note before they disperse once more into cluster. But this is a very different dissonance. Supported by flutes, clarinets,

violins, cellos and contrabasses – all as weightless as possible (*pppp*), this ending has lightness, gentleness, perhaps even hope.

Interestingly, both Duruflé and Ligeti create vocal lines that observe no metre; Ligeti writes in his score – “*In this work the bar lines are purely a means of synchronising the individual parts and an aid to temporal layout.*” (Ligeti, 1997,). Indeed, whilst the voices begin each phrase together, the rhythmic differences create a syllabic counterpoint. However, for Duruflé this is about the conflict between the observance of the ‘correct’ stresses (*artis* and *thesis*) when pronouncing the Latin according to Somesmes, and the demands made on those phrases by the addition of harmony. The music of the monks was monophonic; Duruflé has added, as Reynolds describes – “*a new vertical dimension*” (Reynolds, 2003, p.92) and there will always have to be decisions based on multiple factors. In fact the resulting choices create in the voice parts a ‘floating’-like quality above much of the accompaniment.

Analysis 2: Kyrie

Structural overview

The ABA nature of the text – “A - *Kyrie eleison*; B - *Christe eleison*; A¹ *Kyrie eleison*” – allows Duruflé to continue the tripartite structure he utilized in the *Introit*. He further emphasises the similarity by giving the B section to female voices only, as he did with the *Introit*.

The first thing one notices with Ligeti's structure however, is that the A and B texts are sung simultaneously. Whilst, in this overlapping structure of his, there is certainly a tendency towards more *Kyrie* sequences at the beginning, more *Christe* in the middle and more *Kyrie* towards the end, he is certainly not adhering to a traditional structure. Ligeti utilizes – indeed invents a wholly new architecture for the *Kyrie*. So here it is not appropriate to analyse Duruflé's A, then Ligeti's A, then Duruflé's B and so on. I shall present the whole of Duruflé's *Kyrie*, then Ligeti's.

Duruflé's *Kyrie eleison* – the first A

His *Kyrie* is a straightforward F major continuation of the *Introit* – as the Gregorian rules dictate. The strings merely retain the F major for two beats – long enough to shove the new boat out – then they stop, leaving just organ to accompany the voices. The F pedal point, Reynolds says, – “*binds the Introit to the Kyrie*” (Reynolds, 2002, p.93) Reynolds adds that Duruflé, “*chose to combine these two separate texts into one introductory prayer on behalf of both the living and the dead*”.

With the tempo now at *Andante* (50bpm), Basses enter on bar 1 with a relatively faithful interpretation of the first part of the original chant – beginning with an ascending scale from F. One bar later, the tenors sing the same phrase in the dominant, we surely have a compacted fugue here, as altos join on bar 5 back in the tonic and a bar later sopranos join in the dominant. All the singers have begun dynamically at *p*. However, on bar 10, trumpets and trombones play the *cantus firmus* in the tonic but in a rhythmically augmented

way using dotted minims. Voices are now freed from the Gregorian imitations and a broader counterpoint ensues. Holding the reins firmly, Duruflé allows a *poco cresc*; though the volume is raised simply because we now have flutes, clarinets, bass clarinet, bassoons, trumpets and trombones as well as all four parts of the chorus. Beautifully balanced, all continues until bar 17 with a one-bar brass *tacit*. When they return they herald a surge as the sopranos rise to F – indeed all the parts are singing in their higher registers and Duruflé takes it up to *mf*. – but only for two mildly glorious bars before, on bar 21, he orders a *dim*. And we return, rather quickly, to F and *p*. on bar 26, all the while flutes, clarinets, bassoons and organ stick faithfully to the voices. This is simple, beautiful compositional work, but it is not a *Kyrie* pleading for mercy, not yet anyway....

Duruflé's Christe

If we thought that Duruflé's A section flew in the face of a prostrate and fearful begging for mercy, then his *Christe* might frustrate us even more. He begins by raising the tempo slightly - "*poco più animato*" – to 70bpm. As with the *Introit*, he uses only female voices in his B section; and as it did with the *Introit*, this creates a strong textural contrast to the A and A¹ sections.

