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**Introduction**

GESZA ZUR NIEDEN/BERTHOLD OVER

Until recently, the operatic pasticcio of the 18th century has been mostly examined as a specific musical genre consisting of pre-existing musical material. According to Rainer Heyink’s definition, it is a “practice of composing a new work out of single music pieces by different composers”.¹ Beyond the established tradition of analyzing pasticcios as a tool of music education and stylistic examination, Heyink’s entry especially addresses the study of the origins and transformations of the single parts of a pasticcio in the context of cultural transfers, local music scenes and the mobility of singers. Many studies on the pasticcio have thus offered deep insights into the daily practice of operatic institutions, the careers of singers, and the interconnectedness of different musical metropolises like Venice, Vienna, Hamburg, Leipzig, Dresden, Prague, Ljubljana, Warsaw, Copenhagen and London.²

Over the past 20 years, the musicological study of early modern pasticcios has been shaped by new perspectives:

1. Firstly, the reconsideration of the work concept has led to an analysis of the pasticcio as a paradigmatic genre of co-authorship between the composer and the singers.³ Reinhard Strohm even speaks of a “conglomeration of voices” that also includes fiction- 

---

¹ “[E]ine Praxis, bei der einzelne Musikstücke mehrerer Komponisten zu einem neuen Werk zusammengestellt wurden”. HEYINK, 1997, col. 1496. See also the definition by Curtis Price: “An opera made up of various pieces from different composers or sources and adapted to a new or existing libretto.” PRICE.

² BÄRWALD, 2011; DEGOTT, 2015; DRAUSCHKE, 2012; KOKOLE, 2013; KOKOLE, 2012; LAZAREVICH, 1984; LINDGREN, 1988; POLIN, 2012; STROHM, 2005; STROHM, 2004; TALBOT, 2008. The daily practice of operatic institutions is also stressed in Christine Siegert’s recent definition of the pasticcio: “A pastiche is a self-contained aesthetic object made up of heterogeneous, but ideally equally important musical and possibly textual material, usually produced directly for the purpose of performance.” SIEGERT, 2016, pp. 162f.

³ STROHM, 2011, see also SIEGERT, 2016.
al characters and listeners or readers. Moreover, new research on the development of artistic authenticity and copyright sheds light on the role of operatic patchworks during the second half of the 18th century. At present, the question of whether operatic pasticcios constitute a genre or are just part of the practice of constant musical borrowings and complex intertextual relations seems to be most relevant. This is especially true when considering the various explanations of the terms “borrowing” and “pasticcio” that have already been given in musicological literature. Does the genre of pasticcio aim at creating an ‘echo’ or a ‘resonance’ of the cited pre-existing materials, or does it demonstrate a skillful improvisation in confronting or mixing together musical pieces that already carry aesthetic, social or cultural connotations?

(2) Secondly, the shift from comparative perspectives on single European cultures to European-wide cultural exchanges and transfers has opened a more hybrid view on the pathways that were crucial for the transfer of librettos, scores, single arias or the mobility of performers and composers. Aristocratic correspondences and journeys as well as touring companies and the European-wide careers of singers emerged as central elements of music transfer. Through the distribution of scores and sheet music all these protagonists of early modern musical life pursued their specific intentions of social, cultural and artistic representation. This can be linked to a phenomenon that Joachim Küpper recently defined as a general ‘cultural network’ in the early modern age: he describes this ‘network’ as a ‘floating’ of cultural material, ideas and approaches on the continent and beyond, a network responsible for cultural production in Europe on a supra-national level by combining pre-existing material randomly, or at least in a way that cannot be systemized. Are early modern pasticcios thus a conglomeration of different social habitus or a product of the early modern ‘cultural network’? How were they adapted to local musical life and which cultural horizon was needed to understand the interplay of the single musical pieces and the intertextuality of the constantly modified librettos? While operatic pasticcios have come into the focus not only of musicologists and literary scholars but also of dramaturges and stage directors of contemporary baroque music festivals, the question of the conditions and intentions under which pasticcios were composed, produced, performed and received in 18th-century Europe remains, as well as the question of whether they were ‘only’ the result of time pressure, as often has been thought.

4 Strohm, 2002.
5 Bucciarelli, 2015; Freeman, 1992; Price, 1989; Rabin/Zohn, 1995; Talbot/White, 2014.
6 Buelow, 1987; Buelow, 1986; Burkholder, 2018; Edgecombe, 2017; Mann, 1995; Roberts, 1987; Roberts, 1984; Voss, 2004.
8 Küpper, 2018.
9 In recent years, pasticcios have been regularly staged during the Händel-Festspiele in Halle and performances have also been given during the baroque festival in Schwetzingen.
(3) Last but not least, research on early modern operatic pasticcios has been shaped by the concentration on the material side of the distribution and handling of music. Such an approach includes the study of typefaces and handwriting as well as the analysis of the main media of distribution like printed, often bilingual librettos and copies of scores.\textsuperscript{10} Besides this, digitalization and Digital Humanities have opened new possibilities to reconstruct the composition of pasticcios, the related networks of musical actors and the European-wide intertextual connections fostered by the large distribution of Metastasio’s librettos and the mobility of musicians and singers. At present, the pasticcio seems to be a proficient category of music to connect digital music editions to person related databases. Which culturally informed possibilities of research might be offered by digital music editions in the future and how would these depend on the materiality of the sources that are at hand for the study of operatic pasticcios?

Beyond these three paradigmatic research tendencies in the cultural history of music, the historiography of the operatic pasticcio must reflect the fact, that “pasticcio” was not a generic term for operatic compositions during the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. In a musical sense, it is first mentioned by Johann Joachim Quantz in 1725 as a transformation of the Italian culinary word pasticcio into a description for opera composition with arias by different “masters”.\textsuperscript{11} Nevertheless, during the first half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the term was rarely applied. In the librettos, pasticcios were mostly indicated by the remark “music by different authors”. At least, the term seems less anachronistic in Italy where culinary metaphors were employed to describe the pasticcio practice and thus the several ‘cooks’ involved in creating a salad with different herbs, flowers, salt, oil and vinegar.\textsuperscript{12} In the middle of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, besides the production of operatic pasticcios on the basis of Metastasio’s librettos which had been repeatedly set to music, Carlo Goldoni’s texts came into the focus of a reflection on the music-dramatic qualities of “pasticcios”. In 1759, an anonymous author compiled the “dramma giocoso per musica” *Il Pasticcio* where Goldoni’s texts were patched into a comic action. The play is located “in the tavern *The Log* between Vicenza and Padua” (“nell’Osteria del Zocco tra Vicenza e Padova”) and accompanied by “music by various renowned authors” (“musica di vari celebri autori”). All the characters join to compose a pasticcio. For this they try out arias from various authors and even one aria from the *Quattrocento*, because “in a pasticcio, we do not look too closely” (“in un Pasticcio non si guarda tanto”). The main point is

\textsuperscript{10} Mücke, 2017; Mücke, 2012; Polin, 2011; Siegert, 2015.

\textsuperscript{11} “Here in Florence, I heard several operas that were cobbled together from arias by different masters. The Italians use to call this kind of arrangement a pie (un pasticcio).” (“Hier [in Florence] hörete ich verschiedene Opern, die aber alle von Arien verschiedener Meister zusammen geflicket waren, welche Art von Einrichtung die Welschen eine Pastete, (un pasticcio) zu nennen pflegen.”) Quantz, 1755, p. 230.

\textsuperscript{12} Lo castiello sacchejato, Naples 1732; cf. Angela Romagnoli’s article in the present volume, p. 350.
to worship the pie makers (“pasticcieri”) and the audience, “that acquires a taste for savoring real well-formed pies” (“chi Pasticci tondi e veri / trova gusto ad assaggiar”).

Even before such theatrical statements on the aesthetic values of the pasticcio, the composition of operas out of pre-existing arias could already be contextualized with the many European treatises on artistic taste that tried to bundle different aesthetic approaches to avoid the situation of “there is no accounting for taste” (“de gustibus non esse disputandum”). Consequently, the study of operatic pasticcios is not only dependent on new concepts of the musical work or on new approaches of cultural history, but also on the relations between the arts, a subject that was central to aesthetic debates on taste and on the task of achieving a dramaturgical balance between formal unity and inner variation. The hitherto first known mention of the term “pasticcio” referring to Italian compilation practices was issued by Roger de Piles in his *Abrégé de la vie des peintres* as early as 1699. De Piles, applying it to the fine arts, points at the possibilities for the formation of a new taste via the arrangement of pre-existing parts in a pasticcio (the quote is taken from the English translation published in 1706):

“It remains for me to say something of those Pictures that are neither Original nor Copies, which the Italians call Pastici, from Paste, because, as the several things that Season a Pasty, are reduced to one Tast [sic], so Counterfeits that compose a Pastici [sic] tend only to effect one Truth.”

Recent research on the pastiche by scholars of early modern literature and art have dealt with the question of how to differentiate the pasticcio from other forms of artistic expression and manifestation like parody, burlesque, satire, copy, montage, collage, plagiarism or *capriccio*. This panorama has been enlarged to modern genres, media and forms within the research on contemporary pastiches in gender and queer studies.

___


14 **MYLIUS**, 1754, unpaginated.


16 Piles, 1706, p. 74; the French original: “Il me reste encore à dire quelque chose sur les Tableaux, qui ne sont ni Originaux, ni Copies, lesquels on appelle Pastiche, de l’Italien, Pasticci, qui veut dire Pâtez: parce que de même que les choses différentes qui assaisonnent un Pâté, se réduisent à un seul Goût; ainsi les faussetez qui composent un Pastiche, ne tendent qu’à faire une verité.”, [Piles], 1699, p. 104. The uncertainty of Hoesterey (2001, pp. 4f.) and Fletcher (2017, pp. 49-51) about the source of de Piles’s statement can herewith be clarified.


Introduction

Based on the observation that all those genres contain imitations, modern research has advanced the definition that a pasticcio is “a kind of imitation that you are meant to know is an imitation”. But is this true for operatic pasticcios of the 18th century? Did the composers of pasticcios tend to emphasize the single parts of the composition or did they seek to mingle different musical tastes in one finished ‘work’ as Roger de Piles defined the pastiche? To answer this question, it is important to consider the composition of pasticcios in other arts and the networks between painters, writers and musicians in the 18th century. Looking at the architectural capriccio for example, it was widely received in early modern Europe. Painters like Antoine Watteau and Canaletto were well known in London, where Canaletto continued to exercise his vedute with their enlarged perspectives. Art historians have already pointed to the co-authorship that was necessary for the understanding of architectural capriccios, and the many pieces of ruins. In London, George Frideric Handel owned many copies and paintings in the style of Titian, Rembrandt, Salvator Rosa, Nicolas Poussin, Annibale Carracci and Canaletto. Therefore, we might ask if, and in which way, the aesthetics of copying, patching and comparing early modern paintings affected his musical compositions.

Besides such a historical reconstruction of the influence one medium had on another, due to the relative anachronism of the term “pasticcio”, it is also worth examining conceptualizations and definitions of the pastiche across time. From the Berlin popular revues to the current ‘pastiche pop’, views on composition with pre-existing music material in other periods might reveal important heuristic approaches which shed new light on the structural dimensions of the operatic pasticcio.

Based on this outline of the current state of research and the emerging questions, the articles in this volume discuss the conditions and impacts of the early modern operatic pasticcio between musicians’ mobilities and a socially and culturally rooted formation of musical knowledge and taste. More briefly: which referential potentials were involved during the composition and reception of operatic pasticcios and which mobility contexts were crucial for their production and understanding? Or, to reformulate the definition of the pasticcio in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: which aesthetics were related to early modern pasticcio practices?

The present volume is an outcome of the Polish-German project PASTICCIO. Ways of Arranging Attractive Operas financed by NCN (Narodowe Centrum Nauki/National Science Centre) and DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft/German Research Council) for the years 2018-2021 and hosted by the universities of Warsaw, Mainz and Greifswald. It unites the papers of the conference Music as Reference in Mobility Con-

---

20 At the same time, the capriccio was seen as a mental leap or fancy that departs from mimesis and imitation of nature (Kanz, 2002), a notion that cannot easily be applied to the musical pasticcio.
22 Stahrenberg, 2012; Stahrenberg/Grosch, 2014.
23 Döhl, 2016.
texts: *Operatic Pasticcios in 18th-Century Central Europe* (Mainz, 4-6 October 2018) as well as additional articles that have been kindly written expressly upon our request by Diana Blichmann, Carola Finkel, Tanja Götz, Carlo Lanfossi, Panja Mücke, Reinhard Strohm and Judit Zsovár. Thus, the book presents a broad spectrum of research with regard to both content and contributors. The volume includes not only musicological studies on operatic pasticcios but also interdisciplinary perspectives on pasticcio techniques in other arts, times and contexts. Moreover, besides the inclusion of studies by experienced researchers we sought to encourage young academics to present their research.

The results offer a broad insight into a musical and artistic culture which may have seen in pasticcios and other multi-layered works an ‘alternative model’ to the single-author work, as Reinhard Strohm phrases it.\(^24\) It is well-known that the single-author model became prevalent around 1800 (by and large) and dominated musical thought until New Music broke with traditions and established new models in the first half of the 20\(^{th}\) century and musicology turned away from the traditional work concept in the post-war period.\(^25\) According to Thomas Betzwieser, this ‘alternative model’ was not only restricted to Italian opera, but was present in French music theater as well. It was well established in other arts too,\(^26\) most prominently in the fine arts, where sketching, copying and integrating parts of original and foreign ideas was a traditional technique of pictorial composition, as Hans Körner demonstrates with regard to Antoine Watteau.\(^27\) On a more practical level stage designs, researched by Diana Blichmann, not only rely on stock motives, but were continuously reused and adapted for opera (and theater) performances, appearing ‘new’ on the surface, but actually being rooted in ‘old’ or ‘used’ material.\(^28\) The same applies to dramaturgical ‘recycling’ that is mainly grounded in the ‘art of rewriting’ when scene structures are filled with new wordings or when, for example, Shakespearean dramas, story lines and motives are integrated in new contexts as Bernhard Jahn shows in his contribution on pasticcio techniques in spoken theater.\(^29\) The overall technique of creating a new surface on an old ground structure and of retouching the already existing corresponds to one of the techniques of the musical pasticcio: to retouch an existing opera/recitative structure with new arias. However, while this com-


\(^{28}\) Diana Blichmann, *Adaptations of Stage Directions and Stage Designs in Pietro Metastasio’s drammi per musica*, in the present volume pp. 117-152.

\(^{29}\) Bernhard Jahn, *Pasticcio Practice in 18th-Century German Theater*, in the present volume pp. 103-116.
mon trait can be found pasticcio techniques in spoken theater are basically different: because in theater no modules like recitatives and arias exist exchanges barely play a role, but rewriting does. This aspect may offer future research perspectives with regard to recitatives that often exploit, digest and enlarge standard situations or situations taken over from other operas. In this way they function like spoken drama. The question of how the aesthetics of the relations between different arts in both early modern London and Hamburg may have been relevant for the conception and reception of pasticcios is analyzed by Gesa zur Nieden on the basis of opera-related caricatures and treatises and Telemann’s arrangement of Handel’s *Lotario* for Hamburg. Here, an interest in single motives and their contrasting potential seems to have been relevant to establish an overall dramaturgy of operatic pastiches including the possibility of a comparison of different composition styles.

Since the 18th century the aesthetical component of the term “pasticcio” was crucial and discussions on it continued under the term “pastiche” until the present day. In doing so, its relation to homage and postmodernity was addressed repeatedly. In a time where the work concept (with its implications of author-centered, immutable works of genius) was established and maintained, opera forms based on the mingling of pre-existing elements could barely be accepted. From a contemporary point of view all these aspects can be questioned: an author does not create a work *ex nihilo*, but relies on pre-existing ideas and works; a work (for example a work of art) ages and, therefore, changes (for example, a picture changes its colors when exposed to the sun). This important point is discussed by Alessandro Bertinetto in his philosophical study which compares the techniques of pasticcio to everyday techniques of improvisation. In literature, pasticcio techniques are only rarely found because of the dominance of ‘pastiche’, i.e. parody and travesty, and the disapproval of plagiarism. However, a correlation can be found in the literary quotation as Tina Hartmann shows. Anyway, the question of what constitutes a quotation, plagiarism or a product of artistic involvement deserves more attention in the future. According to Frédéric Döhl, the hardly definable term “pastiche” will have more impact on European jurisdiction since its importance has been emphasized by a judgement of the European Court of Justice in 2019.

As has been said, the mobility of the agents involved in opera production fosters the mobility of musical repertoire. A paradigmatic form of mobile musicians are the wan-

---


31 Nevertheless, in the 19th century concepts of *Werktreue* that conform completely to these aesthetics were not in the foreground. Works were shortened, enlarged, newly orchestrated, arranged for other instruments, etc.


33 Tina Hartmann, *Pasticcio en littérature?*, in the present volume pp. 197-209.

34 Frédéric Döhl, *On the New Significance of the Pastiche in Copyright Law*, in the present volume pp. 211-222.
dering opera troupes that are responsible for the transfer of Italian operatic culture to almost every part of Europe during the 18th century. Whereas Berthold Over gives insight into the life of the first great impresario of an opera troupe, Antonio Maria Peruzzi, and his probable motivations to establish a traveling opera business, Daniel Brandenburg reports from the heart of a troupe: the Pirker couple, Franz being Konzertmeister and his wife Marianne a singer of the Mingotti troupe, address in their correspondence numerous aspects of the daily business of the troupe that help to understand musical strategies, singer’s choices and arrangement techniques in pasticcios and other operas. The importance of a (traveling) singer’s vocal profile and the different use of his strengths by different composers in different local circumstances is evidenced in Emilia Pelliccia’s study on Francesco Borosini. Particular vocal skills of Borosini were emphasized in Vienna by composers active at the imperial court whereas in London, George Frideric Handel focused on other characteristic features that conformed better to his musical intentions and dramaturgical conceptions. Dramaturgical conceptions and musical strategies are also at the center of Berthold Over’s contribution on Didone abbandonata pasticcios by the Mingotti troupe. Obviously, the Mingottis relied on a stable recitative structure over years which was filled by various arias that changed from performance to performance according to local taste and traditions. Mechanisms of the transfer of arias can be evidenced too: in the case of the Mingottis ‘baggage arias’ (arie di baule) were inserted to the same extent as arias coming from the musicians’ professional network or from the Mingottis’ musical library. The aspect of the network is studied more deeply by Kordula Knaus and Andrea Zedler. For their research on opera buffa they use a tool that is able to visualize various aspects of the network of troupes, singers, performances.

Pasticcio performances are bound to local conditions, preferences, traditions and strategies, offering a broad spectrum of reasons and motives for their production. Whereas in Venice, the pasticcio was an opera form ‘taken out of the drawer in emergency cases’, it was an appreciated spectacle performed for official state events in Naples and

36 Daniel Brandenburg, Italian operisti, Repertoire and the aria da baule: Insights from the Pirker Correspondence, in the present volume pp. 271-283.
37 Emilia Pelliccia, Francesco Borosini between the Habsburg Court and the Royal Academy, in the present volume pp. 225-239.
39 Kordula Knaus/Andrea Zedler, Palladio as a Tool for opera buffa Research. Mapping Opera Troupes and opera buffa Outside of Italy (1745-1765), in the present volume pp. 329-345.
40 Gianluca Stefani, Production of Opera Pasticcios in Venice in the Early 18th Century. The Impresario’s Role, in the present volume pp. 377-396.
showing the best of contemporary musical production.\textsuperscript{41} In London where Italian opera was introduced via the pasticcio around 1700 it was a popular form,\textsuperscript{42} whereas in Vienna it formed a contrast to court opera with its single author concept since the opening of the Kärntnertortheater in 1728 and the staging of pasticcios in 1730.\textsuperscript{43} In Rome pasticcios could function as test fields or ‘schools of taste’ opposing ‘old’ musical styles (Antonio Lotti) to ‘new’ ones (Nicola Porpora).\textsuperscript{44} Similar to England, Italian opera was introduced in Central Europe to broader audiences mainly by pasticcios that constituted the leading opera form since the 1730s. The network between troupes and singers cared for a constant exchange of repertoire as evidenced by Jana Spáčilová.\textsuperscript{45} But not only the troupes themselves selected the musical material. The Mingottis obviously satisfied wishes of local patrons like the Attems family in Graz and inserted music collected previously during a voyage to Italy by a family member. This case is investigated by Metoda Kokole,\textsuperscript{46} but seems not to be an isolated one since in London influence of the nobility in the creation of pasticcios seems to have been similar.\textsuperscript{47} In Warsaw, the introduction of the unknown genre of opera buffa resulted in the performance of pasticcios based on librettos by Carlo Goldoni as Alina Żórawska-Witkowska shows in her article.\textsuperscript{48} It was done on the explicit request of the newly elected Polish King Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski, thus underlining the role of aristocratic patronage in the dissemination of the pasticcio. The role of the pasticcio in English song culture and its relation to the materiality of the printed or manuscript sources is investigated by Carlo Lanfossi.\textsuperscript{49} This leads to further developments in thought and the jurisdiction of musical copyright in

\textsuperscript{41} Angela Romagnoli, \textit{Arrangement, Collaboration, ‘Dressing’: The Different Recipes for the pasticcio alla napoletana in the First Half of the 18th Century}, in the present volume pp. 349-376.

\textsuperscript{42} Lindgren, 1988.

\textsuperscript{43} Judit Zsovár, \textit{Singers of the Viennese Kärntnertortheater in the 1730s in the Light of Aria Substitutions and Pasticcios}, in the present volume pp. 425-446.

\textsuperscript{44} Aneta Markuszweska, \textit{Artaserse (Rome, 1721). Nicola Porpora’s First Pasticcio}, in the present volume pp. 397-423.

\textsuperscript{45} Jana Spáčilová, \textit{Local Conditions of Pasticcio Production and Reception: Between Prague, Wroclaw and Moravia}, in the present volume pp. 485-506.

\textsuperscript{46} Metoda Kokole, \textit{The Graz 1740 Pasticcio Amor, odio e pentimento: A Special Case or Mingotti’s Common Practice?}, in the present volume pp. 507-525.

\textsuperscript{47} Over, 2019, pp. 95f.

\textsuperscript{48} Alina Żórawska-Witkowska, \textit{A Granted Royal Wish, or Carlo Goldoni’s La buona figliola with Music by Niccolò Piccinni and Il mercato di Malmantile with Music by Domenico Fischietti, Staged in Warsaw in 1765}, in the present volume pp. 527-538.

\textsuperscript{49} Carlo Lanfossi, \textit{The Book of Pasticcios: Listening to Ormisda’s Material Texts}, in the present volume pp. 447-463.
London at the end of the century researched by Maik Köster from a legal point of view, and crucial for the understanding of authorship and ownership at the time.\(^{50}\)

The 18th century is clearly the heyday of the operatic pasticcio and its practices. It not only exercised influence over other genres like ballet, oratorio or church music, but influenced operatic production well beyond 1800. In Vienna, for instance, pasticcio changed at the turn of the century. Whereas it had previously often functioned as a summary of Italian vocal art, it was subsequently transformed into the *quodlibet*. As Klaus Pietschmann shows,\(^{51}\) the 18th-century pasticcio must be seen as a forerunner of popular entertainment: travesties and parodies are direct successors of pasticcios (and, by the way, conform to the literary term “pastiche”). With regard to dance, ballets and dance tunes were inserted in pasticcios just as dances were assembled in a pasticcio-like way as ballets, as Carola Finkel describes.\(^{52}\) Through the use of pre-existing music intertextual references could add meaning to the pantomimic action. Daniela Philippi emphasizes the role of stage practices and traditions in producing pasticcios;\(^{53}\) the requirements of Paris Opéra – reflecting, of course, expectations by the audience – are the reason for enlarging Christoph Willibald Gluck’s ballet scenes in *La Cythère assiégée* by including new music written by Pierre-Montan Berton. The case study by Katarzyna Spurgiasz investigates an oratorio pasticcio and uncovers the operatic sources as well as the transformations the music underwent when being adapted for another, less virtuosic vocal cast.\(^{54}\) Anyway, due to the ‘customization’ of pre-existing material for different reasons, arrangements seem to have been practiced particularly often in pasticcios and offer a broad field for further investigation. Striking examples of arrangement practices that brought opera into the church are given by Alina Mądry. In her article she points to Mozart’s operatic music that was transformed for church purposes: even pieces from *Don Giovanni* have been arranged as a mass.\(^{55}\)

The interplay between original and arrangement points to the aspect of the materiality of the sources. Sources are based on, relate to or depart from each other; material is


\(^{51}\) Klaus Pietschmann, *Bad Habits in Theater – Late Forms of Operatic Pasticcios in Vienna Around 1800*, in the present volume pp. 541-552.

\(^{52}\) Carola Finkel, *Dance in Pasticcio – Pasticcio in Dance*, in the present volume pp. 553-573.

\(^{53}\) Daniela Philippi, *Presentation of Dance as Motivation for Pasticcio Practices: Gluck’s and Berton’s Cythère assiégée (1775)*, in the present volume pp. 575-587.

\(^{54}\) Katarzyna Spurgiasz, *Pasticcio da chiesa: Transforming Opera Arias into an Oratorio. The Case of Contrafacted Oratorios in Wrocław and Zagan from the Mid-18th Century*, in the present volume pp. 609-619. For other oratorio pasticcios see the article by Jana Špačelová, in the present volume pp. 485-506; for adaptation practices the article by Judit Zsovár, in the present volume pp. 425-446.

moving, changing and being corrupted; material signs are signifiers of different material/compositional/conceptual layers. Thus, Anna Ryszka-Komarnicka bases her study on the different librettos and scores representing different productions of Apostolo Zeno’s *Venceslao*.\(^{56}\) As a result she emphasizes the textual and musical influence of a specific production and of a specific singer on the further ‘life’ of the opera/pasticcio whose compilation was not a simple merging, but a complex process. The complexity of reconstructing musical versions of pasticcios and other works is studied by Tanja Götz, Ursula Kramer and Annette Landgraf – in each case with another focus. Whereas Landgraf gives an insight into George Frideric Handel’s way of compositional working by moving, removing, adapting, rewriting musical sources,\(^{57}\) Götz and Kramer focus on the reconstruction of pasticcios. Kramer’s study investigates Christoph Graupner’s operas for the Darmstadt court evidencing that he used material from the scores of operas he had written earlier for the Hamburg Gänsemarkttheater.\(^{58}\) Götz tries to establish Christoph Willibald Gluck’s contribution to the two pasticcios *Arsace* and *La finta schiava* using a multitude of philological methods and proving once again the influence of the singers in the creation of such works.\(^{59}\)

Since the turn of the century philological methods have been complemented by digital ones. The ‘digital turn’, resulting in the establishment of Digital Humanities, offers new methods, new research results and new presentation forms of knowledge. In the field of critical music editions, a digital approach allows presentation forms of the ever-increasing scientific apparatuses that are more user-friendly as well as editions using the specific advantages of the new media, as Joachim Veit demonstrates in his article.\(^{60}\) Anna Laura Bellina shows that digital approaches facilitate scientific work when dealing with enormous text corpora of, for example, constantly modified opera buffa librettos whose stemmas can be established electronically.\(^{61}\) Martin Albrecht-Hohmaier and Kristin Herold offer an insight into the editions to be created within the scope of the *PASTICCIO* project. Besides numerous philological problems in connection with pasticcios computational solutions of integrating information for a better understanding

---


of the pasticcio practice in the editions are explained. Panja Mücke’s afterword gives interesting research perspectives which forge a bridge from media-historical and material perspectives to interdisciplinary and diachronic ones.

Some remarks on the formal aspect of the volume: in older documents cited in the articles, the often-interchangeable letters “u” and “v” are standardized according to modern usage. Libraries and archives are identified by the library sigla created by RISM (Répertoire International des Sources Musicales/International Directory of Musical Sources), a catalogue of which is easily accessible on the RISM website: http://www.rism.info/en/sigla.html.

Our acknowledgements begin with a tribute to the contributors, who have done their utmost to ensure the successful publication of the volume. With regard to persons who have made the book possible, we wish first of all to thank Jörg Rogge, official spokesman (Sprecher) of the core research area Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften (Mainz Historical Cultural Sciences), recently dissolved, who kindly accepted our volume into the homonymous series and contributed to printing costs, as well as Kristina Müller-Bongard in the core area’s office. We offer many thanks to the Institut für Kirchenmusik und Musikwissenschaft (Institute for Church Music and Musicology) of Greifswald University and to the IKM, Institut für Kunstgeschichte und Musikwissenschaft, Abteilung Musikwissenschaft (Institute for Art History and Musicology, Department of Musicology), at Mainz University for their unwavering support of the project. For the scrupulous correction work we are much indebted to Shane McMahon who took particular care of all the matters concerning language, grammar and wording. We also like to thank Gero Wierichs from transcript for the successful cooperation in realizing our book, our Greifswald colleague Verena Liu for her correction work and our Viennese colleague Emilia Pelliccia for her meticulous work on the indices. And, last, but not least, special thanks go to our student assistants Janica Dittmann, Rebecca Fricke, Johanna Hüther, Maik Köster and Mick Lim for their invaluable work in setting up and running the database and in the creation of the present volume.
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63 Panja Mücke, Epilogue, in the present volume pp. 755-759.
Introduction

Sources


[PILES, ROGER DE], Abrégé de la vie des peintres, avec des reflexions sur leurs ouvrages, et un traité du peintre parfait, de la connoissance des desseins, & de l’utilité des estampes, Paris 1699.

Id., The Art of Painting, and the Lives of the Painters: Containing, a Compleat Treatise of Painting, Designing, and the Use of Prints: with Reflections on the Works of the most Celebrated Painters, and of the Several Schools of Europe, as well Ancient as Modern […], London 1706.
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Id., Le “Opere / che al dosso degli attor non son tagliate / riescon per ordinario impastic­ciate”. Riflessioni sullo status del testo spettacolare melodrammatico nel Settecento, in: Responsabilità d’autore e collaborazione nell’opera dell’età barocca. Il pastic-
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SANDERS, JULIE, Adaptation and Appropriation, Abingdon 2016.


ZUR NIEDEN, GESA/OVER, BERTHOLD (eds.), Musicians’ Mobilities and Music Migrations in Early Modern Europe. Biographical Patterns and Cultural Exchanges (Mainz Historical Cultural Sciences/Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften 33), Bielefeld 2016.
In place of a proper introduction, I would like to refer to a painting in order to outline the topic with a ‘cross-media’ example. The illustration (p. 28) shows a painting by Giovanni Paolo Panini (1691-1764) entitled Roma Antica which displays a gallery of pictures of Ancient Rome. This painting, held at the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart,1 from around 1755 is painted in the so-called “capriccio style”,2 or to be more precise, it belongs to the genre of architectural capriccio.3 Panini’s painting could serve as an illustrative paradigm – in the truest sense – to what is significant for the pasticcio context, since it mirrors features and issues which will accompany our discussion.

Firstly, Panini’s canvas shows numerous individual paintings which make up an ensemble, i.e. the gallery. We see an assemblage of paintings which are assumed to be by different painters. Thus, authorship is an essential issue here, although we can assume that all these ‘paintings in the painting’ are by Panini. Panini himself gives at least the impression that there are other painters involved. Fiction or the fictitious character of this gallery seems therefore to be of certain relevance. Transformed into a narrative and told from Panini’s point of view, it could be stated thus: I present in my gallery lots of paintings from Ancient Rome, supposed to be of different origins, but they are all by me.

Secondly, the layout of the paintings in this gallery is of interest. Undoubtedly, anybody in the 18th century would have accepted such a ‘chaotic’ arrangement of pictures. But this imaginary, non-naturalistic feature is typical for the capriccio style, mixing different layers of reality, in particular when buildings and monuments are relocated and coupled together into one panorama. In short: the architectural capriccio has substantially transformed the traditional veduta genre by presenting items in a new order.

---

3 See Steil, 2014, for Panini see Mayernik, 2014.
Apart from this medley of ordering and display, another point is remarkable, i.e. framing. In Panini’s gallery we can observe different frames of pictures, different sizes of frames, and frames even partly overlapping each other. This specific pictorial capriccio feature could obviously form a parallel with our pasticcio problem: in which way is a pasticcio framed, in what ways are single individual musical numbers framed? Are they separated from each other, bound together, overlapping, linked or bridged by other material?

Thirdly, we should notice the overall frame of Panini’s picture since it is highly theatrical. We can locate several small curtains, but most important is the big curtain in the upper part of the picture. The curtain is drawn back revealing the whole painting and, moreover, the curtain reveals the displayed gallery as a stage. The narrative of the painting is enriched by another (‘outer’) perspective of the author (Panini), i.e. in a way a meta-perspective. To conclude: in Panini’s *Roma Antica* we see paintings in a painting framed as a gallery, and additionally framed by a theatrical prospect.

When we turn now to the operatic pasticcio, these features and principles of the pictorial capriccio could help to identify the artistic strategies of the musical pasticcio. This said, I will try, on the one hand, to widen the scope in dealing with pre-existing text and music more generally, and on the other I will narrow it by dealing with specific examples. According to the title of an influential article by Neal Zaslaw, *When is an Orchestra not an Orchestra?*, we could ask: when is an opera consisting of pre-existing music

---

labelled as pasticcio, and when is it not? In this respect, I am less interested in clear cases like Handel,5 but in ‘borderline cases’, in order to investigate the criteria for pasticcios.

Departing from this perspective, a terminological discussion seems to be inevitable. However, as Christine Siegert6 has detailed, this issue is highly intricate because older and newer terminological features and discourses overlap, therefore Siegert’s basic statement, that the pasticcio is esthetically problematic (“ästhetisch problematisch”) is absolutely justified. As for the intricate terminology, Siegert resorts to Gordana Lazarevich’s metaphor describing the pasticcio as a “Gordian knot”.7 Apart from dealing with 18th-century testimonies, Siegert herself tries to expose a definition which she labelled as “preliminary”: “A pasticcio could be defined as a self-contained aesthetic object, composed of heterogeneous though ideally coequal musical and textual material, normally produced for the purpose of performance.”8 I entirely share this definition, since it is very flexible and covers not only the dramatic context, but also non-theatrical phenomena.9 However, to keep two things in mind: the definition is silent on the quantity of the material used (which concerns old and new composed music), and furthermore the aspect of authorship is not addressed, and the question of how we should designate the persons involved: as arranger, compiler, ‘pasticheur’, composer, etc. I would like to contrast Siegert’s definition with an 18th-century description of “pastiche”, i.e. the entry in the Encyclopédie. The definition does not properly take music into account, but it is nevertheless significant, not least because authorship and style are central to the whole issue.

“Pastiche, s. m. (painting) painting painted in the style of a great artist and displayed under his name. The pastiches, in Italian pasticci, are specific paintings which can be called neither originals nor copies, but which are shaped in the manner of another painter and with such artistry that the most skillful (experts) are sometimes deceived. But above all it is certain that the art forgers can more easily forge the works that do not require a lot of inventiveness than the works in which the whole

---

5 Most of the research in regard to pasticcio has been produced within Handel scholarship; see e.g. Strohm, 2009. Also Curtis Price’s definition seems to be modelled on the London operatic practice: an “opera made up of various pieces from different composers or sources and adapted to a new or existing libretto”. Price, 2001, p. 213.

6 Siegert, 2016.

7 Lazarevich, 1976. Although the title of Lazarevich’s article points to more general aspects, the essay deals only with opera buffa. In light of the publication date of the article, it seems obvious that the pasticcio was (at that period) for the most part identified with the Italian comic genre deriving from intermezzo.


imagination of the artist was able to unfold. The creators of pastiches could never forge the composition, nor the shading nor the expression of the great masters’ works. One imitates someone else’s trait, but one does not likewise imitate his spirit, so to speak, and one cannot learn to think the way another does, just as you can learn to replicate his articulation.”

Most important here is the feature of as if, and the idea of the author as a pseudo-creator. The sentence, “as if it has been painted by someone famous”, is quite significant in this respect. In other words: craftsmanship and artistic capacities play a prominent role for the pastiche. Although this definition in the Encyclopédie is primarily dedicated to painting, it has considerably influenced the perspective of ‘pastiche’ in other arts.

Let’s get closer now to what I have labelled “the world of pasticcio”. When researching the issue of pre-existing text and music, and pasticcio, respectively, a great deal of musical genres come into consideration. It seems that the whole 18th century is dominated by the pasticcio phenomenon. We can verify pasticcios in both opera seria and opera buffa, in French tragédie lyrique and opéra comique, in English ballad opera, in operatic adaptations characterized by insertions and arrangements or lingual transfer (as French parodies); furthermore, it is present in oratorio as well as in other sacred music, and last but not least in instrumental music.

Approaching the pasticcio phenomenon in more detail we can identify recurring motives and issues, as autorship(s), genre, borrowing and parodies, intertextuality, transmission and diffusion, or materiality. The most important are, at least from my point of view: authorship, genre, borrowing and parodie. In the following outline of the 18th century these features will be exemplified by four different genres: opera seria, tragédie lyrique, ballad opera, and finally opera buffa. My very point is to distinguish and – best case – to determine, what could be labelled as pasticcio and what can not. Within each example I furthermore try to focus on a specific problem bound to the corresponding genre, such as borrowing, parodie, genre, or intertextuality.

10 “Pastiche, s. m. (Pein.) tableau peint dans la maniere d’un grand artiste, & qu’on expose sous son nom. Les pastiches, en italien pastici, sont certains tableaux qu’on ne peut appeler ni originaux, ni copies, mais qui sont faits dans le goût, dans la maniere d’un autre peintre, avec un tel art que les plus habiles y sont quelquefois trompés. Mais d’abord il est certain que les faussaires en Peinture contrefont plus aisément les ouvrages qui ne demandent pas beaucoup d’invention, qu’ils ne peuvent contrefaire les ouvrages où toute l’imagination de l’artiste a eu lieu de se déployer. Les faiseurs de pastiches ne sauront contrefaire l’ordonnance, ni le coloris, ni l’expression des grands maîtres. On imite la main d’un autre, mais on n’imite pas de même, pour parler ainsi, son esprit, & l’on n’apprend point à penser comme un autre, ainsi qu’on peut apprendre à prononcer comme lui.” Art. Pastiche, in: Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, vol. 12, p. 155; https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/L%25E2%2580%2599Encyclop%C3%A9die/1re_%C3%A9dition/PASTICHE, 21.12.2019.

In my first approach, authorship is in the foreground. This focus is perhaps astonishing at first sight, since the issue of authorship is supposed to be the least important feature within the pasticcio discussion. Moreover, the pasticcio seems to be predestinated to abandon such problems as the notion of work (Werkbegriff) and ‘composer’ in the traditional sense. And in the light of post-structuralist paradigms authorship hardly plays any prominent role. However, it does play a role, and the more pasticcios I have investigated the more this question is involved in various ways and from different perspectives. The perspective of hommage is perhaps the most prominent, as we will see.

When we speak of pasticcio music is, for the most part, at the center of our interests. According to the title of this essay we yet have to investigate both pre-existing text and music. Therefore, the text side is the starting point for our meditation. The librettist’s perspective is widely underestimated in the whole context of operatic pasticcio. The reuse of music is so prominently focused on by scholarship that the textual side is often neglected. When we look, for example, at the work list of Christoph Willibald Gluck in the New Grove or Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart (MGG), we have to be aware that the genre designation which leads to the classification of “pasticcio” is framed by the musical perspective.\textsuperscript{12} Arsace, Arianna, La finta schiava are labelled as pasticcios. But, as Tanja Gölz and others have shown, we also have to face compilations of text in some Gluck operas of the 1740s.\textsuperscript{13} Gölz uncovered, for example, the text(s) for La Sofonisba (1744), which is based on Francesco Silvani (for the recitatives) and Metastasio (for the arias), taken from at least seven drammi per musica by the poeta cesareo. The Milan libretto of that opera is silent on this pasticcio character and only the name of the composer (Gluck) is given. The name of the text arranger (Claudio Nicola Stampa) is only transparent through court documents. Such dramatic products could be labelled as ‘hidden pasticcios’.

The following example is from the 1750s, a period in Gluck’s œuvre when the composer was dealing with different forms of parodie in ballet and opéra comique. The Italian opera L’innocenza giustificata, a festa teatrale given in 1755 in Vienna, seems to be a special example within this context of parody and borrowing. In contrast to La Sofonisba and other pasticcios of the 1740s the provenance of the libretto text is not hidden: the preface to the libretto text(s) clearly discloses its authorship.

“The author of this short drama did not intend to give birth to a new work: he merely endeavored to choose a subject which offers the opportunity to encourage the public’s just inclination for the famous author, by whom, in different times, all the arias contained in this drama were written.”\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} See Hortschansky, 1966 and 1971; Buschmeier, 2009; Strohm, 2009b.

\textsuperscript{13} Gluck, 2017, preface by Tanja Gölz, passim; see also Gölz’s article in the present volume, pp. 687-704.

\textsuperscript{14} “Chi à disteso questo breve Dramma non si è proposto di dare alla luce un nuovo componimento: si è studiato solo di scegliere soggetto che somministrasse occasione di secondare la giusta parzialità del pubblico per l’illustre Autore da cui sono state in vari tempi scritte
The preface explains that the author of this piece did not intend to present a new opera but rather tried to sketch a plot ‘around’ already existing arias, written by a “famous author” at different times in his lifetime. There is not the slightest doubt that anyone other than Metastasio should be identified as the “illustre Auttore”. In Gluck scholarship this passage in the preface was discussed controversially, but today’s readings more or less follow Alfred Einstein who called this a “questionable homage” (“bedenkliche Huldigung”) to Metastasio.\(^\text{15}\) The identity of the author of this “argomento” is not transparent, but there are strong indications that Giacomo Durazzo was responsible for it. Durazzo shared the view of one of Metastasio’s critics in Vienna, namely Calzabigi, in regard to the necessity of ‘reforming’ opera seria. We know that Metastasio himself was not amused about this text pasticcio, coupling together various aria texts from “different times”, as Durazzo puts it. The subtext of his statement, the tongue-in-cheek, could be read as follows: Metastasio’s aria texts are exchangeable, their meanings are rather unspecific in relation to the given action, in short: the poetry is outdated. Thus, we ‘might’ read the preface of *L’innocenza giustificata* as a critical voice in the whole context of operatic reform in the mid 1750s.

The libretto itself does not contain any indication of Metastasio’s arias, such as asterisks or inverted commas. In total we have 14 numbers in *L’innocenza giustificata*, of which nine numbers are taken from Metastasio librettos dating from 1728 until 1744 (see the left-hand side of the chart below). Some texts refer only to the first quatrain of an aria, some to the whole aria text. Thus, the procedure of compilation varies to what is to be actually compiled.\(^\text{16}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arias from Metastasio librettos</th>
<th>Gluck’s later self-borrowings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 2 <em>Il natal di Giove</em> (1740)</td>
<td><em>Issipile</em> (1752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3 <em>Attilio Regolo</em> (1740)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4 <em>Ezio</em> (1728)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 5 <em>Il natal di Giove</em> (1740)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6 <em>Zenobia</em> (1740), <em>Ipermestra</em> (1744)</td>
<td><em>Ipermestra</em> (1744)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 7 <em>Olimpiade</em> (1733)</td>
<td><em>Tigrane</em> (1743)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 8 <em>Il sogno di Scipione</em> (1735)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 9 <em>La pace fra la vertù</em> (1738)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10 <em>Attilio Regolo</em> (1740)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 13 [not from Metastasio]</td>
<td><em>Issipile</em> (1752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 14 [<em>dito</em>]</td>
<td><em>Ezio</em> (1750)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{15}\) Cf. Einstein in the introduction to his 1937 edition of *L’innocenza giustificata*, here quoted after ibid., p. xii.