The *Christe* is introduced by strings with 2nd violins and violas doing most of the hard work keeping the momentum with quaver phrases and the occasional canon to the voices. After a single bar of introduction, the sopranos enter – dynamically on *p*. Altos begin two bars later in counterpoint and the two parts chase each other questioning and answering, not utilizing any Gregorian chant at all but creating what Reynolds calls – "*a pseudo-chant atmosphere*" (Reynolds, 2002, p.94).

There is an absence of basses in the strings but the resulting lightness is just a calm before well, if not a storm, then certainly a heavy rainfall. On bar 35 two solo *cors anglais* begin in canon and with minimal imitation of the voices. Nine bars later the contrabasses finally appear and Duruflé allows a *molto cresc*. And two bars later, as the women rise to *f*, the men, at *ff*, gallop in over

the hills.

This moment is what Duruflé has been holding us back for. It is not in itself overly climactic, raging nor terrifying; but in contrast to the lightness and emotional constraint of before, this moment packs a significant and deliberate punch.

Returning to the Gregorian chant of the 4th part of the *Kyrie*, the basses are following in strict canon by tenors then altos and finally sopranos; all at *ff* and all a bar apart from each other. Violins and flutes in their highest registers, cap the first *tutti* of the work. At bar 62, in case they are flagging, Duruflé gives a *sempre ff*, but we continue for only a couple of bars before he releases us with a *dim.* along with a *rit.* both *poco a poco*. Again, as with the *Introit*, we glide down to the end, this time with some melodic flutes guiding us down, back to earth. A final *rall.* and we are back in F major and home. It is a moving plea for mercy, to a glorious God, a merciful God.

Ligeti's *Kyrie*

Ligeti took nine months to compose his *Kyrie*. Steinitz remarks that it was – “*the most complicated polyphony Ligeti had ever composed*” (Steinitz, 2003, p....). Take a brief look at the score and it is not hard to see why; study it further and one has to agree with Steinitz, who says it is - “*a huge architecture of micropolyphonic textures*” (ibid.)

Nordwall, writing soon after its first performance, notes – “*the Kyrie is in fact a sort of huge five-part double fugue, with the “themes” composed of four-part intervallic but not rhythmic canons*” (Nordwall, 1966, p.112). Nordwall adds – “*moreover the points of the fugal entries taken together for the “melody” of the Christe*” – and we shall come to this fascinating point shortly.

As with the *Introit*, the major purpose of the instruments is to support the singers, who are divided into five voice plaits: soprano, mezzo, alto, tenor, bass. Each plait has four strands. Throughout the whole movement, all four voice strands of a particular plait enter together and in unison, but they

immediately move into a strict canonic sequence, with the pitch sequence remaining the same but each part varying rhythmically. At the end of each phrase, all four strands of each plait end together – though not always on the same note.

Although Ligeti does nod towards the inherent ABA¹ structure of the *Kyrie*, he begins with both *Kyrie eleison* and *Christe eleison* at the same time; the altos taking the *Kyrie* at *pp* and tenors the *Christe* at *pppp*, creating a delicate penumbra around the altos. This happens again on bar 13 when the Mezzo-sopranos sing the *Christe* at *pppp* as a murmur underneath the Bass's *Kyrie*.

The *Kyrie eleison* pitch sequences are each of 112 notes and have the same intervals. They observe mainly conjunct motions according to strict rules laid out by the composer. There is an overall rhythmic pattern whereby the notes are longer at the beginnings and ends, whilst in the middle they are shorter, more crowded together. This creates a rhythmic counterpoint with different plaits reaching their teeming, intensive moments at different times. And at such points as bars 49-57 and 99-101, when tenors and basses are simultaneously at their most impacted, Ligeti takes them up to *ff* and we hear the full force of pleading before terror.

Meanwhile the *Christe* pitch sequences are far more dynamic and connect with each other in dynamic ways. They contain an often-repeated motif made up of the following interval sequence (see appendix 2):

st, m6, M6, b7, M7,b7,M6,m6,st.

Bernard calls them 'wedge design' (Bernard, 2003, p.44); with their intervallic expansion followed immediately by a mirrored contraction, they are more like a pair of conjoined *crescendo* and *diminuendo* marks – a sideways diamond. This repeated broadening, peaking and narrowing of intervals creates a series of pulses of energy, fighting their way through the often crowded score.