\(^\text{16}\) For further details see ibid., preface, pp. xvif.
As for the music, Gluck – as he often did – refers to some of his earlier compositions dating from the 1740s. We are quite familiar with this borrowing practice, and Klaus Hortschansky has examined the various procedures at length. Interestingly, in this case of a ‘textual’ pastiche, Gluck also resorts to earlier pieces (see the right-hand side of the chart), and even in one number, he refers to an aria of the corresponding opera, i.e. *Ipermestra*. However, the compositions of the arias are modified to a considerable degree in comparison to their original design. And it seems that Gluck invests all his efforts in order to give them a new shape. He seems to follow the hidden purpose of that *festa teatrale*, i.e. to demonstrate in which way new music goes together with older texts. The elaborateness of Gluck’s composition, in particular towards the Metastasio texts, is an indication for such a demonstration.

**Text**

No. 7 Cavata (from *Olimpiade*)

Fiamma ignota nell’alma mi scende:
Sento il Nume, m’inspira, m’accende,
Di me stessa mi rende maggior [mi fà].
Ferri, bende, bipenni, ritorte,
Pallid’ ombre compagne di morte,
Già vi guardo ma senza terror.

**Music (borrowing)**

56 bars taken out of an aria from *Tigrane* (1743)

What can be deduced from the examination of Gluck’s *L’innocenza giustificata* is the very issue of which ways we generally classify the reuse of pre-existing text and music. ‘If’ the music of Gluck’s earlier operas would have been adopted ‘untouched’ for *L’innocenza giustificata*, we would very likely tend to label the work as a pasticcio. And according to Christine Siegert’s definition it would be no problem to classify it as such, either with regard to the text, or to the music. And since Siegert does not regard ‘multiple’ authorship as a condition for the classification of pasticcio, we ‘could’ easily place Gluck’s *L’innocenza giustificata* in this genre. But if we did so, we would certainly open Pandora’s box, since we would have to place most of Gluck’s operas under this category.

To summarize: this *festa teatrale* is ‘framed’ by Metastasio’s texts, in its basic intention and structurally through the imported aria texts. The aesthetic frame, however, is that of Durazzo and Gluck. As evident in the *cavata*, Gluck produced his own frame, modifying the poetic model considerably. In referring for no. 7 to an earlier aria of his *Tigrane* the author Gluck superimposes the text borrowing by his own composition, in consequence shifting the overall ‘pasticcio’ character of the work into the direction of the music. In other words: the textual frame was overlayed by the music, and the aria was re-framed. In my view this is a ‘double’ pasticcio practice.

---

The paradigm of parodie – to use the French terminology, which is in some ways more adequate for our context – involves a lot of musical genres of 18th-century opera.\(^\text{18}\) After all, there are genres which are specifically designed for parodie, such as the opéra comique, comédie-vaudeville, etc. Similar to opéra comique, the English ballad opera is characterized by the use of pre-existing music. As in the French practice of dramatic parodie the ballad opera offers a mixture of popular songs and earlier ‘composed’ music which are supplied with new text in order to shape a drama. With regard to Gérard Genette’s theory of transtextuality the ballad opera is a paradigm for dealing with ‘hypotext’ (pre-existing texts) and their transformation into a ‘hypertext’ (new texts), to use Genette’s terminology (see also below). The technique of parody is the raison d’être for the English ballad opera since The Beggar’s Opera in 1728. Regarded as a later prototype of this genre is the comic opera Love in a Village (1762) by the playwright Isaac Bickerstaff.\(^\text{19}\) This opera consists of seven new compositions, whereas 34 numbers resort to pre-existing music. Ballad operas, as French opéras comiques, are normally not classified as pasticcios. But in the case of Love in a Village we always come across this term in the corresponding literature (as Fiske, 1973; Price, 1991; Holman, 2000).\(^\text{20}\) As in other London pasticcios the printed sources made the provenance of the pre-existing music transparent by disclosing the authors of the borrowed music. A detailed list is given in the second edition of the libretto.\(^\text{21}\) The airs are numbered and in the dramatic text the sequential numbering is maintained in the header of the airs (Air 5, 6 etc.). The exact provenance of these airs, however, is not transmitted, neither through opera titles nor textual incipits of the original music.\(^\text{22}\)

The crucial point is the issue of intertextuality. With intertextuality I do not mean the general relationship between texts and/or music which is quite obvious and always given in a pasticcio. I mean rather an ‘intentional’ intertextuality, producing a deliberate correlation between texts, and eventually targeting the recipient’s perspective. To put it in a nutshell: Is the borrowed music in a pasticcio primarily used as ‘material’, or is the selection of the music bound to specific meanings between the hypotext and the hypertext? With Love in a Village and the genre of ballad opera we are apparently at the crossroads of our pastiche discussion, because we have to challenge the proper reasons for the selection of the music.

At first sight, we can assume that in ballad opera the aesthetics of parodie and its procedures function in the same or in a comparable way as in French opéra comique. Audiences are able to relate the popular tunes (as airs, or vaudevilles, etc.) to their origin-

\(^{18}\) For a terminological discussion of parodie, see also Schmidt, 2001, pp. 12-20.

\(^{19}\) For details of authorships see Toms/Bickerstaff, 2019, preface.

\(^{20}\) The outcome of its success has been described by Peter Holman: “Love in a village started a vogue for English pastiche operas that lasted well into the nineteenth century.” Holman, 2000, p. 11.


inal context and therefore understand the wit, the irony or the critique. Thus, the choice of music is supposed to be guided by an intertextual intention. Berta Joncus, in the introduction to her critical edition, has convincingly demonstrated the various motives for the specific use of the pre-existing text/music. One of the major features uncovered by Joncus is that the performers play an eminent role with regard to the intertextual relationship(s). Very often the music of the popular songs is bound to the artists’s persona, i.e. that it ‘belongs’ to her or him. For the most part, the reason for the choice of the pre-existing music could be found on the performer’s side. The question is whether this is also effective for the Italian music used in *Love in a Village*, even if the arias by Francesco Geminiani, Girolamo Abos, Pietro Domenico Paradies and others were popular at that time in London. Since they were primarily sung in the Pleasure Gardens in form of concerts, the (original) dramatic context is most likely lost.

Whatever intertextual feature comes into play in the ballad opera, my very point is why the genre of pasticcio has been effective with the ballad opera (in the aftermath of *Love in a Village*) and not with *opéra comique*? Although an *opéra comique* such as *Annette et Lubin* by Adolphe-Benoît Blaise (text by Marie-Justine-Benoîte Favart) from the same year 1762 is similarly based on common *vaudevilles*, on well-known arias and on *airs nouveaux* (newly composed arias), we would be very reluctant if not negative to classify such an *opéra comique* as pasticcio. Thus, where is the criterion? And is there any at all?

This is a good point to strengthen the theoretical side a bit more. The theory of Gérard Genette seems to be the most appropriate to employ in order to describe the various phenomena of pasticcio practice. Although Genette deals only with text in his theory, the paradigm of transtextuality is best suited to deal with our issue. ‘Transtextuality’ is the umbrella term with which Genette characterizes all aspects which emerge with the relation of two (or more) texts. Within this generic term he distinguishes five different types: 1. intertextuality, 2. paratextuality, 3. metatextuality, 4. architextuality, 5. hypertextuality.

With intertextuality Genette points only to very specific forms of references, such as quotations, plagiarism, etc. Paratextuality embraces features as titles, genre, preface, footnotes, etc. Metatextuality refers to all sorts of examination of and commentary on the basic text. Architextuality deals with structural analogies such as design and outline. Hypertextuality, finally, describes the references related to the hypotext produced by transformation and imitation.

In pasticcio, all five types of transtextuality are effective in one or another way and to a greater or lesser extent. Hypertextuality could be described without any doubt as fundamental for pasticcio, since the categories of “transformation” and “imitation” were essential to its compositional process. Paratextuality is also effective when we think of the different genre designations or labels given in librettos or scores. Prefaces are also important in this respect leading the recipient into a specific direction. Metatextuality seems to be less focused, but I will give an example at the end of this article. In my

---

23 For these relationships see in detail Toms/Bickerstaff, 2019, preface.
24 For a summary of Genette’s theory see Kopp.
view, the most problematic point is still intertextuality, from Genette’s terminological perspective (not in the broader sense). Are pasticcios generally bound to a framework of (intentional) reference? Should we read the pre-existing arias in a Handel pasticcio as quotations, and should they therefore be identified as a reference? Are the Italian arias in Love in a Village intended as quotations? In Genette’s terms, intertextuality is the “actual presence of a text in another text” (“la présence effective d’un texte dans un autre”).

This condition is naturally given when an aria or song is used in a new dramatic context. We can certainly refine the theoretical coordinates in regard to the pasticcio issue according to Genette’s differentiated sub-categories, but we have to be aware that Genette’s system is a ‘one-media theory’, so to speak, and he primarily deals with ‘text’, whereas we have to face the presence of two media, text ‘and’ music. But even if we regard music as text, we will come into trouble. A timbre in a French opéra comique, i.e. the text incipit which indicates the tune on which the air is to be sung, always points to both sides, text ‘and’ music. Such problems could hardly be covered by a theory based on one medium. And to recall the last criterion of Siegert’s definition: a pasticcio is targeted for performance. Indeed, a performance could shape transtextuality in various and different ways (through the performers) in addition to the possible references of the hypotext(s).

To enlarge the picture of 18th-century pasticcio I would like to focus on two paradigmatic examples from different operatic cultures, one from French opera and the other from the Italian operatic culture. With these two examples the categories of paratextuality and metatextuality could (also) be stressed, categories which are not normally in the forefront of the pasticcio discussion.

The audiences’ familiarity with the music seems to be an essential element of the pasticcio, in particular for the success of the individual works. This probably motivated the production of pasticcios in France, which are labelled “fragments” or “fragments d’opéras”. The prototype of this genre is Les fragments de Mr. Lully, a ballet which André Campra compiled in 1702 out of diverse comédies-ballets by Molière and Jean-Baptiste Lully. With these Fragments de Mr. Lully the French operatic pastiche was born, inaugurating a certain vogue for such pieces. This fashion exhibits various forms, from the use of single airs tel quel, to the adaptation of larger scenes and up to the presentation of whole acts, which was the most common practice in the later 18th century. In these works the framing of a new dramatic context was abandoned, the single individual acts and entrées were given in their original form making up the ‘opera’.

26 See e.g. Betzwieser, 2018.
27 For the literary tradition, e.g. Les fragments de Molière, see Jary-Janecka, 2005.
28 For a provisional list see https://operabaroque.fr/fragments.htm, 20.05.2019.
29 In contrast to the success of this genre the aesthetic evaluation was not unanimously positive. “At the Paris Opera, ‘Fragments’ is the label for the compilation of three or four ballet acts taken from different operas, coupled together although there is no link between them, destined to be performed on the same day, making up altogether the normal length of a
However, besides the impact of popularity we also can observe the tendency to ‘promote’ music being in danger of falling into oblivion. An outstanding example following this trend in the early 18th century is the opera *Télémaque* by Antoine Danchet and André Campra. Within this work, the two authors succeeded in creating a whole five-act *tragédie lyrique* out of textual and musical fragments. The procedure in *Télémaque* is remarkable because Danchet and Campra based their opera on text fragments bound to their original music. In other words: the fragments of the original operas appear *tel quel* in *Télémaque*, i.e. with their original text ‘and’ music, without any *parodie* involved. The purpose of this creation is highly interesting, since Danchet and Campra wanted to promote post-Lullian operas which were not subject to a *reprise*. The two authors obviously regarded works by Pascal Collasse, Henry Desmarest, Marc-Antoine Charpentier and others underestimated by the audience, because the impact of Lully’s operas had been still so strong, even 15 years after the composer’s death. In this respect, the subtitle of this pastiche, “Fragments des Modernes”, must be read as an aesthetic device. It should demonstrate the efforts of the new, “modern” generation of composers who try to find their own way in the aftermath of the Lully era.

With regard to the feature of paratextuality, the preface of the libretto is an excellent example because the musical score does not include any corresponding information.

“You will find in this work, what I desired for several people: that five or six qualified musicians compose an *Opera* together. After the Fragments of Monsieur de Lully have been given, which had a favourable success, I was charged with composing the Fragments of modern *Opera*[s] that are not supposed to be performed in their entirety at the Theater. In order to create something unique, I intended to make them interesting by providing a plot, which initially seemed impossible; but the desire to please the public helped me to resolve the difficulties, as well as the advice of my friends, who strived to deter me from it. I chose the subject of *Télémaque*, hence I created the plot of a tragedy that I composed out of the most beautiful pieces of music which the connoisseurs commended to me, or which I saw applauded at the theater. This work can be compared to a cabinet decorated with paintings chosen from different performance. Only persons without taste could invent such a mish-mash and only in theaters without importance you can bear it.” (“On appelle ainsi à l’opéra de Paris le choix de trois ou quatre actes de ballet, qu’on tire des divers opéra[s], & qu’on rassemble, quoiqu’ils n’aient aucun rapport entre’eux, pour être représentés successivement le même jour, & remplir avec leurs entr’actes, la durée d’un spectacle ordinaire. Il n’y a qu’un homme sans goût qui puisse imaginer un pareil ramassis, & qu’un théâtre sans intérêt, où l’on puisse le supporter.”) Art. *Fragmens (Musique)*, in: *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, new ed., vol. 15, Geneva 1777, p. 303.

30 For a detailed analysis of text and music see Burgess, 2012.
masters. I hope that the public will give its consent to that whole, of which it already approved every part.”

Interestingly, the literary side was hardly stressed in the preface. The primary reason for the production of this opera was to present “the most beautiful musical pieces” (“les plus beaux morceaux de Musique”), which – according to Danchet – had been suggested to him by connoisseurs. The final product, the pastiched opera, should be regarded as an art gallery where the paintings of different artists are displayed. The comparison with an art gallery is striking, because – as we have already seen – the (later) definition of pastiche in the Encyclopédie of the 1750s refers prominently to the context of art.32

However, in contrast to that definition, the authorship(s) in Télémaque is not hidden, neither to the text fragments, nor to the music. Quite the contrary, the compositions used by Collasse, Desmarest, Charpentier and Campra are all exhibited: at the end of each (text) fragment the libretto indicates the title of the opera and the corresponding scene on which the new scene in Télémaque has been based.33 On the other hand, Danchet has set his supplementary verses bridging the fragments in inverted commas. (“On the margins of this libretto I have indicated the names of the authors of whom I made use of; and I labelled the linking verses with double inverted comma, which I produced and which Monsieur Campra set to music.”/*J’ai placé en marge dans ce Livre le nom des Auteurs dont je me suis servi ; & j’ai marqué par double Virgules les vers de liaison que j’ai faits, & que Monsieur Campra a mis en Musique.”)

The pasticcio practice in Télémaque is extraordinary in French opera, firstly, because it actually prioritizes music (over text), and secondly, because it refers to the genre of tragédie lyrique, and not to opéra-ballet as most of the “fragments d’opéra” did. Here, we have a complete tragédie lyrique based on pre-existing music, in complete analogy to the Italian practice in opera seria.

31 “On trouvera dans cet Ouvrage, ce que j’ay vu souhaiter à plusieurs Personnes; que cinq ou six Musiciens habiles voulussent d’intelligence composer un Opera. Après avoir donné les Fragments de Monsieur de Lully, qui eurent un succès favorable, je fus chargé de faire les Fragments des Operas [sic] Modernes, que l’on ne veut pas remettre entiers sur le Théâtre. Pour en faire quelque chose de singulier, j’entrepris de les rendre interessants en y mettant une action, cela paraît d’abord impossible; mais le désir de plaire au Public m’a fait résister aux difficultez, & aux Conseils de mes amis, qui sembloient m’en détourner. J’ay choisi le sujet de Télémaque, j’en ay fait le plan d’une Tragédie, que j’ay composée des plus beaux morceaux de Musique, que les Connoisseurs m’ont indiqué, ou que j’ay vu moi-même applaudir au Théâtre. Cet Ouvrage peut être comparé à un Cabinet paré de tableaux choisis de différents Maîtres. J’espère que le Public donnera son suffrage à un tout, dont il a déjà approuvé chaque partie.” DANCHET, 1704, preface, s.p.


33 See also the list of the pre-existing music in BURGESS, 2012, p. 266.
The World of Pasticcio

The popularity of (existing) music has induced the authors of pasticcios in various ways in their motivation for picking up existing musical fragments. My last example is a clear case in this respect, moreover it is a pasticcio classic, i.e. *L’ape musicale* by Lorenzo da Ponte, premiered in Vienna in 1789 (in two versions), then given in a revised version in Trieste in 1792, and finally in New York in 1830 with new music, then mostly by Rossini. The motive for this pasticcio is quite the opposite as for *Télémaque*, insofar as Da Ponte assembled the most celebrated music, for the most part from the second half of the 1780s, music recently applauded by the Viennese audience. The libretto informs us on the compilation, and in the chart included in the preface we can identify the pieces, actually the greatest operatic hits from Vicente Martin y Soler’s *La cosa rara*, Antonio Salieri’s *Axur*, Domenico Cimarosa’s *L’Italiana in Londra*, or Wolfgang Amadé Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*.

The basic intention and the overall-procedure, respectively, is to keep the music and the text ‘untouched’ as far as possible. Only minor changes are made according to adapt it to the new plot, as the following example, the duetto “Là ci darem la mano” from Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*, demonstrates (alterations marked in italics).

Là ci darem la mano,
Là mi dirai di sì.
*Napoli è un po’ lontano,*
Partiam ben mio di qui.
Vorrei e non vorrei,
*Incerto in petto ho il cor.*
Contenta è ver sarai
Ma può burlarmi ancor.
Vieni, mio bel dilettto.
*Ho un poco di sospetto.*
Là cangerem di sorte.
Presto non son più forte.
Andiam, andiam, mio bene.
A ristorar le pene
D’un innocente amor.

There is no need to discuss the hypertextual character of Da Ponte’s pasticcio which is obvious, but rather to stress the issue of metatextuality. In Genette’s terms, metatextuality effects any form of commentary, normally not in the same genre as the hypotext, as, for example, in literary criticism. But metatextuality is also present in fictitious texts, when (meta)texts are dealing with themselves in a sort of self-reflection, a feature ascertainable at many points in *L’ape musicale*.

A look into the overall frame of *L’ape musicale* is helpful in order to understand the basic dramaturgical construction. From the table of the *dramatis personae* we can

deduce that the plot is set in the theater milieu: “BONARIO, Poeta” – “Don[na] FARNELLA, Virt[uosa] di Mus[ica]” – “D[on] CAPRICCIO, Virtuoso di Musica” – “BRUNETTO, Primo Buffo” – “Don[na] ZUCCHERINA, Virt[uosa] di Musica” – “CECHI-NA, Nipote del Poeta”. Thus, basic ingredients of *metamelodrama* are effective in Da Ponte’s pasticcio. And as we can expect from this outline, the *virtuosi* are actually singing within the plot, therefore diegetic music is in the foreground, or even more: di- egetic music is the dramaturgical platform of this *commedia per musica*. Consequently, the feature of ‘performance within a performance’ – comparable to Panini’s paintings in a painting – is explored in depth, a typical element in *metamelodrama* where we see artists singing, rehearsing, and even composing. From this perspective Da Ponte’s *L’ape musicale* has a strong meta-character through this frame of ‘metamelodrama’. However, this does not automatically lead to self-reflection and commentary in the sense of Genette’s specific notion of metatextuality. But exactly this feature can be observed too, in particular at those passages in which Da Ponte refers to his own librettos.

In the sixth scene of the first act the poet Bonario and the singers Donna Farinella, Don Capriccio and Donna Zuccherina are chatting about which music should be performed next, and they come to the conclusion that they would like to hear another French aria (two have been performed in the preceding scene). They agree on Calpigi’s *barcarolle* “Je suis né natif de Ferrare” from *Tarare*. This opera by Pierre-Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais and Antonio Salieri was premiered in Paris in 1787, a real ‘revolutionary opera’ *avant la lettre*. Da Ponte had been charged to adopt this opera to the Viennese stage, and he had to accomplish major alterations because the plot was too hazardous for the Habsburg capital in terms of its political proposition. The final product, i.e. the transformation into the Italian *Axur rè d’Ormus* performed in 1788, was actually ‘another’ opera.

The clou is that when it comes to performing Calpigi’s *barcarolle* in *L’ape musicale*, Da Ponte meditates on his own adaptation of *Tarare* into *Axur*. The *dramatis personae* are arguing facts of that transformation, e.g. that this aria has (now) an Italian title (“Nato io son nello stato Romano”) and not a French one, that it was not sung by Calpigi but by Biscroma, the person in Da Ponte’s *Axur*, etc. The whole scene in which this aria is embedded is a self-reflection on the adoption of Beaumarchais’ opera into the Viennese context. This scene does not only match Genette’s paradigm of hypertextuality but also the features of metatext in the sense of actual commentary and self-reflexivity.

One issue, however, remains obscure in *L’ape musicale*, i.e. the materiality of this pasticcio, or, in other words, the sources. As we do not have a musical score of the Viennese versions of this pasticcio, our analysis must be based on text only. It would be highly illuminating to retrace the composition of the recitatives to see whether they exhibit further intertextual relationships in the music, as e.g. in Salieri’s *Prima la musica e poi le parole* which is the clear model for *L’ape musicale*, while the latter could even be read as a sequel of Salieri’s *metamelodramma* of 1786.

35 See e.g. Bellini, 2009, and Betzwieser, 2018.

Despite the absence of a score *L’ape musicale* could be regarded as a pasticcio paradigm in many respects, and last not least it is a paradigm of what pasticcio is after all about, namely success. *L’ape musicale* was the biggest immediate success for Da Ponte in Vienna, it ran unexpectedly for eight opera nights in succession, a record which no other opera has equaled. The selection of recent arias, the framework of theater and ‘metamelodramma’, and the diegetic character of the music presented in quote-like performances, all these ingredients seem to be the perfect ‘recipe’ for producing a successful pasticcio. Hardly any other author was more conscious about the ‘composition’ of these elements than Lorenzo Da Ponte. And finally, the basic feature of meta-opera supported the work’s flexibility and openness to further transformation – even its transfer to the entirely ‘new world’ of New York in 1830.
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The Italian word “pasticcio” is made up of two ingredients: “pasta” (dough, pastry) and “-iccio”, a suffix indicating the mingled or deteriorated state of something originally whole or good. The combined word is already found in Vulgar Latin as “pasticium” and in Old French as “pastiche”. The suffix can also describe – without any derogatory meaning – the further processing of, or derivation from, an original, as in “salsa” > “sal-siccia” (sauce > sausage). In the late 17th century, the term “pasticcio” migrated from its gastronomic origins to the world of the arts, being used to describe a poem, a work of fine arts or a musical-theatrical performance of heterogeneous character. This happened, as I suggest, in analogy to “capriccio” (something comparable to the sudden leap of a goat), a term which since the 16th century had meant a work of art that was derivative or jumbled together in a fanciful way or at an author’s personal will, without regard to the conventions of genre or verisimilitude. In the literary debates (discours) on the values of French and Italian music around 1700, keywords such as “pastiche”, “caprice”, “rhapsodie” and “fêtes” are almost interchangeably used by French writers when characterizing Italian musical approaches, whereas it was thought that French musicians were more inclined to stay within the formal boundaries of genre. The quality (such as there was) of a poem or stage work called “capriccio” or “pasticcio” would depend on how it managed to maintain a sense of coherence while following fanciful inspiration or containing a mixture of borrowed materials.