There are 22 *Kyrie and Christe* sequences and here we can see Nordwall's

point and glimpse at the extent to which Ligeti creates an obsessively detailed structure; a brick-by-brick architecture, for his hugely complex piece. Bernard notes that there are just two *Christe* sequences, both soprano, one entering on bar 40, the other on bar 102, that with their '*wedge design*', utilize all 12 pitch classes quite quickly – a series (Bernard, 2003, p.44). Bernard suggests that to determine the entry pitches of each of the 22 sequences, Ligeti takes these two *Christe* sequences, juxtaposes them and transposes them down a perfect fifth. The combined 22 notes of this new sequence provided the starting notes, in order, of all 22 *Kyrie and Christe* sequences in the piece. Floros points out a letter Ligeti wrote in 1970 on this detailed matter.

If you write out these individual notes, the result is a melodic line that contains the twelve notes twice over and whose second half is [the] inversion of the first (except for the exchange of two notes in the second half); there is a constructive reason for this, but it would be too complicated to describe that here. (Floros, 2014, p.97)

This may seem an extreme form of structural calculation but, Ligeti is trying to express the enormity and complexity of his subject matter and he has determined that this cannot be achieved without minute detail. He doesn't want us to dwell on it – as he has famously said – "*polyphony is what is written, harmony is what is heard*" (Clendinning, 1995, p.232). It's all there in the service of what Tom Service, writing in the Guardian 2012, calls– "*one of the darkest visions of musical terror ever imagined*". (Service, 27 August 2012). Griffiths, referring to the vocal texture, remarks - "*Instead of an ordered community moving with mutual respect along the lines of a canon, we are presented with a mob.*" (Griffiths, 1997, p.50). Mob perhaps; it might be an ordered chaos of souls; it might be the collective inner terrors of men, women and children being forced onto trains. Lord have mercy indeed.

Conclusions.

This is an academic paper, researched and prepared accordingly, but I also write it with eye of an experienced composer. I know that the act of composition is a series of decisions, intertwined with a series of problems to be solved. Every small moment is the result of a number of options and if one is to understand the purpose of a composition, then one has to be forensic in exploring each point where there must have been a choice, a challenge met, a decision taken.

I will admit that I began researching for this thesis with a preconceived notion concerning Duruflé, as the traditionalist, conservative who gained a commission under the Vichy government; who obeyed the rules and didn't like change. I suspected that I would use his *Requiem* as a comparator, a paradigm of liturgical works, whose sole purpose was to exist in the sanctified and rarefied spiritual realm of the Catholic Church. Against it I would compare radical subversion of Ligeti's use of the text and the extraordinary layers of meaning he has added to it. Of course, in Ligeti's case this is all true and I have shown that he is, amongst other things, a composer of dramatic music – music that can be assessed *dramaturgically*, because it creates a narrative, adds layers of subtext to it, subverts it and takes the listener on a journey as moving and heart-wrenching as any playwright.

However, It has been my profound pleasure to be proved even slightly wrong on Duruflé, for I now believe he was, in his own less dramatic way, trying to reach out beyond the confines of the liturgical context, to say something about his beloved France and its occupied situation. Using the structure of the *Requiem* and the historical certainties surrounding the Gregorian chants with some relatively straightforward skills of the highest standards, he has produced a nuanced commentary; one that tells a layered story, paints pictures beyond the liturgical and that can also stand as an ecclesiastical work.

Much has been made of Duruflé's obsession with the Gregorian chant, his conservatism, traditionalist attitudes; but I have produced evidence here that

he was happy to alter a line, sometimes relatively radically, in order to suit his purpose – if it helped him paint the picture he wanted, he would bend the rules.

It is perhaps unfortunate that there is little or no documentation about the actual timeline of Duruflé's compositional process. It would be useful to know how much was actually written during the years he lived under the shadow of the German occupation. If he finished the work in 1947, what did he do with it from 1941, when it was commissioned, to 1945, the end of the war and the liberation of France? If indeed he did write much of it during those years, we must bear in mind that, with the Germans outside his front door, Duruflé would have been in significant danger if he had written anything controversial. Whilst, though Ligeti's life was the more damaged by wartime and cold war time circumstances and events, at the time of writing his Requiem he was living in the West in freedom.

Appendices

Appendix 1

The strand structure of Ligeti's *Kyrie Eleison*.