Stylistic and formal multiplicity in art, whether created by a single author or concocted from heterogeneous materials by an arranger, could therefore mean an aesthetic

1 Paintings such as Claude Lorrain’s *Capriccio with ruins of the Roman Forum* (c. 1634) combined classicist sublimity with a fanciful arrangement within one picture. A musical pasticcio could, likewise, be regarded as a collection of venerable fragments skilfully arranged.

2 For example, in writings by Charles de Saint-Évremond and François Ragueneau, see Price, 2001.
challenge to prevailing classicist ideals. This may be relevant for an assessment of the pasticcio practices in Italian opera, which became prominent in the late 17th century. Unity and single authorship of the art-work had already been classical (Ciceronian) principles, transmitted to modern Europe via humanism and Renaissance classicism. The author-work principle, although it was not universally practiced, had been applied to musical compositions already in the early 15th century. In opera (the Italian word for “opus”) and other performing arts, the principle worked in tandem with the options of performative flexibility, improvisation and undefined authorship.

The 18th-century opera pasticcio is therefore not a default option or ‘natural’ phenomenon in this art-form, but may often have functioned as an alternative to the classicist tradition. Educated audiences could enjoy a pasticcio opera as an exception from the author-work convention or as a stylistic license. This aesthetic function is sometimes evident in contemporary sources such as diaries, treatises or librettos. Multiplicity was intended and had a communicative function, for example, in some operas and oratorios from around 1700, which were deliberately contrived to have as many composers as possible (27 in the case of Arione, Milan 1694). The names of composers of a pasticcio opera were often known at least to insiders; they were occasionally entered by hand in libretto copies, but could also be advertised to the public by being printed in librettos, newspaper adverts, playbills and printed editions of opera arias. Multiple authorship of opera ‘texts’ (for example as a result of later arrangements of a work) is often acknowledged in the libretto prefaces, where more respect is paid to literary unity and authenticity than to composership. In librettos by Zeno and Metastasio, aria texts were sometimes marked by asterisks if they had not been written by the original poet – because they had been inserted together with the music.

3 See, most recently, Strohm, 2016.
4 This opera was, strictly speaking, not a ‘pasticcio’ but a ‘collaborative work’, where various composers contributed original compositions.
5 For various libretto announcements of multiple authorship, see Strohm, 2011. More examples of these are quoted here below. Composer names were also occasionally printed over individual arias in pasticcio librettos.
6 An example of many is the libretto preface of Stratonica (Naples, 1727, libretto after Apostolo Zeno’s Antioco), which explains that, if the drama was “different from its original state, this was done to accommodate it to the wishes of the actors, to whom the liberty was left to insert arias of their choice; these were marked with an asterisk, the others were replaced, not out of disregard for its eminent author, but only to please the whim of the performers, and this has been done by Sig. Carlo de Palma”. (“Se diverso dal suo primo essere, ti verrà sotto l’occhio, il presente Drama, sappi, che si è fatto per meglio accomodarsi agli Attori, à libertà de quali s’è lasciato il poner l’arie à loro sodisfazione, e sono tutte quelle contrasegnate con il presente asterisco * l’altre si sono fatte di pianta, non già per pregiudicare il suo Degnissimo Autore; mà solo per incontrare il genio de’ Rappresentanti, e questo si à fatto dal Sig. Carlo de Palma, […].”) The composers of the insertions (Vinci, Porpora and others) are not named. See Strohm, 2011, p. 70.
On the other hand, the knowledge of authorship of either text or music was not always explicitly transmitted, and operatic anonymity was the rule rather than the exception in several European repertoires. Opera-goers would not necessarily care about the difference between single and multiple composership.\(^7\) We should differentiate: the pasticcio procedure may often have been the only feasible way of getting a performance together, or of resolving conflicts between different agents involved in the opera business, whether sponsors, impresarios, *maestri di cappella*, singers, librettists or audiences. The practice was more prominent in 18th-century Italy and Germany than in France.\(^8\) It was unequally distributed over the repertoires and could be an administrative principle of some theater companies.

Research on 18th-century pasticcio practices and repertoires began in the early 20th century, triggered by the chameleonic transmission of some comic operas. It was already clear then that pasticcio status could have resulted from the dissemination of an originally unified work in later arrangements.\(^9\) It was ultimately found that the *dramma per musica* offered even more examples of the pasticcio procedure than comic opera; scholarly studies focused at first on the pasticcio production of famous *opera seria* composers.\(^10\) Inevitably, the phenomenon was soon connected with post-modern objections to the author-work discourse, with reader empowerment and with a growing emphasis on aspects of performativity and event in theater studies. The pasticcio status of many transmitted operas has fueled a tendency to dispute the ‘work-status’ of Italian 18th-century opera as a genre altogether, and the single-author principle in opera is occasionally being challenged by declaring singers as “co-authors” in the pasticcio practice.\(^11\) But these debates are not ideally conducted within the pasticcio phenomenon alone. In fact, the co-existence between author-work principle and performativity is as fundamental to the entire genre of opera as is the co-existence between single composership and pasticcio or collaboration. Opera composers often admitted changes and revisions to their creations, in order to achieve memorable performances, and conversely, pasticcio arrangers depending on performers’ inputs were sometimes striving to design coherent musical works. Studies of the compositional genesis and the transmission of works have

\(^7\) Some audience members believed that the London Pasticcio *Catone* (1732) was an opera by Handel: see Burrows et al., 2015, p. 563: “I am just come from a long, dull, and consequently tiresome Opera of Handel’s, whose genius seems quite exhausted […]” (Lord Hervey to Stephen Fox, 4 November 1732). The *Daily Advertiser* of 6 November 1732, however, informed its readers: “We hear that the Opera was not composed by Mr. Handell, but by some very eminent Master in Italy” (Ibid., pp. 563f.).

\(^8\) See Calella, 2007, p. 29.

\(^9\) Sonneck, 1910-11.

\(^10\) Hortschansky, 1966; Strohm, 1974 (with later English and German revised editions).

\(^11\) On this debate, see Calella, 2007; Brandenburg/Seedorf, 2011, entire volume; Strohm, 2011. Extending the privilege of authorship to performers will neither remove the contested author fixation of modern scholarship nor change 18th-century social realities of the opera business.
dominated the discussion so far; now we should focus on studying opera as ‘collective action and practice’, paying attention to diverse and possibly competing ‘agencies’ (originations) within the practice.\textsuperscript{12}

In the field of early 18\textsuperscript{th}-century Italian pasticcio opera, I found that the influence of singers on the aria contents of such operas was much less significant or statistically noticeable than had often been assumed. Rather, the musical and textual make-up of a production could variously depend on one or more of five different agents: the composer or maestro di cappella, the impresario, the poet, the singers, and audience members including patrons and protectors. Contemporary evidence exists for all of these agencies; Pier Jacopo Martello (1714) offers the most detailed description of the process of inserting an extraneous aria as it highlights the collaboration of the singer with the librettist, not with the composer.\textsuperscript{13} Statistically, the pasticcio operas of Handel and Vivaldi document an increasing dominance of the composer’s and impresario’s agency over that of the singers, as time went by.

The recognition that pasticcio practices varied over time and between different regional repertoires, that they privileged one or the other agent and met with different audience attitudes, opens up the entire field of early 18\textsuperscript{th}-century Italian pasticcio opera to particular (local) as well as generic (supra-regional) observations. In the following sections, I wish to offer observations about four different ‘repertoires’ (by which I mean composers’ outputs, theater playlists, collections of sources, not repertoires in the sense of the modern ‘repertoire theater’):

1. Antonio Vivaldi and Venetian opera
2. Hamburg and the Mingotti opera company
3. London and George Frideric Handel
4. The Theater am Kärntner Tor, Vienna.

Even within these selected repertoires there are still gaps of information, making general conclusions rather unsafe. The following observations are therefore intended as ‘case studies’, not as a comprehensive assessment. Court opera repertoires are not included, partly because their pasticcio practices are not well researched yet, partly because court operas used them less. There are some surprising connections between the selected four repertoires: but although migration and supra-regional transmission are typical of the pasticcio culture, explicit acknowledgement of geographic transfer or of specific local provenance is quite rare in the sources, except that “Italy” is often named as the origin of imported music. Aria ‘parody’ (text change) is of course frequent: if singers insisted on singing inserted arias because of their music, they had to learn new texts quite often.

\textsuperscript{12} Strohm, 2003, recommending to ground opera studies on sociological “action theory” (Talcott Parsons) and “Handlungstheorie” (Alfred Schütz, Jürgen Habermas, Thomas Luckmann). See, for example, Parsons/Shils, 2001.

\textsuperscript{13} Strohm, 2011.
**Vivaldi and Venice**

The statistics of Vivaldi’s migrating opera arias offer a first surprise. 148 individual arias from operas by Vivaldi were inserted into 88 different pasticcio opera productions of the period (some arranged by Vivaldi himself), performed in 24 different cities of Europe. But in only 15 cases of 148 did ‘the same singer’ perform the aria in question in both the original opera and the pasticcio, implying the singer had the piece in her/his baggage. Moreover, in six of these 15 cases the **virtuosa** in question was the mezzosoprano Anna Girò, a close associate of the composer, who will sometimes have carried out his particular wishes in the transfer of his arias. The overwhelming evidence here is the popularity of the composer’s arias, spread over many European centers; since he himself was involved in several of the pasticcio productions or had business contacts with their arrangers, it is safe to conclude that the composer’s popularity and agency was the strongest factor in this dissemination. Nevertheless, the insertion of the arias can still have been initiated by the singers, who followed the trend. These singers willingly took up someone else’s showpiece aria as long as it was by a famous composer.

It is of course useful to compare such a set of data with others not based on a single composer’s output, for example by surveying the repertoires of operatic centers in their entirety. For Venice, we have fairly comprehensive opera statistics, albeit not on the provenance or authorship of all the individual arias. How widespread, however, was the pasticcio practice in Venice? Who was involved as composer, impresario, poet, singer, patron or audience member? Which theater cultivated pasticcios, at what time and in what operatic genre? Eleanor Selfridge-Field documents 528 productions of any sort of opera (excluding spoken plays, *intermezzi* and short farces) in Venice in the years 1700-1750; of these, 56 have no composer attribution either in the contemporary sources or in modern research data. The Teatro Sant’Angelo performed 18 of them, San Moisé and San Cassiano twelve each, San Fantin seven (all before 1720) and other venues even fewer. Half of the productions of San Moisé and San Cassiano happened in the 1740s and concerned comic opera, a genre which these two theaters had begun to favor. About half of the 56 productions seem to have been revivals of earlier single-author works, when (newly-composed?) arias by the arranger or by other composers may have been inserted (‘impasticciamento’), but a genuine pasticcio character cannot be ascertained.

---

15 For 68 of the arias, the name of the singer in the pasticcio performance is not known, but it can be concluded from other evidence that the original singer was not involved.
17 Another 15 productions or so were ‘collaborative works’; this figure is not quite certain because we do not always know whether this multi-authorship arose from revisional arrangement or was originally intended.
18 On Venetian impresarios and pasticcios in the early part of this period, see Gianluca Stefani, this volume, pp. 377-396.
Thus, the use of the pasticcio format—an opera with inserted ‘pre-existing’ arias by other composers—was strikingly rare in Venice. Only the Teatro Sant’Angelo, regarded by contemporaries as a cheaper and more popular venue for some of this time, and San Moisè, a small theater focusing on revivals, arrangements and spoken plays, favored pasticcio operas under certain circumstances. Even at Sant’Angelo and San Moisè, about half of the productions counted here were revivals with added extraneous arias. It is no coincidence that Antonio Vivaldi was the impresario and composer/arranger in seven of the 18 Sant’Angelo productions. This set of data could usefully be expanded by following up not only the singers involved, but also, for example, the poets, whose contribution to pasticcio operas in re-writing aria texts for pre-existing music was substantial; not every self-respecting poet would be willing to do this on a regular basis.

Within Vivaldi’s own production, we find a great variety of pasticcio practices, apparently resulting from different circumstances.\textsuperscript{19} Orlando furioso 1714, for example, is a revival of Giovanni Alberto Ristori’s opera of 1713 with many new arias by Vivaldi himself. These ‘refresher arias’ were inserted already in the first season to keep audience interest at a high level, a motivation clearly shared by singers and the composer-impressario. The 1714 libretto does not name the composer. At the other end of the Vivaldi series, Rosmira of 1738 was attributed to him in the libretto, although twelve inserted arias by six different composers are evidenced by the composer’s own score—not in the libretto. In Nerone fatto Cesare of 1715, by contrast, Vivaldi as impresario, arranger and co-composer published a list of the arias and their composers in some exemplars of the libretto (see Figure 1).\textsuperscript{20}

The agency of singers is evident or possible in most of these cases, except with a few arias coming from Giacomo Antonio Perti’s original version of this opera (Venice 1693), or composed by his contemporary Francesco Antonio Pistocchi: no singer was old enough to have sung or rehearsed the originals. The bass virtuoso Anton Francesco Carli (or his father)\textsuperscript{21} composed an aria for himself and is duly named as its composer in the libretto. Definite evidence for the agency of a singer seems also present in Armida al Campo d’Egitto of 1738, where Vivaldi’s score contains the actual manuscript gatherings of two arias inserted for the soprano Margherita Giacomazzi. They were performed by her in an opera by Leonardo Leo in Naples, 1736: the two manuscripts, copied by Neapolitan scribes, attribute the music to Leo. The anonymous libretto contains no clue about these and some other insertions. In this and other pasticcio operas, Vivaldi tends to allocate arias written for superior virtuosos, whom he could not employ, to his own singers, presumably satisfying their ambition. In his Tamerlano (Verona 1735), for example, arias originally performed by Carlo Broschi “detto Farinelli” were sung by the sopranos Pietro Morigi and Margherita Giacomazzi, and arias by the famous contralto Vittoria Tesi were heard from her fellow Florentine Maria Maddalena Pieri. Although the recipients of these pieces must of course have agreed and were perhaps pleased

\textsuperscript{19} See the respective titles in STROHM, 2008.
\textsuperscript{20} See also \textit{ibid.}, pp. 155-159.
\textsuperscript{21} See \textit{Stefani}, this volume.
about the opportunity, I have no doubt that the composer-impresario Vivaldi allocated the arias to them after some scrutiny.\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{Figure 1: Libretto Nerone fatto Cesare, Venice 1715 (I-Bc Lo. 06808), pp. 2f.}
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\textbf{Hamburg and the Mingotti company}

The old Hamburg opera house near the Gänsemarkt was an impresario theater like the Venetian theaters, and for all of the period in question here, Venice was a main supplier of its Italian opera repertoire. From about the turn of the century, imported Italian material came in the form of librettos and individual arias, then more and more of entire Italian scores. Local composers such as Reinhard Keiser, Johann Mattheson and

\textsuperscript{22} \textsc{Strohm}, 2008, pp. 552-556. The Venetian soprano Maria Camati Brambilla “detta La Farnella” (fl. 1729-1775) surely earned her nickname by singing arias composed for more accomplished colleagues. On her personal repertoire, see Zsovár, 2019; id., forthcoming 2021.
Georg Philipp Telemann contributed many newly-composed arias in both languages.\textsuperscript{23} Full German-language operas continued to be produced alongside these imports. Some Italian scores were brought from Vienna and London; personnel connections and shared repertoire also temporarily linked Hamburg with the court (and civic) opera of Brunswick, and with London and Copenhagen. From 1740 onwards the Gänsemarkt opera house was used by the traveling companies of Angelo Mingotti (in 1740) and then Pietro Mingotti, with all-Italian casts and \textit{maestri di cappella}, who produced many pasticcio operas. But even under the old regime before 1740, musical and textual arrangements, translations and pasticcio were daily practice at Hamburg: not a single Italian composer worked there before 1740 and the singers were mostly German.\textsuperscript{24}

Hamburg’s repertoire relied on opera imports as much as Venice produced operas for export.\textsuperscript{25} The share of pasticcios in the total repertoire was higher in Hamburg; but since composer attributions in the librettos are haphazard and fewer scores are extant than for Venice, statistics cannot be conclusive. About 240 musical stage works were produced between 1700 and 1750, including Italian operas, German operas, \textit{intermezzi}, prologues and festal acts; multiple composership can be proposed for at least 30 productions before 1740. In addition, there were perhaps another 20 collaborative works with original contributions by various composers. 20 genuine pasticcio productions were given from 1740 onwards by the Mingotti companies, mostly under the musical direction of Paolo Scalabrini, who habitually added extraneous arias to scores he had created in outline himself.\textsuperscript{26}

Earlier works were often revived at Hamburg with new musical additions of diverse origin (‘impasticciamento’), in arrangements by local \textit{Kapellmeisters} (mainly Keiser, Mattheson, Schürmann and Telemann). The tendency to repeat popular works as often as feasible was more pronounced here than in Venice. ‘Repertoire works’ (in the modern sense of the word) were Keiser’s \textit{Fredegunda} (first given in 1715 and repeated in thirteen subsequent years until 1738), and the two pasticcios \textit{Der ehrsüchtige Arsaces} (1722) and \textit{Nero} (1723), both with music by Giuseppe Maria Orlandini, arranged by Mattheson, which remained popular for many years, too. The original opera from which \textit{Arsaces} was derived was itself a pasticcio, performed in London in 1721 with music by Orlandini and Filippo Amadei; in Hamburg, Mattheson added arias, recitatives and choruses.

The Hamburg ‘repertoire tendency’ was apparently related to a relatively stable ensemble of singers, some of whom never traveled outside the city to take up alternative employment; Margaretha Susanna Kayser, the most popular local prima donna, worked in Hamburg from 1708 to at least 1727. Under these circumstances, it was near-impossible for singers to come up with new pieces from a famous rivalling opera house, as

\textsuperscript{25} For further information about Hamburg’s opera imports see Strohm, 2013.
\textsuperscript{26} See Strohm, 2004. On Scalabrini’s biography, see Hauge, 2018.
would have been possible in Italian centers with their rotating ensembles; in order to insert new arias singers had to rely on the music director or impresario, on patrons or even the audience for the manuscripts. The demand for variety, especially in revived operas, was partly met by repeating pieces from ‘inside’ the Hamburg repertoire: favorite songs thus traveled from one Hamburg production to another for years.  

This practice of internal ‘recycling’ also happened in the pasticcio repertoire of the Kärntnertor Theater at Vienna.

A few examples may suffice to illustrate pasticcio practices at Hamburg before 1740. The German opera Der grossmüthige Roland of 1720 (called Der rasende Roland in a second, identical libretto edition) was an adaptation of Der grossmüthige Roland by Agostino Steffani of 1695 (a translation of his Orlando generoso, Hanover 1691): apparently only the German recitatives of 1695 were retained, and new German and Italian arias by various composers were inserted, including four from Ristori’s and Vivaldi’s Orlando furioso (Venice 1713/1714). The music director was the Brunswick Kapellmeister Georg Caspar Schürmann, who temporarily worked at the Gänsemarkt opera in the absence of Reinhard Keiser. He gave an Italian Orlando furioso in Brunswick in 1722, where the libretto preface explicitly states: “The music has been assembled by G. C. Schürmann from selected arias by the most famous Italian composers” – a description which would also have been true of the Hamburg opera of 1720, although its contents were not identical. In his Hamburg pasticcio Jason, oder Die Eroberung des Güldenen Flüsses of 1720, Schürmann used his own German setting for Brunswick (of 1707, 1708 and 1713) but modernized it with several Italian arias, some extracted from an opera on the same subject, Antonio Bononcini’s La conquista del vello d’oro (Reggio 1717). In 1726, another Hamburg music director (Telemann or Keiser?) similarly enriched an older opera skeleton, Steffani’s opera Der hochmüthige Alexander of 1695 (a translation of his La superbia d’Alessandro, Hanover 1690) with newer Italian arias, this time all taken from Handel’s Alessandro (London 1726), a different opera on the same subject. In the same year, Keiser arranged a genuine pasticcio opera, Der lächerliche Prinz Jodelet, with arias by eight different Italian composers, most of them composed between 1719 and 1724 in Venice, although five arias and one duet had already been used in Hamburg operas of 1717 and 1725. The latter was Bretislaus, oder Die siegende Beständigkeit (1725), where the libretto explains: “The music is by Kapellmeister Keiser, with the

---

27 The duet “Mio tesoro – mio diletto” in Der lächerliche Printz Jodelet, a pasticcio arranged by Keiser in 1726, had already been sung in the pasticcio Jobates und Bellerophon (Hamburg, 1717), whilst “Leon feroce”, “Nel suo sangue”, “Non temer” and “Se avete influssi o stelle” came from Bretislaus (Hamburg, 1725). “Aura seconda” in Nero (1723) reappeared in Der sich rächende Cupido (1724), and so forth.

exception of some inserted Italian arias”. In all these cases, the singers would have to learn new Italian arias and probably were keen to opt for them – but it is unlikely that they had any influence on their supply, since the scores were imported from Italy, where none of these singers had recently been.

Possibly the contrary happened in the serenata Die gecrönte Beständigkeit, given on 7 December 1726 as a benefit performance of the soprano Maria Domenica Polone (Polon, Pollone), one of the few Italian singers at Hamburg in this period, who had formerly served at the court of Waldeck. She was perhaps personally responsible for assembling the arias and duets for this short work. The Hamburg newspaper Relations-Courier advertised the performance on 6 December by attributing the music to the “world-famous Italian virtuoso, Signor Vivaldi”. Seven items can be shown to have been by him; others were by Orlandini and other contemporary composers. One aria was repeated in the popular pasticcio Nero soon afterwards. Polone had been educated at the Ospedale della Pietà under Vivaldi; nevertheless, in 1721 her Waldeck employer had to use the help of Joachim Christoph Nemeitz to send vocal music from Venice to Pyrmont, “in order to supply the court soprano with suitable repertory”. In another Hamburg serenata of 1730, also apparently created by and for Polone (Die in ihrer Friedens-Hoffnung gestärckte Europa, in einer serenata fürgestellt von M. D. Polone), the stylistic horizon is much changed as the libretto announces “arias by Porpora and Leo, choruses and recitatives R. Kayser”: in fact most arias came from Nicola Porpora’s Ezio and Leo’s Catone in Utica, performed in Venice in 1728 and 1729, respectively. Two items had been heard at Hamburg itself in Pharao und Joseph (1728), a pasticcio derived from Antonio Caldara, in which Polone had also appeared.

Keiser’s pasticcio Circe (1734) is a work on a new libretto; its literary model had been a pasticcio drama in French and Dutch. The special task of the poet (Johann Philipp Praetorius) was to accommodate as many existing Italian arias as possible: “The Italian arias are all still new on our stage, and by the best masters in Europe […] The other arias, choruses and recitatives are compositions by […] Keiser”. Of the 18 arias and five duets with Italian texts, eleven arias and two duets by Hasse, Handel, Orlandini,


Giacomelli and Leonardo Vinci can be identified in the score, none of them older than 1729. Although there is little doubt that the main beneficiaries of this effort were the singers, it seems equally certain that selection, negotiation, adaptation and rehearsal had to be shared between several agents, perhaps including audience members and singers’ patrons. Singers had to present their arias to the musical director or impresario in any case to get them inserted into the performing score and libretto, usually with textual and musical adaptations; a major factor was the competition of rivalling performers for the best possible aria set within a production.\textsuperscript{34} The influence of audience members and patrons has recently attracted more attention.\textsuperscript{35}

The pasticcio practice of the Mingotti companies was obviously different from that of a resident opera company, because traveling troupes would carry their musical repertoire with them, enabling them to repeat many items as novelties in different places.\textsuperscript{36} The Mingottis had a relatively stable ensemble (although individual singers joined or left each year), so that the artists could repeat their own personal ‘repertoire’ from venue to venue. Pietro Mingotti regularly played in Hamburg from 1743 to 1748, often repeating successful operas in subsequent seasons. Variety was created by replacing many arias from season to season while maintaining the recitatives and some aria skeleton (by Scalabrini) for each opera. The newly-inserted arias, which often replaced earlier insertions, partly came from opera productions in the North-German area, including the court operas at Berlin and Dresden, or were transmitted in manuscripts circulating in the region. The librettos usually only say that the music was “by Scalabrini except for some inserted arias by various composers”; but manuscript scores contain further composer attributions, and several libretto copies have handwritten attributions which are largely correct.\textsuperscript{37}

Since the Mingottis were in the habit of selling copies of favorite arias through their concert master (Franz Joseph Carl Pirker), knowledge of composer attributions

\textsuperscript{34} Schröder, 1995, p. 111, where this announcement is not mentioned. Details about the composers of 13 numbers in Strohm, 1976, vol. 2, pp. 270f.

\textsuperscript{35} Brandenburg, this volume (pp. 271-283), presents compelling evidence for the struggle of a singer (Marianne Pirker) for favorable treatment in Hamburg and Copenhagen productions of 1748-1749 – at the time when she began to obtain \textit{prima donna} roles under Mingotti on a regular basis.

\textsuperscript{36} Strohm, 2011, p. 79, with reference to English patrons returning from Italy. Further important patrons are mentioned in Over, 2019, especially pp. 95f. and 102f. Impresarios and courtly patrons surely owned music collections exceeding those of individual performers. An example is Marianne Pirker’s account on arias sung by her in private at the Danish court on 14 December 1748: the Queen herself had sent arias from her collection to the singer, who on the day of the audition had to sing five more “from the Queen’s books”, of her own only ones. See Müller von Asow, 1917, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{37} For essential information see ibid., and Theobald, 2015.
can have spread through this secondary market as well as by hearsay. It seems, in any case, that the selection of compositions to be inserted in the Hamburg operas of 1743-1747 was firmly in the hands of the Kapellmeister, Scalabrini, and his librettists and translators. The Mingottis must have had an opera library which migrated with them on their tours; it would have held the repertoire from which the company’s singers could be fed for each performance. It was being developed by the acquisition of new scores from patrons and colleagues in the centers visited.

**London and Handel**

Pasticcio practices of Italian opera in London, 1700-1750, followed several different procedures over the years. In the earliest phase between 1705 and 1717, Italian opera scores were imported to serve as the basis of adaptations for the London stages – first the Drury Lane theater, and from 1708 the Haymarket theater under its director John Vanbrugh. The creation of “operas after the Italian manner” involved local composers, immigrant adaptors, for example the Roman-born Nicola Haym, and many Italian singers, spearheaded by the Tuscan soprano Margarita de l’Épine and the castrato Valentino Urbani from Udine; Nicola Grimaldi, Diana Vico and others followed. Few manuscripts of the opera music are still extant, but the “symphonies” and arias were usually printed. Because of the intense free publicity and the musical competition that surrounded these performances, there are numerous written testimonies in newspapers, pamphlets and satires. At least 24 London operas before 1718 had multiple authorship, against only six or seven operas by a single composer – mostly Handel. The pasticcio practice was somehow congenial to this fashionable society in its craze for Italian culture.

Successful productions were repeated in later seasons, usually enriched with new imported arias (‘impasticciamento’); English arias of the earliest versions were replaced by new Italian ones. Internal recycling of favorite songs was frequent; the most popular items migrated from one singer to another in successive seasons, with parodied words if reappearing in a different opera. The pasticcios *Thomyris, Pyrrhus and Demetrius, Clo-

38 In 1744 Franz Pirker was responsible for the sale of copies of the company’s arias to the public in the context of public concerts: see Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. VI and VII.

39 On the acquisition of manuscript and printed arias by Franz Pirker in London (1748-1749), for his wife Marianne Pirker, or in general for the impresario Pietro Mingotti, see Brandenburg, this volume, pp. 271-283. Inevitably, traveling companies carried opera scores and librettos (a ‘traveling library’) with them, since they repeated many performances in distant places. The six opera scores performed in Hamburg in 1743-1747 (see Strohm, 2004) were ‘Archivpartituren’ showing successive layers of use over several years. From this stock of musical material fresh copies could be derived as required.

40 Price, 2001, discusses London pasticcios of the entire 18th century; most noteworthy is his introduction on the aesthetic premises.

tilda, Almahide, Hydaspes and Ernelinda lasted longer in London than the singers who originally presented them. Although particular arias were “introduced” or “inserted” by certain singers for particular performances, as Lindgren has formulated, it is clear from the arias’ origins and other evidence that the impresarios (John Jacob Heidegger, among others) and music directors (Nicola Haym, among others) were in charge and distributed the musical material to the singers as they saw fit. To give examples, two opera scores by Carlo Francesco Pollarolo, La fede riconosciuta (Vicenza 1707) and La vendetta d’amore (Rovigo 1707) have been identified by Lindgren as the sources for arias and a sinfonia movement surfacing in five different London pasticcios in the years 1709-1713: they were all connected to the castrato Nicola Grimaldi, who personally arranged these pasticcios and apparently owned the two scores, which are still extant in London today. Arias from Antonio Bononcini’s La regina creduta re (Venice 1706) were sung in three different London pasticcios by Grimaldi, Urbani and Mrs Catherine Tofts, although none of these singers had participated in the original Venetian production. The various singers who presented such arias in London must have received them from Grimaldi: he was the ‘agent’ of these pasticcio arrangements in both senses of the word. An opera from which arias were transferred into several London pasticcios was Handel’s Agrippina (Venice 1709): the composer also used this score himself in London as a quarry for his Rinaldo (1711). Yet in none of his operas of these years did Handel insert pieces by a different composer (except by reworking them musically); thus he established a contrast between the multi-author type of pasticcio and the ‘pasticcio from one’s own works’, a distinction he observed until the late 1730s.

Since modern reception and research has privileged Handel’s operas over those of his contemporaries, his pasticcios have also received more attention than those arranged by his colleagues. This may seem an unfair distraction from the real cultural circumstances of the time. But Handel’s habit of not mixing his own compositions with those of others in the same opera does seem to distinguish him from most of his colleagues in London and in Italy. Three exceptions, all of the later 1730s, are known today: Handel inserted four arias by other composers (Vinci and Ristori) into a revival of his Poro in 1736, for the benefit of the newly-engaged castrato Domenico Annibali, who had

42 Ibid., p. 646, and similarly elsewhere. Some arias can have been chosen by singers, for example by Diana Vico in the case of Vivaldi’s arias (see p. 651). Lindgren does show, however, that Valentino Urbani and Nicola Grimaldi acted as impresarios when introducing arias for themselves and others in operas under their responsibility (see pp. 637f. and 641f., respectively).
43 GB-Lam, MS 77: La fede riconosciuta; MS 78: La vendetta d’Amore.
44 Lindgren, 1988, pp. 658f.
45 See Kubik, 1982.
47 In Italy, Leo, Vinci, Porpora, Orlandini, Vivaldi and many others occasionally performed their operas with inserted pieces by other composers.
sung the Ristori arias in Dresden; in a revival of his *Ariodante* in 1736, Handel inserted several arias by Leo, Gaetano Maria Schiassi, Pietro Vincenzo Chiocchetti and perhaps others for Gioacchino Conti “detto Gizziello”, who had sung them in Italy before. In Handel’s *Giove in Argo* (1739), a pasticcio mainly taken from his own works, the composer inserted two arias and an accompagnato recitative by Francesco Araja for the new mezzosoprano Costanza Posterla. She had not sung these in their original performance in Venice in 1735, but had since traveled with Araja as far as St. Petersburg and was surely familiar with the pieces. Handel also produced the pasticcios *Oreste* (1734) and *Alessandro Severo* (1738), which contained only his own music. Many of the arias used in *Oreste* were considerably older and may not have been familiar to their new singers, whereas in *Alessandro Severo* the borrowed music allowed several singers to repeat earlier successes. In the pasticcio operas made up of music by other composers which Handel arranged for London from 1730 to 1737, he had to write or adjust many recitatives, transpose and sometimes adapt arias by others, and may have composed shorter items (duets? sinfonia movements? choruses?), although his authorship of any item has yet to be demonstrated. A pasticcio opera in which Handel’s creative involvement had been presumed, *Elpidia* (1725), has recently been separated from his output altogether: John H. Roberts showed that the main composer of this score, Leonardo Vinci, was also himself the arranger and composed the recitatives, on a commission negotiated for him by the London agent Owen Swiney in Venice.

That Handel’s pasticcios had the function of presenting new singers to the audience with arias that suited their skills seems beyond doubt. This was also the practice of his London rivals, for example in the so-called “Opera of the Nobility”, which presented pasticcios in the 1730s for vocal stars such as Farinelli and Caffarelli. The question is, again, one of agency: how often did the singers actually propose these arias themselves, and how often did the music directors allocate them from their own resources? Was there a compromise, a negotiation, a collaboration? A newly-engaged singer usually had greater influence on his parts, especially when taking on a role originally intended for a colleague with different vocal preferences (as happened in revivals of *Elpidia* and *Ormisda*). A few singers seem to have been particularly privileged in this matter. Antonia Merighi sang nine arias from her previous Italian roles in the two Handel pasticcios of 1730-31; Giovanni Carestini sang altogether 15 arias from his earlier repertoire in three Handel pasticcios of 1733-34. The castratos Bernacchi and Senesino also concentrated on arias from their own background in their respective appearances in 1730 and 1731. Aria ‘substitutions’ made by Handel in his pasticcio scores often reflected the preferences of newcomers – although by the same token, it often seems that he originally had other arias in mind for them and did not wait for their suggestions. Generally,

49 Roberts, 2016.
50 See the tables in Strohm, 2009.
it seems that not many singers supplied arias from their own repertoires for the London performances.\textsuperscript{51}

We have to ask, however: what ‘was’ actually the repertoire of these singers? Celeste Gismondi, for example, had been an \textit{intermezzi (buffa)} singer in Naples before arriving in London in autumn 1732; she was the talk of the town.\textsuperscript{52} In the pasticcio \textit{Catone} (based on Leonardo Leo’s \textit{Catone in Utica}, Venice 1729) she sang five arias, none of which had been part of Leo’s original score; three of them were replaced by others before and during the London performances. Did she have access to any of these eight arias before she arrived in London? Berthold Over has suggested that Gismondi might have brought her arias personally with her from Naples, where she had known them through her participation in the respective operas as \textit{buffa} singer, and from travels in Italy.\textsuperscript{53} It is more likely that these \textit{opera seria} arias were already available in London when she arrived. Three arias from Hasses’s \textit{Attalo} (Naples 1728) had been sung by Antonia Merighi in Handel’s pasticcio \textit{Venceslao} (1731);\textsuperscript{54} thus the two remaining arias from Merighi’s role in \textit{Attalo}, which were now inserted for Gismondi, may also have been available already. These and other Neapolitan items seem to have reached London in 1729 through Merighi and Antonio Bernacchi, her Naples partner, as well as Anna Maria Strada. \textit{Catone} contains no arias performed in Naples in the seasons 1729-1732, when Gismondi was still engaged there. This pasticcio is a predominantly Venetian product: in addition to the music by Leo, it includes three arias by Hasse, composed for Venice in 1730-1732, and seven (regardless of their original place of performance) by Vivaldi and Porpora, who also worked in Venice at the time.\textsuperscript{55} English patrons such as Charles Sackville and others, who visited Venice in 1732, may well have brought Leo’s \textit{Catone in Utica} and most of the other music of \textit{Catone} with them back to London.\textsuperscript{56}

Handel’s soloists sometimes cultivated the repertoire of a more illustrious colleague. Anna Maria Strada, for example, not only took over the \textit{prima donna} parts of Faustina Bor-

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{51} The term “arie di baule” (suitcase arias) originally used to refer to composers, who of course often re-deployed their own older arias in newer operas; in the recent literature, however, it is mistakenly interpreted as if it referred to singers only. As regards the ‘uses’ of baggage arias, a distinction should be made between stage productions – where many other interests were competing – and solo auditions, academies or benefit concerts. A solo audition for a court opera (Stuttgart) was probably the purpose of the arias Franz Pirker recommended to his wife Marianne, see Brandenburg, this volume, p. 279, n. 32; the arias loosely assembled in Domenica Polone’s Hamburg serenata of 1726 (see above) were intended for concert performances.

\textsuperscript{52} See Strohm, in prep.; Strohm, 1985, pp. 249-258.

\textsuperscript{53} Over, 2019, pp. 88-101.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. 91.

\textsuperscript{55} An early Venetian copy of Hasse’s \textit{Attalo} is I-Vnm, Cod.It.Cl.IV.483 (= 10007).

\textsuperscript{56} Over, 2019, pp. 95 and 102f. On Hasse’s \textit{Demetrio} (from which Faustina Bordoni’s aria “Fra tanti pensieri” was sung by Gismondi in \textit{Catone}), and its dedicatee, Charles Sackville, see Hasse, 2014.
doni and Francesca Cuzzoni in Handel operas revived with her, she also preferred arias written for the castratos Farinelli and Carlo Scalzi, and for the Venetian soprano Lucia Facchinelli, in her pasticcio appearances. As mentioned above, similar ambitions were held by Vivaldi’s Venetian singers with arias originally written for a Farinelli or a Tesi.

London patrons and audiences were usually informed about authorship and singers’ preferences. The librettos of the Handel pasticcios, and of pasticcios arranged by others in the years 1720-1740, lacked composer attributions. Hearsay, newspapers, and notably the published scores of favorite songs transmitted many composer names, especially when the composers were present in the city or had noble patrons. Just as in Hamburg, librettos with handwritten composer attributions exist, for example one of Elpidia (in the British Library, 639.g.29).

In the 1740s (and later), pasticcios were again the main fare of London serious opera. Foreign impresarios and traveling opera ensembles or soloists imported much music, appreciated on the continent, which local poets and musicians had to arrange. When Christoph Willibald Gluck wrote two operas for the impresario Francesco Vannecki in 1745-46, he partly derived the music from his own earlier works, a common practice of musical visitors to London. This may be compared with the Vienna Burgtheater, where Gluck presented his Semiramide riconosciuta in 1748 and where Baldassare Galuppi (in 1748-49) and Niccolò Jommelli (in 1749) both had their foreign debuts in opera. All these Viennese operas were newly composed, ambitious works. We are faced with two different operatic environments, of which London was in many respects the more modern one.

The Theater am Kärntner Tor in Vienna, 1728-1748

The opera repertoire of this theater is at present being researched by an international research group under the direction of Andrea Sommer-Mathis (Vienna). The theater itself, built as Comoedi-Hauss by the city magistrate of Vienna in 1709, began to play Italian operas in 1728, along with spoken comedies, farces and intermezzi; in 1748, when the Burgtheater (Theater nächst der Burg) was officially inaugurated, repertoires

---

57 A typical title of many is the printed edition by John Walsh: Farinelli’s celebrated Songs &c. Collected from Sigr. Hasse, Porpora, Vinci and Veracini’s operas. Set for a German flute, violin or harpsicord. vol. I. no. 2. [Continued as] Hasse, Vinci, Veracini & Pescetti’s Chamber Aires. For a German flute, violin or harpsicord. Being the most celebrated songs & ariets collected out of all their late operas. vol. I. no. 3-5. [Continued as] Galuppi, Hasse, Vinci, Lampugnani, Veracini & Pescetti’s Chamber Aires, etc. vol. I. no. 6, 7. vol. 2. no. 1-7 [c.1737-1750]. (GB-Lbl, Music Collections g.444). These pieces are not ‘chamber music’ in the modern sense, but opera arias for domestic use, arranged for instruments.

58 The present state of knowledge is outlined in Sommer-Mathis, 2015. See also the contribution of Judit Ősovár in this volume, pp. 425-446. A volume presenting new research of several authors, edited by Andrea Sommer-Mathis, is scheduled for publication in 2021.
of staged works in Vienna began to be differently assigned by the court. Until 1735, the Kärntnertortheater could not officially declare its productions to be “operas”, as this would have conflicted with an Imperial privilege awarded long ago to the singer Francesco Ballerini, who died in 1734. Thus the productions of the *dramma per musica* genre before 1735 were officially called “Intermezzi” (“Zwischenspiele”); act divisions were not shown in the librettos, although the performances mostly had act divisions, involving set-changes and often also ballets and/or comic intermezzi. There was no language mixture (unlike Hamburg); the full operas were all in Italian until 1741, with German translations published alongside.

The pasticcio status was predominant: of c. 150 operas produced in 20 years, at most 30 are attributable to a single composer. This is at present only an estimate: most of the librettos lack a composer attribution, and of the only eleven extant complete scores, although mostly attributed to individual composers, five are nevertheless *impassicciati* with arias by others. 16 other operas have been attributed to single composers in the libretto or other contemporary sources (the Viennese newspaper, *Wiennerisches Diarium*, and the correspondence of the Questenberg court agent Georg Adam Hoffmann): yet some of these attributions make characteristic exceptions pinpointing pasticcio procedures. The libretto preface of *La caccia in Etolia* (3 April 1733) ascribes the music to Geminiano Giacomelli “and others”. Two attributions to Johann Adolf Hasse are similarly inflected: for *Lo specchio della fedeltà* (1st January 1733), the newspaper *Wiennerisches Diarium* tells us that “the arias are mostly by the famous Sassone, and the remainder equally by the most prominent Italian masters”. In *Tarconte principe de’ Volsci* (14 August 1734), the “music was by the famous composer Hasse detto il Sassone, except for two arias” (we are not told which). *Lo specchio della costanza* (December 1738) was intended to be a medley of arias from earlier seasons; it served for the internal recycling of the music. The libretto describes it as “a new opera, except for many arias sung in carnival 1736 in this privileged theater, and some others, which have been applauded in the current year”. The precise make-up of the opera includes repeated items from the years 1736, 1737 and 1738, but also at least two others (the titles of Kärntnertor productions in the right-hand column are preceded by a <):

59 On the administrative history of the theater, see Schenk, 1969.
60 On Hoffmann and the Kärntnertortheater, see Perutková, 2015.
61 A-Wn, 444.612-A.M.
63 „Die Music von dem berühmten Compositor Hasse ditto il Sassone […] ausser zwey Arien.“ (*Wiennerisches Diarium*).
64 „Operetta Nuova, a riserva di molte arie, che sono state cantate il Carnovale dell 1736 in questo Privileggiato Teatro, & alcune, che hanno avuto aprovazzione in quest Anno corrente“/„Eine Neue Operette biß auf verschiedene Arien, so in dem Fasching im Jahr 1736. und anheuer mit beliebter Genehmhaltung gesungen worden“: *Lo specchio della costanza*, Vienna 1738: A-Wn, 444.311-A.M.
Yet further internal and external imports are presumably hidden under parodied texts; there are altogether 16 arias including those in the intermezzi, one duet and the coro finale. In Bacco trionfante dall’Indie, by Franz Pirker (1728), the libretto preface says: “The reader is informed that for respectable motives a few arias have been inserted that had already been sung in Italy”. Surely the most important of these “respectable motives” was the wish of singers to repeat Italian arias, whether they had themselves sung them before or not. A major research difficulty, however, is the absence of singers’ names from almost all of the extant librettos, so that the agency of performers cannot be easily assessed.

Analysis of the extant full scores and comparison of the theater’s librettos with musical repertoires elsewhere in Europe leads further. Italian singers frequently arrived in Vienna to perform at the Kärntnertor; their home-base was usually Venice, sometimes Milan (then under Habsburg administration) or Bologna. That these singers imported opera music from Italy is certain, although only occasionally can it be shown that they had sung the arias before. Far more frequently do we have to assume a simultaneous and parallel transfer of musical scores through impresarios and their agents, through patrons (such as Count Questenberg of Jaroměřice/Jarmeritz, who was a patron of the theater, or the Graz noble family of Atttems), or through traveling musicians and other artists. Some musical copies were sent by post on request of regional patrons. A theater library must have existed at the Kärntnertor in which musical repertoire was assembled to feed the demands of an excessively rich and rapid production.