Bar	Sop	Mezzo	Alto	Tenor	Bass
1			<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Christe start</i>	
7			<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>
13		<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
18	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
21	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
23	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
25	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
28	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie end</i>
29	<i>Kyrie</i>		<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe start</i>
33	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>
39	<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>
40	<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>
41	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe end</i>
44	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>
45	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie end/st</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
52	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
55		<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
60		<i>Christe start</i>		<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
61	<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
64	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie end</i>
66	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie end</i>	
77	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>		
79	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>		
82	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>		<i>Christe start</i>
83	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Christe</i>
86	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe</i>
88	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Christe</i>
89	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Christe</i>

90	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>
91	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe</i>
92	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Christe end</i>
94	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie start</i>
100	<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
102	<i>Christe start</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
108	<i>Christe end</i>	<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
111			<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Kyrie end</i>	<i>Kyrie</i>
117					<i>Kyrie end</i>

Appendix 2

Pitch sequences in Ligeti's *Christe* from bar 60/1 showing the positions in each sequence of the intervallic motifs (in bold)
 Red and black bold differentiates between adjacent motifs u=upward interval; d=downward interval

Soprano F F# G E A Eb **D Bb C# B C B C# Bb D Eb** A Eb **D Bb**
 st u st u m3 d 4 u b5 d **st d m6 u M6 d b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d M6 u m6 d st u** b5 u b5 d **st d m6 u**

C# B C B C# Bb D Eb D Bb C# B C B C# Bb D Bb C# B C
M6 d b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d M6 u m6 d st u st d m6 u M6 d b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d M6 u m6 d m6 u M6 d b7 u M7 d

Mezzo D# E F D F# G Db **C Ab B A Bb A B Ab C** Eb G Db **C Ab**
 st u st u m3 d M3 u st u b5 d **st d m6 u M6 d b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d M6 u m6 d** m3 u M3 u b5 d **st d m6 u**

B A Bb A B Ab C Db C Ab B A Bb A B Ab C Ab B A Bb
M6 d b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d M6 u m6 d st u st d m6 u M6 d b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d M6 u m6 d m6 u M6 d b7 u M7 d

A B G# B A Bb A B A Bb A Bb
M7 u b7 d M6 u M6 u b7 u M7 d M7 u b7 d b7 u M7 d M7 u M7 d

Alto D D# E C# E# F# C **B G Bb Ab A Ab Bb G B C** F# C **B G**

Draft Bibliography

Australian Bureau of Statistics: (2016). Retrieved from
<http://www.stats.govt.nz>

Bálint, A. V. (2011). *Three questions for sixty-Five composers*. Rochester NY. University of Rochester Press.

Beechey B. *Maurice Duruflé and his requiem op.9*. Musical Opinion 105 (December 1981): 89, 91-92.

Bernard J W. (Jul-Oct 1994). *Voice Leading as a spacial function in the Music of Ligeti'*, in Music Analysis, Vol. 13 No. 2/3 Twentieth-Century Music Double-Issue pp227-253.

Bernard, J W. (2003). *A key to structure in the Kyrie of Gyorgy Ligeti's Requiem*. Bulletin of the Paul Sacher Foundation. No 16. (March)

Blanc, Maurice "*Le Requiem de Maurice Duruflé*". *Musique et Liturgie* (November-December 1950): 110

Blanc, F. (2005). *Maurice Duruflé: Souvenirs et autres écrits*. Éditions Atlantica-Séguier,. ISBN 2-84049-411-6.

Bossin, J. (1984). *György Ligeti's new lyricism and the aesthetic of currentness: The Berlin Festival's retrospective of the composer's career'*. Current Musicology 27/28 p233

Carroll, J.R. (1955). *The technique of Gregorian chironomy*. Ohio: Gregorian Institute of America.

Clendinning J. (1995). *Structural factors in the microcanonic compositions of György Ligeti'* in Concert Music, Rock & Jazz since 1945, ed. Marvin E & Harman R, University of Rochester Press pp229-256.

Cooksey, K.L. (2000). *The Duruflé Requiem: a guide for interpretation*. (Undergraduate Honors Thesis).

Creasy, B. (2013). Duruflé Requiem. Retrieved from <http://coll-mus-lon.org.uk/programme-notes-a-d/>

Drott, E. (2011). *Line, masses, micropolyphony: Ligeti's Kyrie and the "crisis of the fugue"*. Perspectives of New Music. Winter. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7757/persnewmusi.49.1.0004>

Duchesneau, L. & Marx, W. (Eds) (2011). *György Ligeti: Of foreign lands and strange sounds*. UK: Boydell Press

Duruflé, M. (1950). *Requiem*. Paris. Edition Durand.