---

66 For details see STROHM, forthcoming 2021.
67 For important case studies see ZSOVÁR, forthcoming 2021, and ID., this volume.
68 See PERUTKOVÁ, 2015; KOKOLE, 2016.
69 This hypothesis is elaborated in STROHM, forthcoming 2021.
Complete operas by external composers rarely made it to the stage unchanged. Instead, local musicians and poets, surely in collaboration with the singers, stuffed them out with new arias, the more so when the same (skeleton) opera was to be revived in a later season – which, however, happened relatively rarely by comparison with Hamburg, for example. The ‘impasticciamento’ of five extant full scores is briefly described as follows.\(^\text{70}\)

- **Eumene (1730).**\(^\text{71}\) Score attributed to Francesco Rinaldi (probably a pseudonym for the music director in those years, Franz Joseph Carl Pirker); but also containing four arias by Giovanni Antonio Giai, Orlandini, Leo and Giovanni Battista Pescetti (all originally given in 1729 and 1730 in Rome and Venice).

- **Giulio Cesare (1731).**\(^\text{72}\) Score attributed to “Hendl” and based on his *Giulio Cesare in Egitto* (London 1724). Only six closed numbers of the present 21 were taken from this opera (which include two accompagnatos), for which probably only the printed London edition had been used; three came from his *Admeto* (1727), one from *Rodelinda* (1725); one each of the others was by Caldara, Tomaso Albinoni and Porpora. The recitatives were of course written locally.

- **Artaserse (1732).**\(^\text{73}\) The score is attributed to Leonardo Vinci. Its contents correspond to the Roman premiere of 1730, but two arias by Handel are inserted; one of these (“Fra tempeste il legno infranto”) had also been sung in the Vienna *Giulio Cesare* and was parodied here as “Vanne pur tra selve ircane”, imitating Metastasio’s original words.

- **Medea riconosciuta (1735).**\(^\text{74}\) The score is attributed to Vinci and is derived from his *Medo* (Parma 1728). Eleven arias are inserted, one each composed by Leo, Vinci, Andrea Stefano Fiorè and Luca Antonio Predieri, the others are of unknown provenance.

- **La fedeltà sin alla morte (1741).** The score in Vienna (A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17950) is of Florentine provenance; the work is the opera *Arsace* (originally *Amore e maestà*, 1715) by the Florentine court Kapellmeister Giuseppe Maria Orlandini. This opera was well-known all over Europe and circulated in many versions. The present version seems to hail from a Florentine production of 1732, which was itself a pasticcio of Orlandini’s own compositions, with a few arias by others. The Viennese libretto shows that the performance exactly reproduced the version found in this score.

---

70 Further details in ibid.
71 Full score: D-MEIr, Ed 147p.
73 Full score: A-Wgm, IV 11476 (Q 2100).
The performers, authors and audiences of pasticcio operas in Hamburg, London and Vienna were interested in brilliant music with theatrical impact. They did not care exactly from where or how the scores had arrived, except that everyone gave Italy credit for the best music of the time. Venice, in turn, offered the fantastic entertainment of opera to anyone who arrived with money in the city, employing many non-Venetian Italians as well as citizens. Just as these two major aspects of the genre, the aesthetic-imaginary and the commercial-professional, worked into each other, so the contributions of individual arts and artists to individual productions can seldom be neatly separated. The foregoing study has focused on singers and arias, a relatively narrow aspect of this ‘dream factory’. But it may have demonstrated how variable or contradictory the solutions were. Sweeping statements about abstract concepts such as “authorship” or indeed “co-authorship” are easy to make; we should be listening more to the evidence found on the factory floor of human behavior.

**Sources**


Farinelli’s celebrated Songs &c. Collected from Sigr. Hasse, Porpora, Vinci and Veracini’s operas. Set for a German flute, violin or harpsicord. vol.1. no.1, 2. [Continued as:] Hasse, Vinci, Veracini & Pescetti’s Chamber Aires. For a German flute, violin or harpsicord. Being the most celebrated songs & ariets collected out of all their late operas. vol. 1. no. 3-5. [Continued as:] Galuppi, Hasse, Vinci, Lampugnani, Veracini & Pescetti’s Chamber Aires, etc. vol. 1. no. 6, 7. vol. 2. no. 1-7 [c.1737-1750]; GB-Lbl, Music Collections g.444.

**Giacomelli, Geminiano et al.**, La caccia in Etolia, Vienna 1733; libretto: A-Wn, 444.612-A.M.

**Handel, George Frideric et al.**, Giulio Cesare, Vienna 1731; score: D-MEIr, Ed 129a.

**Hasse, Johann Adolf,** Attalo, score: I-Vnm, Cod.It.Cl.IV.483 (= 10007).  

**Keiser, Reinhard,** Bretislaus, oder Die siegende Beständigkeit, Hamburg 1725; libretto: D-B, 1 in Mus T 6 R (and elsewhere).

**Lo specchio della costanza**, Vienna 1738; libretto: A-Wn, 444.311-A.M.

**Nerone fatto Cesare**, Venice 1715; libretto: I-Bc, Lo.06808.

**75 Without isolating this topic, opera history through the perspective of singers and singing seems an important new project. I do not mean singers’ biographies: rather, a view on the productions from the angle of the interests and actions of their creators or ‘agents’. Some remarks on such a history of ‘voices’ (as I called them then) are in Strohm, 2002.**

Orlandini, Giuseppe Maria et al., La fedeltà sin alla morte, Vienna 1741; score: A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17950.

Orlando furioso, Wolfenbüttel 1722; libretto: D-B, Mus.T 12-1/7.

PollaroLo, Carlo Francesco, La fede riconosciuta, Vicenza 1707; score: GB-Lam, MS 77.

Id., La vendetta d’amore, Rovigo 1707; score: GB-Lam, MS 78.


Praetorius, Johann Philipp/Keiser, Reinhard, Circe, Hamburg 1734; libretto: D-B, 27 in Mus T 7 R (and elsewhere).

Rinaldi, Francesco et al., Eumene, Vienna 1730; score: D-MEIr, Ed 147p.

Strattonica, Naples 1727; libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2439.02 (and elsewhere).


Id. et al., Artaserse, Vienna 1732; score: A-Wgm, IV 11476 (Q 2100).

Wienerisches Diarium.

**Literature**


Kokole, Metoda, Migrations of Musical Repertoire. The Attems Music Collection from Around 1744, in: Musicians’ Mobilities and Music Migrations in Early Modern
Europe: Biographical Patterns and Cultural Exchanges (Mainz Historical Cultural Sciences/Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften 33), ed. by Gesa zur Nieden/Berthold Over, Bielefeld 2016, pp. 341-370.


Perutková, Jana, Der glorreiche Nahmen Adami. Johann Adam Graf von Questenberg (1678-1752) als Förderer der italienischen Oper in Mähren, Vienna 2015.


Schenk, Eleonore, Die Anfänge des Wiener Kärntnertortheaters (1710 bis 1748), PhD Vienna 1969.


Strohm, Reinhard, Celestina’s Repertory (liner notes), in: CD La Celestina (Sunhae Im/René Jacobs), in prep.


Theobald, Rainer, Die Opern-Stagioni der Brüder Mingotti 1730-1766, Vienna 2015.


Id., Insights into the Early Years of Vienna’s First Public Opera House: Farinella at the Kärntnertortheater, 1730-1732, in: Opera as Institution: Networks and Professions (1730-1917), ed. by Ingeborg Zechner/Cristina Scuderi, Münster et al. 2019, pp. 37-54.
1. Pasticcio Principles in Different Arts
Antoine Watteau’s pasticci

HANS KÖRNER

The Embarkation from Cythera?

In his article published in the Burlington Magazine in 1961, Michael Levey, director of the National Gallery in London from 1973 to 1985 and acclaimed connoisseur of 18th-century French art, offered nothing less than a new interpretation of a key painting of the 18th century.¹ His starting point is a philological problem. With much hesitation and only after having been prompted by the Academy, Antoine Watteau submitted his reception piece in 1717 (Figure 1). The report recorded the following title: Le pelérinage à l’isle de Citere. For the moment we will put aside the question of the title’s translation, as it would lead straight to the problem which we will only approach gradually.

Figure 1: Antoine Watteau, Le pèlerinage à l’isle de Cythère, 1717, Oil on canvas, Paris, Musée du Louvre.

¹ Levey, 1961.
Firstly, a summary description: A young cavalier is kneeling in front of a young seated woman in the group of figures closest to the beholder. He is gesturing lively with his hand and is leaning towards her, certainly to whisper words of love. She remains reserved, only the inclination of her head reveals that she is listening to her admirer’s words. However, this does not go quickly enough for the putto huddling by her feet. Impatiently, he is tugging her dress. The couple further to the left is about to leave. He has stood up and is offering his lady both hands to assist her with getting up. The woman from the next couple is looking back to this little scene, while her cavalier is putting his arm around her waist and is presumably urging her to move on. The hill slopes behind the couple. At the foot of the hill there are two couples in rural costume tightly crouched together and taken up in an animated conversation. Then again, a fashionably dressed man, who is turning around to his companion dressed in peasant costume. She is grabbing his arm lovingly, although not in a very gracious manner. To ensure that both find their way, a putto is flying ahead keeping the cavalier’s cane and pointing towards the left with his other hand. In the left-hand corner a few couples are already close to their destination, a golden ship. A cavalier embraces his lady, probably to help her embark the ship. The last couple on the left-hand side is wholly in consent. He is bending his upper body in an affected pose towards her. She has linked her arm with his and is looking at him affectionately. On the ship two lightly dressed rowers greet the arriving couples warmly. Above, a group of putti is flying: one is holding an arrow, another a bow, and another a burning torch.

Figure 2: Antoine Watteau, L’Embarquement pour Cythère, 1719/20, Oil on canvas, Berlin, Schloß Charlottenburg.
A few years later, in the penultimate or last year before his early death, Watteau painted a second version of his masterpiece, which was bought by Frederick the Great, an admirer of Watteau’s art (Figure 2). The application of the paint is less free, the contours more precise, the modelling more plastic; the couple on the bottom right is a new addition. The garden sculpture, which was a herm of Venus in the older version from 1717, became a full statue of Venus in the version in Berlin. Despite these changes, the Berlin version is about the same as the Paris version. But what is going on?

A historical title for the later version was handed down as well. Jean de Jullienne was a friend of Watteau’s and he marketed Watteau after his death. The engravings published after 1735 under the title *L’Œuvre d’Antoine Watteau* reproduced his paintings while at the same time serving as a republication of Watteau’s print sets. This publication has the character of an illustrated catalogue raisonné. However, it is not a complete one. A few of Watteau’s most important works are missing, such as the first version of *The Embarkation for Cythera* in the Louvre or the great Pierrot. This might in part be because Jullienne could not provide the necessary original for each engraving; or perhaps because he preferred to reproduce paintings as prints which were in his possession and which he could then sell on, aided by the publicity of this catalogue raisonné. For art historians Jullienne’s album with engravings after Watteau’s paintings is a fluke. A large number of lost paintings or decoration was preserved in those prints. Furthermore, Jullienne’s collection of prints is a helpful tool for the attribution of paintings.

Jullienne’s second publication with reproductions of Watteau’s paintings and decorations is useful in another way as well. The engravings are reproduced with a caption. There is no evidence that Watteau gave his paintings titles. The picture titles used today were only invented after Watteau’s death by Jullienne or by littérateurs commissioned by Jullienne. If we consider the titles offered by the engravings as what they are (usually, they are the beginning of a picture-poem), that is valuable source of contemporary interpretation, not necessary the same as the artist’s. As they have the advantage of being contemporary, then we should at least gratefully accept them as a guideline, albeit not necessarily as a compulsory template of interpretation. That is particularly true if they were published by a friend of Watteau’s.

In Jullienne’s *L’Œuvre d’Antoine Watteau* Watteau’s painting in Berlin was given the title *L’Embarquement pour Cythère* (*Emarkation to Cythera*). Tardieu’s engraving was made in 1733 (Figure 3). The title recorded in the Academy’s protocol from 1717 is older: *Le pelérinage à l‘isle de Citere*. At this point we cannot avoid the problem of its translation any longer. The preposition “à” is ambiguous. It can mean “to”, as well as “in” or “at”. Therefore, the same title can be translated as “Pilgrimage to Cythera”, which corresponds to the title of the engraving from 1733. However, grammatically equally correct would be the translation “Pilgrimage on Cythera”. In his famous article from 1961, Michael Levey could almost convince all experts with this second translation.
The herm of Venus is decorated with the flowers of love, red roses. Statues or herms of Venus are positioned at places where the Goddess is worshipped. The place of worship of the Goddess of Love was on the island of Cythera. Therefore, we are already on Cythera – Levey’s discovery. According to Levey the couples are not leaving for the island of love, but they are about to leave it.2 The condition of Watteau’s painting prior to conservation and the traditionally assumed melancholic connotation of Watteau’s art supported Levey’s hypothesis. Based on the darkened varnish, Levey thought it is dawn in Cythera. Time to go home.

Challenged by Levey’s interpretation, Hermann Bauer had been arguing for a long time prior to the painting’s restoration that the diffuse light in the painting in the Louvre was an obvious sign of the Poetic, Idyllic and the Enchanted etc. and could not be defined as a particular time of day.3 The restoration chased the shadows of dawn away for good. Still, the problem that worried Levey, remains unsolved. Ultimately, the pilgrims are moving to the left towards the ship, therefore they are moving away from Venus. Hermann Bauer’s solution to the problem: the pilgrimage to Cythera is an allegory, an

allegory for the states of courtship. Watteau did not tell the story of a pilgrimage, but he visualized the persuasion to love.

Watteau did not leave anything un-attempted to emphasize that the departure is not a literal one and that the ship is only a metaphorical vehicle. The ship is golden, the rowers are not human, but delegates of the Goddess. Also, when one starts realizing that the ship is formed like a magnificent Baroque bed, first pointed out by Mirimonde, with a shell motif and some kind of red bed baldachin, then one does not want to see the painting as soberly as Levey did. Where could the pilgrims be heading to anyway? The foggy air blocks any view of a concrete destination. The figures are not only on an island iconographically. The painting itself is island-like. We do not have an entry-point and the painting does not have any exit. The way from the first flirt to the fulfillment of the desire for love dominates its internal spatiality and temporality. This way is embedded in the allegory of Cythera itself; aesthetically and erotically it is out of question whether the couples actually wanted to go somewhere else, or if that was it.

Hermann Bauer’s insight that Watteau is telling the story of the persuasion to love through couples in different situations was not entirely new. Already Auguste Rodin associated the painting with a “longue action”, the states and successes of courtship depicted in different phases of action like a film strip. The sitting and kneeling, standing up and helping up, moving forward, looking backwards, and walking together peacefully would represent different stages of the successful persuasion to love – a foreshadowing of an amorous future for the first couple to the right.

Auguste Rodin and Hermann Bauer understood that Watteau’s narrative is an improper one, a sequence of different stages of the persuasion to love. Despite knowing that all the couples symbolize a happy couple’s life, what keeps the couples visually connected and what prevents them from falling apart into disconnected groups? Recognized by Hélène Adhémar and Donald Posner as an important precursor to preposition for Watteau’s *Fêtes galantes*, a comparison with an engraving by Bernard Picart – a depiction of a concert in a park – will offer helpful insights (Figure 4). The location is more concrete in Picart’s work than in Watteau’s ‘Embarkations’, however, the various couples are much more isolated: the left couple with the urging cavalier and the reserved woman, the couple reading together on the right next to them, the concert in the center of the picture and the two musicians observed by a person at rest are disconnected and isolated groups in the composition. It is completely different to the musical rhythm described by Vinçon, which the figures in the *Embarkation to Cythera* adhere to and which not only ensures the formal, but also the atmospheric unity.

---

4 Mirimonde, 1962, p. 18.
5 Rodin, 1912, pp. 103ff. In this sense Manuela Vergossen described the narrative structure of the *Embarkation to Cythera* as a “love story that is in a constant metamorphosis” (“Liebesgeschichte, die sich in einer stetigen Metamorphose befindet”). Vergosseen, 2005, p. 89.
6 Rodin, 1912, pp. 103ff.
8 Vinçon, 1996.
As mentioned above, the title Le pelérinage à l’isle de Citere was recorded in the minutes of the Academy by a secretary on 28 August 1717:

“What Sir Antoine Watteau, painter from Valenciennes, accepted on 30 July one-thousand-seven hundred-twelve, brought the mentioned painting, that had been commissioned from him and that depicts le pelérinage à l’isle de Citere. The Academy accepted the mentioned sir Vatteau as an Academician, after it voted in the usual way.”

Strangely enough, the title of the painting “le pelérinage à l’isle de Citere” was crossed out in the protocol afterwards and substituted with the words “une feste galante”. The common explanation for the correction is that the Academicians struggled to categorize Watteau’s painting within the known genres of painting and therefore had to create a genre only for Watteau. But there is strategy behind this correction, one that was favorable not only for Watteau.

Which category should one put Watteau’s academic reception piece in? The painting is of a comparatively large format, which in itself is already ambitious. It shows multiple figures and those figures seem to be embedded in a narrative. This accords with the defi-

---

9 “Le sieur Antoine Watteau peintre de Valenciennes après avoir été agréé le trente juillet mil sept cent douze a fait apporter ledit tableau qui luy avoit été ordonné représentant le pelérinage à l’isle de Citere. L’Académie après avoir pris les suffrages à la manière accoutumée elle a receu ledit sieur Vatteau académicien.” Cited after Morgan Graselli/Rosenberg, 1984, p. 25.
ntion of history painting. It can be assumed that Watteau was also aspiring to the dignity of a history painter and that the title *Le peléranage à l'isle de Citere* reflects the preliminary acceptance of the painting as a history painting. With the change to “a galant feast”, a generically unspecific description, the door to the dignity of professorship which was connected to the title of the history painter, was closed.  

We have a tendency to side with the painter, but we should be careful with making a hasty judgement of an institution such as the French art academy. Did the academicians not have justified reasons to refuse Watteau the title of history painter? A history painting is, according to academic art doctrine, first and foremost a painting that shows a significant episode in the lives of significant people. The narrative has to adhere to three rules, which were also dictated in French theater: the action has to be unitary – targeted at one destination; the location has to be unitary and the action also has to be unitary in terms of time. Bearing these rules in mind, it is understandable that the Academy had problems with Watteau’s picture.

Is it a unified narrative? Does the painting not crumble into variants of the persuasion to love, like already observed by Rodin? Is there a temporal unity, or is Rodin also right in this regard, when he sees it as a “longue action”, hence the unfolding of the galant approaches in different time phases. And where is the spatial unity, if the location became a “non-location”, the literal “Utopos” of the earthly paradise?

Count Caylus made the following critical remark in his memoirs of Watteau:

>“Despite a few pictures, such as The Bride or The Wedding in the Village, The Ball, The Shop Sign he painted for Gersaint, The Embarkation to Cythera, which he painted as a reception piece for our Academy and which he repeated, his compositions do not have an object ("objet"). They never express the struggle of a passion and are therefore robbed of the most piquant parts of painting: I mean the narrative.”

The “objet” for Caylus means the destination of the plot. From this point of view the majority of Watteau’s paintings do not have an object and therefore no narrative either. However, Caylus excluded some of Watteau’s paintings from this critique, amongst them The Embarkation to Cythera. The committee for the reception of new academicians anticipated Caylus’ critique and did not even exclude Watteau’s Embarkation like Caylus did.

10 Kirchner, 2005, pp. 107f., 111.
‘Contact tension’

The Academy was right, but we have to emphasize that Watteau was right artistically. These disruptions of the narrative of a history painting enabled Watteau to visualize a metaphor – he could tell a story without having to connect the figures in a traditional narrative.

Characteristic for Watteau’s artistic method as a whole is this paradoxical way of connecting figures and groups of figures. Some sheets in his œuvre as a draughtsman are preparatory for his compositions. A free compositional study for the Feast of Love in Dresden is extant, executed in red and black chalk (Figure 5). There are three extant studies for the composition of the The Italian Comedians probably painted in 1720: the study in the Musée Jacquemart-André is loosely connected to the finished painting. The red chalk drawing in the British Museum in London is closer to the final composition. With a study from a private collection in New York (Figure 6) the outlines of the composition are set, although there was going to be a few changes to the figures.

Figure 5: Antoine Watteau, Plaisirs d’amour, c. 1717, Drawing, Chicago, Art Institute.

---

So, there are preparatory studies for compositions in Watteau’s paintings, but they are strikingly few. Some were probably lost – however, considering the amount of Watteau’s compositional studies in proportion to his other extant drawings, they constitute less than one percent. On this basis, it can certainly be assumed that originally his compositional studies constituted only a small part of his oeuvre as a draughtsman. Usually, artists prepared a painting by deciding on its overall composition before they started making studies and sketches. Watteau did not follow this common procedure in most cases.

Count Caylus, a close friend of Watteau’s, had to distance himself from his deceased friend as he was a pioneer of classicism and therefore criticizes Watteau in his biography. Because of this he is a valuable source for us. Emphasizing how Watteau did not use compositional studies very often, he reports on the painter’s usual practice: “I said that he usually drew without a particular purpose, because he never made the simplest sketch or a preparatory drawing for one of his paintings.” As observed above, Caylus’s remark was incorrect, but the fact that Caylus, who knew Watteau’s work very well, generalized to that degree confirms how very rarely Watteau made preparatory studies for his paintings, unlike other artists. What did he do then?

“It was his habit to make his studies in a little bound book, so that he always had a great number on hand. [...] When he felt inclined to paint a picture, he would return to this collection. He chose the figures that he liked the best in the moment. Based on those he created his groups, often connected to a landscape in the background, which he had drafted or sketched. Only on a few occasions he did it differently. In this kind
of composition, which is surely not worth imitating, lies the reason for the monotony of his paintings, which Watteau can be criticised for; besides that he repeated the same figure very often without realizing – either because he liked it or because he came across it first while searching.”¹⁴

The quote above was taken from a speech on Watteau’s life given by Count Caylus on 3 February 1748 at the Academy. Strong anti-rococo tendencies were on the rise in 1748, so both the date and the location, the Academy, certainly contributed to Caylus’s critique, but the quote is a valuable record all the same. Watteau usually drew studies of figures, without having a particular painting in mind. He went back to these studies when he was planning on painting a picture and would put them together in a composition only then. A few examples of his artistic practice are representative for many others.

The sketches on a sheet in the Petit Palais in Paris were made using three different types of chalk – typical for Watteau’s late style (Figure 7). The sheet is covered with several unrelated studies. In the top left corner Watteau drew a cavalier at rest. Below, a bare arm with a cloth is visible. In the lower center Watteau studied wine leaves in red and white chalk. On the right he added a seated man, who could be a gardener based on his clothes. We encounter the resting cavalier in *The Enchanted Island* (Figure 8). The painter placed him in the central axis of the picture wearing a green costume with a red tailcoat which has slipped from his shoulder. A musician is playing the flute in a painting in Angers titled *The Expected Explanation* (Figure 9). As is common for Watteau, the musical play has an erotic connotation. A young man – the gardener from the drawing – is sitting in the grass, but is now holding a little bunch of flowers in his hand. Dreamily, he is looking at it, probably contemplating when and if he can dare to declare his love to the lady next to him. This young lady is already inclining towards him trustfully and her facial expression shows that she is expecting this declaration of love with excitement. Once more Watteau used his study of the gardener in one of his paintings. *The Shy Lover* in Madrid is quite similar to the one mentioned above, only the musician and the children are missing and the woman’s affection is more like coy curiosity (Figure 10). The courted woman from the Madrid painting was taken from a drawing by Watteau which is now in the Getty Museum (Figure 11) and which he reused for *The Elysian Fields* in the Wallace Collection (Figure 12).

¹⁴ „Je dis que le plus ordinairement il dessinait sans objet. Car jamais il n’a fait ni esquisse ni pensée pour aucun de ses tableaux. (…) Sa coutume était de dessiner ses études dans un livre relié, de façon qu’il en avait toujours un grand nombre sous sa main. (…) Quand il lui prenait en gré de faire un tableau il avait recours à son recueil, Il choisissait les figures qui lui convenaient le mieux pour le moment. Il en formait ses groupes, le plus souvent en conséquence d’un fond de paysage qu’il avait conçu ou préparé. Il était rare même qu’il en usât autrement. Cette façon de composer, qui n’est assurément pas à suivre, est la véritable cause de cette uniformité qu’on peut reprocher aux tableaux de Wateaux. Indépendamment de ce que sans s’en apercevoir, il répétait très souvent la même figure, ou parce qu’elle lui plaisait, ou parce qu’en cherchant ç’avait été la première qui s’était présentée à lui.“ CAYLUS, 1984, pp. 78f.
Figure 7: Antoine Watteau, Figures et feuilles, Drawing, Paris, Musée du Petit Palais.

Figure 8: Antoine Watteau, L’Île enchanté, c. 1717, Oil on canvas, Private Collection.
Figure 9: Antoine Watteau, La déclaration attendue, c. 1716, Oil on canvas, Angers, Musée des Beaux-Arts.

Figure 10: Antoine Watteau, L’amoureux timide, c. 1716, Oil on canvas, Madrid, Palacio Real.
Figure 11: Antoine Watteau, Femme assise, Drawing, Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum.

Figure 12: Antoine Watteau, Les Champs-Élysée, c. 1717-1718, Oil on canvas, London, Wallace-Collection.
It is this method that was critically described by Caylus. Watteau had picked figure studies from his collection and combined them differently each time. That sounds uncomplicated, but it is not. It is actually really difficult to combine finished figurative material, without making it appear inhomogeneous. In Watteau’s paintings it seems in no way inhomogeneous; it even appears as if the figures were made for nothing else than the respective composition.

Donald Posner plays the matching-game with a drawing of a man playing the guitar, which was probably made prior to the model (Figure 13). Watteau based a little painting in Chantilly on this drawing, in which he also specifies the location: the musician is sitting on a stone bench (Figure 14). Watteau put this figure in a larger context in a painting on display in Dresden (Figure 15). Multiple figures have gathered in a park. A dignified gentleman in a ponderous pose admires the back of a sculpture of a female nude with the eyes of a connoisseur. To the right young men and women are resting on and next to a park bench. A musician is entertaining them with his guitar. It is the guitarist from the drawing. As reported by Caylus above, Watteau “repeated the same figure very often – either because he liked it, or because his eyes fell on it first when we was searching.” The guitarist, crossing his legs and bending his chest forward, appears to have been liked very much by Watteau or “while searching he came across him first”, because he re-appears once more in Watteau’s work, now in a painting that is salvaged in an engraved reproduction (Figure 16). In The Gathering Outside the group of young people was behaving in a civilized way, but the guitarist is now playing amid wilder proceedings. In this case Watteau used a drawing he had made after a painting by Rubens (Figure 17). We observe a proper montage/assembly with prefabricated elements. The appropriate contemporary term for this montage technique would be “pasticcio”.

Continuing with another series of examples, we start with a drawing which shows a seated woman, rendered in Watteau’s typical late style in three different chalks, holding a fan in her left hand and looking and gesturing towards the right – these gestures do not have a narrative purpose in the drawing (Figure 18). In The Venetian Feasts (Figure 19) this figure reappears between the two dancers. Her withdrawal is motivated by the brisk young man. However, the right hand is already angled in the painting, perhaps signaling that her reluctance is only of a temporary nature. The study of the woman was reused for a figure of the seated woman dressed in red in The Enchanted Island. This time the gesture of reluctance, once again like in the study, is made much stronger by stretching the arm. Again, Watteau used the figure study in The Assembly in the Park of the Louvre (Figure 20) (third figure from the right). Should the attribution to Watteau be correct, then the figure can be discovered for a fourth time in a reproduction by Mercier after a lost painting by Watteau.

16 Caylus, 1984, p. 79.
17 See Parker/Mathey 1957, II, p. 305. For further examples see: Vogtherr, 2016, pp. 53f. For considerations about transferring the drawing to the painting surface see: Wenders de Calisse, 2011, pp. 69f.
Figure 13: Antoine Watteau, Guitariste, Drawing.

Figure 14: Antoine Watteau, Le donneur de sérénade, c. 1715, Oil on canvas, Chantilly, Musée Condé.
Figure 15: Antoine Watteau, Réunion en plein air, c. 1717/18, Oil on canvas, Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.

Figure 16: Benoît Audran, after: Antoine Watteau, La Surprise, 1716, Etching, London, British Museum.
Figure 17: Antoine Watteau (after Rubens), Couple, Drawing, Paris, Musée des Arts Décoratifs.

Figure 18: Antoine Watteau, Femme assise, Drawing, New York, Private Collection.
Figure 19: Antoine Watteau, Fêtes vénitiennes, c. 1717/18, Oil on canvas, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland.

Figure 20: Antoine Watteau, Assemblée dans un parc, c. 1717, Oil on canvas, Paris, Musée du Louvre.
One of Watteau’s most striking peculiarities is that he combines drawings of single figures in compositions that do not fall apart despite having been constructed through these single figures. It seems that every figure Watteau took from his stock of drawings and inserted into any context became charged with magnetic power and connected with the other figures naturally. To explain this phenomenon in a less occult way: usually Watteau first prepared his figures one by one, but anticipated right from the beginning that he would be using them for various compositions – to an extent that he only had to put the figures together to create a connection and often even a convincing narrative that makes us believe that the figures were created for exactly this context.

Even isolated studies of single figures, when they happen to be juxtaposed on a sheet of paper connect to each other occasionally. Since the 19th century Watteau has been admired for his mise en page. This refers to an arrangement of single studies, which, however different they might be, join together as a closed whole on the picture plain. Due to the intensified research on Watteau’s work as a draughtsman over the past decade, it was argued that Watteau could not have intended to put his studies in a particular order on the sheet – in later years he took out a sheet he had already used for some studies and then added in a new drawing to an empty spot.\(^\text{18}\) One example comes from the collection of works on paper in the Metropolitan Museum (Figure 21): on the left-hand side Watteau drew a woman with a distaff. The motif and drawing style suggest a dating to 1713-14. Years later (c. 1717-18), the artist used the empty right-hand side of the page to add a study of a young woman’s head.\(^\text{19}\) Both studies remain unconnected to each other, the newly added head study balances the sheet, but only in regards to the formal composition. A sheet in the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam (Figure 22) was also reused by Watteau. He added two small studies of seated women to four views of a woman’s head he had done much earlier. This disrupts the balance of the sheet, and disrupts the ‘spatial harmony’.\(^\text{20}\) If we imagine the sheet without the two later studies, a ‘contact tension’ is created between the views of the woman’s head – despite or because of her facing different directions it creates a sense of a casual gathering of a group of women. Watteau did not have many options for adding the seated women. But he arranged them diagonally facing each other. The sheet in Amsterdam entangles two pseudo-narratives and this entanglement creates additional tension and liveliness for the older and later studies.

On the sheets with single studies that were executed at the same time, this phenomenon becomes more obvious – I called it ‘contact tension/contact electricity’ because of the lack of a more appropriate term.\(^\text{21}\) On a sheet in the British Museum in London, Watteau studied the model in ‘lost profile’ (Figure 23). On the same sheet Watteau captured the model’s face and bust from the front. Two young women seem to be engaged in an intimate conversation. Watteau probably did not intend to achieve this effect, neither is

\(^{18}\) Sonnabend, 2016, p. 27.
\(^{20}\) Plomb/Sonnabend, 2016, p. 216.
it based on a mistake by the beholder. The study of a model from behind on the right-hand side partially overlays his study of her front. Would one intend to read the sheet as a scene, the study of the back would have to be positioned closer to the beholder, being perspectively larger in size than the study of the front. But the opposite is the case: Watteau does not give the viewer any aid to connect the studies to a scene. However, the studies relate to each other, almost as if they did not have any choice.

*Figure 21: Antoine Watteau, Femme à la quenouille/Tête de femme, Drawing, c. 1713-1714/c. 1717-1718, New York, The Metropolitan Museum.*

*Figure 22: Antoine Watteau, Têtes de femme/Femmes assises, Drawing, c. 1717/18, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet.*
The same phenomenon can be observed on a sheet with an actor or a model that Watteau depicted in an actor’s costume, once with bonnet, then without hat and with the head tilted to the side (Figure 24). Watteau did nothing to conceal that this is the same head in two views and that there is no narrative connection between these two studies. But it is difficult not to see the sheets as showing two figures spending time with each other, one placing her head trustingly or lovingly on the other’s shoulder.

*Figure 24: Antoine Watteau, Tête d’acteur, Drawing, Private Collection.*
This magnetism occasionally even works when Watteau placed two or three studies on one sheet. On a sheet at the Louvre, he captured three views of a female and male model (Figure 25). We are tempted to perceive the studies on the bottom right as connected: the fact that the lady turning away thoughtfully appears to be aware of the man’s gaze upon her tempts us to create a little love story around them. Above, the two studies of the men with the bonnet merge together to two men having an active conversation. Even the two studies of a woman inclining her head to the right and to the left respectively are attracted magnetically by the context of the sheet; a context that does not exist. The head’s inclination to the right (seen from our point of view) makes the woman seem to look sadly after the two men in conversation that are hurried away. And the same figure, who is turning her head to the left, seems to have given up. This description is not intended to suggest an interpretation of Watteau’s drawing. Watteau simply filled his sheet. But as he charged his studies with a lot of communicative power, he could not avoid connections being created. This communicative potential is the secret why Watteau only had to combine single studies to create a picture. But nothing is explained yet, especially not the secret. The terms magnetism and ‘contact tension’ were simply swapped for communicative potency.

Figure 25: Antoine Watteau, Femme et homme, Drawing, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.

Was it aesthetic calculation or mere austerity to fill the sheet as much as possible before additional artistic material is required? A decision is perhaps not desired. Regardless of the artist’s intention we nonetheless get the indisputable impression of a coordination of these diverging studies. Watteau will not have found any preconditions for his artistic practice in French art. But as Watteau was from Valenciennes, which had been part of Flanders until seven years before his birth, and was labelled and marketed as a ‘Flemish’ artist at the beginning of his career in Paris, he might have remembered Dutch drawing of the 17th century, which shows parallels to his work as a draughtsman.
The combination of multiple studies on one sheet – multiple heads, heads and figure studies together and/or body parts – was used in 17th-century Dutch draughtsmanship.22 Here, a few examples taken from Peter Schatborn’s exhibition catalogue on Dutch figurative drawings (1981-1982): Jacob de Gheyn II covered his sheet with studies of a young man in different poses, a group of women that is being observed by two other figures, a standing woman with child, one study of an arm and two of hands (Figure 26).23 Some sheets by Abraham Bloemaert combine two studies of a male chest with studies of a leg, a foot and a hand, or head-studies with studies of an arm and a hand – studies that were preparatory for the painting of the Adoration of the Magi in the Niedersächsische Landesgalerie.24 And sometimes this mis en page used by Dutch artists is quite similar to Watteau’s and creates a sense of connection between unrelated drawings. The two studies of a female arm by Caspar Netscher are too far apart on a sheet in the Rijksprentenkabinets in Amsterdam (Figure 27) to have been conceived as one study. The upper right and the lower left hand are gripping the same piece of fabric, so that the two different studies come together to form a common action.

*Figure 26: Jacob de Gheyn II, Femmes, observateurs, femme avec enfant, garçon, bras et mains, Drawing, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet.*

22 Plomb, 2016, pp. 41, 47 with reference to Peter Schatborn’s catalogue of the drawings exhibition in Amsterdam.
24 Ibid., pp. 38f.
Therefore, it seems that there are already cross-references between unrelated studies in Dutch drawing, but these references are usually of compositional or motivic nature. Although there is no direct evidence, it is indisputable however, based on aesthetic experience, that this ‘connectedness’ of the unconnected is much more intense in many of Watteau’s sheets. Yet we have to ask again, but this time not in regards to a composition such as The Embarkation to Cythera but to the pasticcio on his sheets of drawings: what exactly is it that makes these figures, those hands, those heads etc. so open to each other? I could get away with saying that I do not know. However, this avoidance would not be terribly bad and it would not even be completely inappropriate in regards to this aesthetic phenomenon.

In 16th-century Italy the term *non so che* referred to correspondences, atmospheres and accordances which are obvious in their effect, but conveyed in such a subtle way (artistically and habitually), that the acknowledgement of not knowing appears to be the appropriate characterization and mode of appreciation.

French art literature translated the Italian *non so che* with *je ne sais quoi* – later this term became charged with ‘aesthetic-theoretical’ prestige when sentiment replaced the aesthetic-theoretical rules as a category of judgment. Abbé Dubos represents this change of aesthetic paradigms with the publication of the first consequent sensualistic aesthetic, his *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture* published in 1719.

---

26 Dubos, 1993.
In the volume *Watteau au confluent des arts. Esthétiques de la grâce*, published by Valentine Toutin and Chris Ransea, Claude Jamain and Nathalie Kremer introduced the terms *je ne sais quoi* and *air* together with the umbrella term *grâce* as revelatory for Watteau’s art. (The starting point had been Dominique Vivant-Denons admiring words for the *Pèlerinage à l’île de Cithère* and René Vinçon’s reading of Watteau.)\(^{27}\) *Je ne sais quoi*, *air* and *grâce* are open terms which refer to atmospheric qualities. Atmosphere as an aesthetic quality creates unity within the art work, independently of narrative links.\(^{28}\)

Observations of the interrupted gestures in Watteau’s paintings is illuminating for the research question of this article. According to Katalin Barthe-Kovác the impression of interruption in the gestures of Watteau’s figures – the gestures appear to stop before they become more concrete or targeted – contributes to what can be described with the term “grâce”.\(^{29}\) It is this early stopping that creates a degree of uncertainty and of something undefined in the action of the figures or the narrative as a whole. Therefore, it allows them to work differently (or at least in a less defined manner) in other contexts. This lack of narrative and expressive definition promotes the adaptability of these figures to diverse compositions. The facial expressions and gestural confessions of interest, affection and repulsion are defined only to the extent that the same figures can also be read as being interested in, or affectionate/reluctant toward, other figures or other objects.

There are a few exceptions: the way the man is embracing the dancer in the etching after the painting *The Surprise* is an expression of open sexual desire. Nothing is vague or undefined here. In a drawing, Watteau copied this couple from the *Fun Fair* by Peter Paul Rubens, which was already in the royal picture gallery during his life-time, and combined this visual quote with the figure of a guitar player as seen above (Figures 16, 17). This is certainly a counter-example to the frequent use of ‘stopped’ gestures in Watteau’s œuvre, but under the musician’s look the passionate movement of the dancers becomes calm, because they are also de-contextualized from their original composition (Rubens). Passion and certainty is contained within the couple; the connection to the landscape or the musician remains vague.

Targeted glances and actions, rarely used anyway, stay within groups of figures, often couples, that can be isolated as such and were therefore easy to de- and re-contextualize. But even in these cases targeted action can be the result of the subsequent montage of the template material: for example, the couple in the pictures of shepherds at Musée Condé in Chantilly and Palace Charlottenburg (Figure 28) is a combination of two different studies, as was first noticed by Parker:\(^{30}\) he is embracing her passionately from behind, she is backing off slightly but is giving in at the same time – a coherent action, but the result of a pasticcio.

---

28 For atmosphere as an aesthetic category see Böhme, 1995.
30 Parker, 1931, p. 11.
Pasticcio and collage

The fundamental openness of Watteau’s single figures and figure groups contributes to their adaptability to different contexts, and is the reason for Watteau’s painted pasticcios and the ‘communicative potential’ which is expressed even in the *mise en page* of disparate single studies. Cultural-historical equivalents are addressed with the pasticcio in opera in this publication. At the end, I would like to discuss another cultural-historical equivalent of the pasticcio in Watteau’s *œuvre*.

The Goncourt brothers talked about a fashion of idleness in their history of *The Woman in the Eighteenth Century*:

> “The regency is obsessed with cutting out. All engravings have to be cut out, particularly the hand-colored ones and the woman’s idleness directs the scissors towards the most beautiful, the oldest, the rarest engravings that cost one-hundred livres each; once cut out, they are stuck to cardboards, varnished and furniture and hangings are made, a type of wall paper, screens, lamp shade. This folly is general, great the art, the art of cutting out.”

---

31 “Sous la Régence, la fureur est de découper. Toutes les estampes passent à la découpage, celles-là surtout qui sont enluminées, et le désœuvrement de la femme taille aux ciseaux les plus belles, les plus vieilles, les plus rares, des estampes de cent livres pièce, une fois découpées, on les colle sur des cartons, on les vernit et on fait des meubles et des tentures,
One can feel the discomfort. Two passionate collectors of 18th-century prints must have gotten goosebumps by just thinking about the fact that valuable engravings were cut apart like a cut-out book for children and were pasted together anew.\textsuperscript{32} This really came into fashion after the Régence – the literary documents pile up in 1727. According to a letter by Charlotte-Elisabeth Aissé from 1727 everyone, little and grown up, had started to cut out colored prints in order to use the fragments (protected through a layer of varnish) for the decoration of tapestries, wall screens and chimney screens. If it was to go on like this, one would cut paintings by Raphael apart one day.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{Figure 29: Louis Crépy fils, Pierrot, 1727, after: Antoine Watteau, Pierrot.}

\textsuperscript{32} For a general history of cutting-out since the 15th century see: \textsc{Metken}, 1978, pp. 7ff.

\textsuperscript{33} Cited after \textsc{Apgar}, 1995, p. 33. Charlotte-Elisabeth Aissé’s letter to Julie Calendrini was probably Goncourt’s source. See \textsc{Metken}, 1978, p. 101.
In the November issue of *Mercure galant* in 1727 Gersaint advertised the purchase of prints after the works of his friend Watteau by referring to this fashion: the engraver Crépy was currently engraving six plates after a wall screen with galant scenes by Watteau (Figure 29). Motifs such as these would be suited best for cutting out “through which the ladies nowadays make pretty furniture”.34 How one should imagine a piece of furniture like this is shown this example of a secretary: a grotesque motive by Watteau is pasted to its right wing amongst other “découpures” (Figure 30).

*Figure 30: Secretary, Venice, c. 1730, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.*

Art like Watteau’s, which is built on the ‘magnetic field’ of the atmospheric, did certainly inspire the fashion of cutting out and the re-contextualizing of print fragments. But one should also consider the reversal of the cultural-historical causal chain. Perhaps Watteau’s pasticcios respond to the play of de- and re-contextualization through the scissors. Described as women’s folly by the Goncourts, this fashion of cutting out had a (male) predecessor.

He was diverse – a garden artist, probably the first to import the English landscape garden to France; a composer and musician, and a successful author of comedies of his time – without being tempted to characterize him as a universal genius. In the context of this article, one other of Charles Dufresny’s artistic occupations is of interest.

It is mentioned in the foreword to the 1731 volume of his plays and Pierre-Jean Mariette discusses it in his “Abecedario”: around 1700 Dufresny radicalized the cutting out and gluing together of prints long before it became virulent. He was said to have possessed a cupboard in the drawers of which he had arranged what his scissors had left him as material for later collages – in one drawer he kept feet, in another arms; other drawers contained heads, noses, eyes, hands. The fragments were waiting to be brought together in new faces, new figures, new stories. Mariette saw as a result of Dufresny’s art of cutting out and gluing together a collage with a group of drunks. In the process of de- and re-contextualization the drunks had emerged from an engraving of The Last Supper.

How and if the fragments in Dufresny’s collages fit together convincingly cannot be judged anymore because of a lack of extant examples of his skill. The rules and the intention, however, were clear: to evoke cohesiveness in the non-cohesive and simultaneously to “sublate” (Hegel) the tension of the diverse. The aesthetic reality in Watteau’s pasticcios is defined, to a comparable degree, by the success of the assembly of something that does not genuinely belong together, and the restrained tension. In Dufresny’s collages this tension might have seemed like an insufficient harmonization in a (negative) sense and in a positive sense a clever, and funny disturbance; in Watteau’s art it became an atmospheric state of tension, in which the trace of disparity was generalized to an undefined (je ne sais quoi) longing; it became so general that art might as well stand for longing.