Ebrecht, R. ed. (2002). *Maurice Duruflé: The last impressionist*. Lanham, Maryland & London. The Scarecrow Press.

Floros, C. (trans. Bernhardt-Kabisch). (2014). *György Ligeti: Beyond avant-garde and post modernism*. Frankfurt. P.L. Academic Research.

Frazier, J.E. (2007). *Maurice Duruflé: The man and his music*. NY. University of Rochester Press.

Griffiths, P. (1983). *György Ligeti*. (Contemporary Composers series), Robson Books.

Hilgarten, N.O. (2012) *Finding God in 20th-century composition*. <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2012/4/29/ross-sacred-classical-music/>

Holloway, R. (2004). 'Ligeti's Half-Century' in *The Musical Times*. Vol. 145, Winter. No 1889 pp54-64 Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4149129>

Iverson J J (2009). *Historical Memory and György Ligeti's Sound-Mass Music 1958-1968*. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas.

Jarjisian PG 1991. *The Influence of Gregorian Chant on Maurice Duruflé's 'Requiem', op9*. DMA diss., Madison. University of Wisconsin.

Kievman, C. (2003). *Ockeghem and Ligeti: the music of transition*. PhD thesis, Princeton Uni.

Levy, B. (2013). "'Rules as Strict as Palestrina's': The Regulation of Pitch and Rhythm in Ligeti's *Requiem* and *Lux Aeterna*" in *Twentieth-Century Music*, Cambridge University Press. 10/2, 203-230

Ligeti, G. (1997) *Requiem*. Frankfurt. Edition Peters.

Montagne, J. H. de la. (1986) *Maurice Duruflé (1902-1986)*. Retrieved from <http://www.musimem.com/durufle-maurice.htm#note2>

Nordwall, O. (1969). *György Ligeti. Tempo No. 88. (Spring 1969) pp.22-25*

Nordwall, O. 1966). 'Sweden'. *Current Chronicle, The Musical Quarterly*,52(1), 90-113. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/741130>

Northcott, B. (1997). London, Independent, 7 March.

Pope Pius XII, 1955. *Musicae Sacrae*.

Reynolds, J. (2002) *On clouds of incense*. In R. Ebrecht (Ed.) *Maurice Duruflé: The last impressionist*. (pp. 87-119) Lanham, Maryland & London. The Scarecrow Press.

Searby, M. (1997). '*Ligeti the Postmodernist?*' *Tempo*, New Series. Cambridge University Press. No. 199

Selvey, J. (2011). *'Unlocking the Mystery in Ligeti's Lux Aeterna'* from his paper: *'György Ligeti's Lux Aeterna: An Analysis Toward a Conductor's Interpretation'* 2011

Service, T. (2012). Gyorgy Ligeti: contemporary music guide. Guardian, 27 August 2012.

<https://www.theguardian.com/music/tomserviceblog/2012/aug/27/gyorgy-ligeti-contemporary-music-guide>

Steinitz, R. (2003). *György Ligeti: Music of the Imagination*. London: Faber and Faber.

Szigeti, I. (1983). *A Budapest Interview with György Ligeti* Monk Mink Pink Punk No.9 2003 transcribed from Budapest Radio broadcast 1983.

Toop, R. (1999). *György Ligeti*. London: Phaidon Press.

Tsioulcas, A. (2006). *Composer György Ligeti dies*. . *Billboard*, 118(25), 84. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.aim.edu.au/docview/227219293?accountid=30063>

Várnai, P. Häusler, J. Samuel, C. Ligeti, G. trans. Schabert, G. J. (1983). *Ligeti in conversation*. London: Eulenburg

Ward, B.E. (2001). *New Sounds of Mourning: the changing role of the Requiem in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries as demonstrated by the works of Giuseppe Verdi, Johannes Brahms, Paul Hindemith and Benjamin Britten*. MA diss. University of Montana.

Whitson, H. (2014). *Program notes*. San Francisco Lyric Chorus, Jongen-Durufle concert August 23&24.

Zuke, F.C. (2015). *Ligeti's Requiem: the genius within*. (PhD Thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.fczuke.com/writings/>