To come to a conclusion: The pasticcio as a compositional principle of Antoine Watteau is a way of connecting. This way of connecting is so withdrawn that what lies in between, which on the one hand makes this connection possible, but on the other keeps it hanging in the balance, becomes an aesthetic object itself.
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Pasticcio Practice in 18th-Century German Theater

Bernhard Jahn

Talking about pasticcio practice in 18th-century music theater automatically leads to asking about the existence of similar artistic procedures in 18th-century spoken theater, especially since in the 18th century, music and spoken theater were not institutionally split between two different establishments in most European cities, but were combined in one theater, often even in one evening. The typical programme from the second half of the 18th century onward scheduled an evening comprised of both spoken and music theater (Figures 1 and 2).

As can be seen on the playbill from 3 May 1792, the Hamburg Stadttheater first presented “a play in three acts”, followed by a German translation of an *opera buffa* by Niccolò Piccinni. The Weimar Hoftheater, according to the playbill from 22 March 1792, first staged a comedy translated from French, followed by a one-act musical number called “Operette” which means a *Singspiel*.

But even in those cities which could boast an opera house as well as a theater, as was the case in the German-speaking world, for example in Vienna or Berlin, the separation did not run along the lines one might expect: Carl Maria von Weber’s famous *Freischütz*, for example, premiered at the Königliches Schauspielhaus (Royal Theater) Berlin, not at the Hofoper (Court Opera).\(^1\)

Despite this institutional interconnectedness of spoken and music theater, which suggests that the pasticcio practice of the music theater must have a pendant in spoken theater, and even though the so-called spoken theater exhibited a large amount of music – namely stage music – \(^2\) I will begin with some reflections which focus on the specific differences that separate the spoken from the music theater, regardless of it being part of the same theatrical institution and regardless of the stage music.

---

1 For a reprint of the playbill see Schreiter, 2007, p. 168.
Figure 1: Playbill of the Hamburg Stadttheater, 3 May 1792 (https://www.stadttheater.uni-hamburg.de).
Concerning spoken theater, the different theater reforms of the 18th century were, among other things, aiming to enforce an unbroken chain of causality in a play’s plot, in accordance with rationalist doctrine.\footnote{One of the main proponents was Johann Christoph Gottsched. See \textit{Alt}, 1994, pp. 66-84; \textit{Jahn}, 2005, pp. 170-198.} Every single sequence of action had to stand in a causal
relationship with the previous and subsequent actions. Subplots, if they were to be tol-
erated at all, had to refer back to the main plot. In an ideal case, demands of this kind,
which were made in the name of probability and authenticity, meant that Enlighten
ment tragedies and comedies were less easy to split into single interchangeable segments.
This was different with the theater of the Commedia dell’arte or with theater that worked
with comical characters (like Hans Wurst or Kilian Brustfleck): single *lazzi*, jokes, and
little embedded subplots could be effortlessly extracted from a play and integrated into
other plays.⁴ In these forms of theater, which the enlightened theorists first rejected,
there was a clear parallel to music theater, be it *opera seria*, *opéra comique* or *Singspiel.*
This was due to the architecture of the plays, because all these forms of theater worked
with clearly separated elements that appeared like building blocks.

Although neither the enlightened comedy nor the tragedy suggested a pasticcio prac-
tice based on their structure, the reality was different: there was a kind of pasticcio
practice for spoken theater as well, but it was modified to suit the specifications of en-
lightened spoken theater. Hereafter, I will introduce this pasticcio technique through the
example of a play by Friedrich Ludwig Schröder (II).

But first, some observations on the special circumstances of authorship and work in
connection with 18th-century theater practice – this is relevant since the term pasticcio
originates in the particular 18th-century meaning of these two terms (I).

I. Author, work, and theater in the 18th century

When Roland Barthes’ and Michel Foucault’s theory on the death of the author⁵ was
discussed in German studies in the 1980s,⁶ the historical dimension of “authorship”
was put into focus. It became apparent that in the German-speaking world, the concept
of emphatic authorship first developed with the classical authors Schiller and Goethe
and the complete editions of their works. Goethe’s numerous complete editions, for
example, dominated his œuvre during his lifetime and up to the last authorized edition;
in the great *Sophienausgabe* (Weimar edition) this concept was philologically secured
and approved.⁷ But even at the center of an emphatic concept of authorship, as it de
veloped for the classics in the 19th century, there were areas in which this concept stayed
vague and could not fully develop its authority. The most important of these areas is
theater practice. Friedrich Schiller, for example, wrote stage adaptations of most of his
plays. There are stage adaptations of *Don Carlos*,⁸ *Maria Stuart*⁹ and *Die Jungfrau von

---

⁵ Michel Foucault, *Qu’est-ce qu’un auteur?* (1969) in: FOUCALt, 1988, pp. 7-31; Roland
⁷ For the different editions of Goethe’s works and their edition principles see NAHLER, 1998.
⁸ SCHILLER, 1974.
⁹ SCHILLER, 2010.
that Schiller wrote specifically for the Hamburg Stadttheater. These adaptations are marked especially by massive cuts, the rearrangement of scenes, but also slight changes in emphasis. Do these adaptations belong to Schiller’s work? The editors of the Schiller Nationalausgabe were divided on this. In the case of the play Die Räuber, the edition includes the ‘Schauspiel-Fassung’ (drama version) of 1781 as well as the so-called ‘Trauerspiel-Fassung’ (tragedy version), which Schiller wrote for the Mannheim premiere and which was printed in 1782. However, the version of Die Jungfrau von Orleans that Schiller wrote for the Hamburg performance did not get included in the Nationalausgabe. The stage adaptation of Maria Stuart was included only in the new edition of the Nationalausgabe.\footnote{The manuscript is edited in \textit{Hellmich}, 2014.}

Although it was indisputable that these stage adaptations were written by Schiller, meaning that his authorship of them was indisputable as well, the concepts of work and authorship do not seem to be easily compatible with the realm of theater. While authorship and work are tied to book printing in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century – the subject of plagiarism, which was already virulent in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, was mostly discussed through the example of illegal prints – and the complete edition is above all a publishing concept to present an author on the market, the realm of theater still relied more on handwritten texts.\footnote{Schiller, 2010, pp. 372-379.} Even though the productions in spoken theater are based on printed drama texts in most cases, as shown by the example of the Hamburg Stadttheater,\footnote{Cf. Kaminski, 2013; Reulecke, 2016, pp. 86-112; Andersch, 2018.} the actual stage versions that are played onstage are most often hybrid versions comprising handwritten as well as printed parts, or even purely handwritten manuscripts (Figure 3).

Schiller’s stage versions did not make it onto the Mannheim or Hamburg stage in their original state, however. As shown in the example of Die Räuber, what was played was not Schiller’s stage version, but an adaptation by the theater director Freiherr von Dalberg that was based on the stage version and has been preserved in the form of a prompt book.\footnote{Kluge in Schiller, 1988, pp. 883f. and 898-902; Plachta, 2012.} The same was the case in Hamburg. Here, we even have the manuscript of an anonymously written adaptation of Die Räuber, entitled Die Grafen von Moor (1785), which was edited in 2013 by Nina and Gerhard Kay Birkner.\footnote{Birkner/Birkner, 2013.} This version, which relocates the plot to Russia, changes the ending to a happy one and overall makes such drastic changes that older research called it a “rewriting”.\footnote{Wohlwill, 1905, p. 636.} It is one of many examples of the theater disempowering the author and weakening the concept of the work.

19\textsuperscript{th}- and early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century philology, which placed its focus on the printed book, could only describe this usually multistage editing process of a play as a contamination, or as the increasing removal of the work from the original intention of the playwright, which could only be explained with external constraints such as censorship or limited
stage conditions. The unsoiled, pure work could only exist in the complete, last authorized edition, but never on the stage.

*Figure 3: Prompt book: König Lear, p. 78 (D-Hs, Theater-Bibliothek 2029).*

There is a second aspect that shines light on the instability of the concepts of authorship and work on the 18th-century stage: the practice of translation.17 Although there had been a recurring demand for German *Originaldramen* (original plays) since Gottsched and Lessing, the reality of the stage until the end of the 18th century was that programs were dominated by plays by French, English, and Italian authors. 80% of plays at the Hamburg Stadttheater were probably of foreign origin, meaning they were translated from other languages or adapted in the broadest sense from foreign language plays.18 Here, though, a grey area begins to appear, since translations and adaptations are often not labelled as such. In 1739 Johann Mattheson writes in the *Vollkommener Capellmeister* during a plea for “musical history science”: “Where historical insight is lacking, they often ascribe to Caio what Titius created. We even transform the mere translator of a work into its true creator, which recently happened when the opera *Sancio* was mentioned,

18  Cf. Jahn, Datenbank.
and which is not proper.” Mattheson is referring to the opera *Sancio, oder Die Siegende Großmuth*, which was staged in 1727 at the Gänsemarkt-Oper with Telemann’s music. In the libretto print, the poetry of the “very famous author” Johann Ulrich von König was explicitly highlighted. Mattheson is right: *Sancio* is an almost word-for-word translation of Francesco Silvani’s *Il miglior d’ogni amore per il peggior d’ogni odio* (Venice 1703). The opera being attributed to von König in the Hamburg libretto print most likely does not originate with von König himself, who was at Dresden at the time, but with an anonymous individual involved in creating the Hamburg print. In the Brunswick libretto print, which came out before the Hamburg staging, the libretto is presented without naming an author. Be that as it may: in 1753 von König’s translation found its way to the printing press in Vienna under the title *Sancio und Sinilde, Die Stärcke der mütherlichen Liebe*. The opera libretto turned into a play in Alexandrine verse, with the editor sticking closely to von König’s text. The editor is not named in any of the three Vienna prints, nor do they mention von König or even Silvani in any way. The author of this Alexandrine version is Heinrich Gottfried Koch, the famous theater director, who should be known in musicology first and foremost in connection with the establishment of the *Singspiel* in Leipzig.

Until well into the 19th century, Mattheson’s desire for authors to be separated from translators and to be named at all did not correspond to the actual practice. Editors often stay anonymous, but do not disclose the author of the original either, except if the original is so famous with the audience that it cannot be kept secret (for example plays by Shakespeare or Molière). Even the epithet “Original-Drama” (original play), which begins to emerge in the 1770s, is of no help here. The combined terms “Original-Lustspiel” (original comedy), “Original-Schauspiel” (original play) or “Original-Trauerspiel” (original tragedy) appear on playbills as well as on the front covers of drama prints (Figure 4).

---

23 Ibid., p. 334.
24 KOCH, 1753.
25 URBUEGUIA, 2015, pp. 81f.
The label “original” is problematic in several ways, and playbills of the time are unsystematic in their use of the term. Many plays are billed as original, though they can clearly be classified as adaptations, as with, for example, Friedrich Ludwig Schröder’s *Die väterliche Rache oder Liebe für Liebe*,26 an adaptation of William Congreve’s *Love for Love*. On the other hand, plays like *Der Fähnrich* or *Der Vetter in Lissabon*, both by Friedrich Ludwig Schröder, which could reasonably pass as original plays by today’s standards, are sometimes simply classified as “by Schröder”. For the play *Glück verbessert Torheit*, we sometimes find the note “after the English by Miss Lee, by Schröder”,27

27 Cf. the playbook of the Hamburg Stadttheater for 2 February 1789. Ibid.
but those notes are not used consistently. It must be assumed that labelling a play as original was a way of advertising and cannot be understood as saying anything about copyright or authorship as we understand them today. The term was mainly used to advertise new plays. Schröder’s Fähnrich, for example, is consistently called “Original” during the 1780s; from 1800 on, it is only referred to as “Schauspiel” (play).28

From the perspective of the newer intertextuality research, the term “original” is problematic a priori, since no play and no text in general is completely original in the sense that it does not refer to previously written texts in some way. Rather, there is a continuum of possible dependencies which has been sufficiently examined in intertextuality research and which makes it hard to determine when a play can no longer be called an adaptation but is to be labelled as an independent version instead. In searching for answers, it is also vital to consider the criteria established by the plays’ contemporaries, which are the result of the editing practice described above.

II. Forms of pasticcio in spoken theater, examined through the example of Friedrich Ludwig Schröder’s comedy Das Gemählde (Portrait)29 der Mutter oder Die Privatcomödie

In the following, I will provide an insight into the pasticcio practice of spoken theater through the example of a comedy by Friedrich Ludwig Schröder. Schröder was one of the most famous actors of the 18th century and maybe the most famous theater impresario of his time.30 He managed the Hamburg Stadttheater, with some breaks, between 1771 and 1812, and for some years (1781-1785) the Nationaltheater (Burgtheater) in Vienna. He was also successful in the entire German-speaking world as the author of about 160 plays.31 Schröder’s dramatic œuvre is particularly significant concerning the question of pasticcio practice, since all of his plays – even those advertised to his contemporaries as Originaldramen – can be classified as more or less severely edited adaptations.32 Schröder’s first biographer, Friedrich Ludwig Wilhelm Meyer, consequently prefaced the catalogue of Schröder’s works with the following careful and tentative header: “Catalogue of the works which Schröder more or less edited, changed, translated, and wrote himself.”33

Finally, I will now introduce a small typology of pasticcio-like practices in spoken theater through the example of one of Schröder’s most successful comedies, the “Ori-

28 Cf. the playbill of the Hamburg Stadttheater, 2 September 1800. Ibid.
29 The title fluctuates between “Gemählde” and “Portrait”.
30 See Jahn/Košenina, 2017.
32 For Schröder’s adaptations of English plays see Pfenniger, 1919.
The borrowing technique which is closest to opera is to transplant a scene or a sequence of action from one play to the other while mostly keeping the dialogue. In Schröder’s comedy, this affects scenes 8 to 13 of the first act. The protagonist Rekau, who has been disowned by his father due to an intrigue, is deeply in debt. He is being pursued by bailiffs Falk and Krähe, whose task is to throw him into debtor’s prison on behalf of his creditors. Rekau can convince the bailiffs that he is owed money by an acquaintance, resulting in them accompanying him to his acquaintance’s flat. As Rekau goes inside, they wait in front of the house, until the acquaintance emerges and pretends that Rekau has disappeared through the back door. Schröder takes this entire sequence of action, partially including the – albeit severely cut – dialogue, from the comedy *The Puritan; or, The Widow of Watling-Street*, the work of an unknown Elizabethan author, which was attributed to Shakespeare in the 18th century.

Schröder can easily transplant this entire sequence of action, which contains many puns by the bailiffs, into his comedy. This is because – contrary to what theoreticians demanded – the causal chain of scenes in his work is constructed rather like pearls on a string, at least up until the beginning of the counter-intrigue.

The second pasticcio-like technique which is often used in spoken theater is copying specific plot points. This is not about general motifs like the motif of the lost son or Faust, but about more detailed elaboration. For his comedy, Schröder copies such specific plot points from Sheridan’s comedy *The School for Scandal* (London 1777) and from Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*.

From Sheridan, Schröder takes the motif of the unsold portrait and the connected sequence of action: Charles Surface, a bon vivant like Schröder’s Rekau, does not sell his uncle’s portrait despite his severe financial hardships, resulting in the uncle forgiving him and paying off all his debt. Schröder changes the portrait of the uncle into the portrait of Rekau’s late mother. His father shuns Rekau because he assumes that his son callously sold the portrait and last memento of his mother to make money. It is only when Rekau can prove to him that the portrait was stolen that his father accepts him back into the family. In addition to copying the motif, Schröder creates a variation on it that increases the emotional effect.

To convince his father, the son uses the play inside the play. His father is an enthusiastic amateur actor and has a small indoor theater at his house (the “Privatcomödie”). Like Hamlet does in Shakespeare’s play with his mother, Rekau has a play performed in front of his father which uncovers the machinations of the enemy that Rekau fell victim to.

---


35 The front page of the 1734 edition names Shakespeare as author: “A Comedy by Shakespear.”

36 Hoffmann, 1939, pp. 182f.
There is a third central sequence of action that Schröder takes from a model: It is the father’s widowed sister-in-law, Madame Waker, who turns out to be Rekau’s main opponent. Together with her evil servant Franz, who himself shares characteristics and motivations with his namesake from Schiller’s *Die Räuber*, she enforces Rekau’s disinheri-ittance – among other things by stealing the portrait of the mother. Mrs Waker’s aim is to have her own daughter appointed heiress instead of Rekau. This sequence of action originates from Friedrich Wilhelm Gotter’s *bürgerliches Trauerspiel Mariane* (Gotha 1776), which itself can be traced back to a French model (de la Harpe: *Mélanie*).37

In contrast to the first mentioned borrowing technique, when plot points are taken from another play, the dialogue is usually not copied but rather newly created. The editor’s own share of original writing is relatively high in this case. Looking at the copying of sequences of action in general, we can say that Schröder takes five sequences of action for his comedy from other plays and combines them to create a new sequence of actions. His success in connecting them in the sense of an unbroken chain of causal motivation is mixed. The sequence of scenes in which Rekau fools the bailiffs could be deleted without consequences, which is not possible for the other sequences. Copying sequences of action cannot be understood as secret theft, or not exclusively, but should instead be seen at least partially as an intertextual offering to the audience: the father in Schröder’s comedy, for example, explicitly references Sheridan’s *School for Scandal* and calls it his “favorite play”.38

The third pasticcio-like borrowing technique we need to mention in this list is the copying of small motifs. It is not about entire sequences of action or dialogues, but about smaller motifs, which can be located in the plot, the linguistic presentation or the stage equipment. In Schröder’s *Das Gemälde (Portrait) der Mutter*, for example, this is the case with the small indoor theater and its stage equipment. We can find parallels with the craftsmen’s play in Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, for example in the area of stage props (the moon for Shakespeare, the sun for Schröder).39 Smaller plot points, for example the servant Franz, who intercepts Rekau’s letters to his father (see Schiller’s *Die Räuber*), must be mentioned here as well.40

The pasticcio-like practices of spoken theater might have become clearer through the example of Schröder’s comedy. Of course, these practices also apply to the creation of librettos. The main difference between spoken and music theater is that the former lacks clearly separated components, such as for example arias in music theater. This means that when we look at pasticcio-like practices such as the copying and recombination of sequences of action, we are dealing with less clearly distinguishable compo-

37 Ibid.
39 Compare Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, III,1, to Schröder, III,1; Schröder, 1831, p. 96.
40 Ibid., p. 91 (= II,11).
nents. Moreover, the practice involves changes to the copied parts and rewriting of the dialogues in most cases. A question that must be left unanswered is how strongly plays like Schröder’s count on the audience recognizing the copied parts, which would mean that we can surmise a consciously created intertextual aesthetic. A generalizing answer is most likely inadmissible, and instead we will have to decide on a case by case basis.
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Adaptations of Stage Directions and Stage Designs in Pietro Metastasio’s *drammi per musica*

DIANA BLICHMANN

The stage settings of the *drammi per musica* written by Pietro Metastasio (1698-1782) reflect the different surroundings and lifestyles of an elite society. In the dramatic visualization there is almost no visual set that the members of this privileged aristocracy could not have frequented in the course of their daily life. These ambiances were the product of contemporary realism. The presence of these surroundings was an indispensable tool for allowing culturally homogeneous spectators to identify in particular with the heroes present in the dramas. As a result, the décors and spaces strengthened the exemplary nature of the moral and political message of the performances.\(^1\) The correspondence between the Metastasian dramas and the political situations of the time were highlighted by the poet’s constant reflection on the legitimacy and the burdens of supreme power. The stage is therefore an ‘imitation’, because the visual example elevated people and institutions. Every sovereign could see the ideal image of his court with its temples, squares and gardens reflected on the Metastasian stage.\(^2\)

The Metastasian *drammi per musica* seem to offer a large spectrum of stage directions and décors. Scrolling through the expressions used to define the scenic spaces, the general impression is that of an extraordinary richness of subjects, but on closer investigation it consists of many variations on relatively few recurring themes. All of the dramatic texts written between 1724 and 1771 contain the following scenographic spaces: non-specific settings like aqueducts, amphitheaters, apartments, armories, atriums, woods, rooms, countryside, battlefields, huts, prisons (fortresses, narrow places, towers etc.), walled cities, courtyards, delightful places, cabinets, galleries, gardens,

---

caves, lodges, magnificent places, marine and mountainous areas, hanging gardens, pavilions, parks, squares, harbors, arcades, palaces, ruins, halls, fairs, temples and valleys.\textsuperscript{4} Specific Roman surroundings are the Capitol, the Forum Romanum, the Palatine gardens and the Ponte Sublicio. In some cases, the scene is divided into two distinct spaces with different meanings such as, for example, the magnificent place and the amphitheater (“Luogo magnifico che introduce a vasto anfiteatro”) in \textit{La clemenza di Tito} or the arcades and the shores of the sea (“Portici della reggia corrispondenti al mare. Navi poco lontane dalla riva”) in \textit{Achille in Sciro}. These were different settings and have to be distinguished.

Different kinds and methods of adaptation in the \textit{drammi per musica} by Metastasio can be discriminated and will be examined in this paper.\textsuperscript{5} On the basis of different levels of investigation, an almost all-inclusive view becomes possible. The investigation can be divided into two levels: on the one hand the ‘text level’, which deals with stage directions exclusively based on those printed in the librettos, will be analyzed. This level can be further divided in two sub-levels: 1) stage directions and stage designs in Metastasian opera were not only used for one single drama, but adapted in many others. 2) A special feature regarding the practice of transformation is the use of \textit{décors} in the same drama over many years and within different productions. Normally the stage directions of the original version of a specific drama were not changed in subsequent versions of the libretto – in contrast to recitatives and arias whose texts were frequently altered. On the other hand, the ‘material level’ will treat the stage directions based on those printed in the libretto and on the basis of the physical nature of the \textit{décors} on stage. This level also has two sub-levels: 3) its methods are the adaptation of the same stage design in different dramas staged in the same theatrical season and in the same theater and 4) the adaptations within different dramas performed in the same theater during successive years.

Therefore, the sources used in this article which show the multiple use of stage directions in the \textit{drammi per musica} by Metastasio are primarily the librettos printed for each performance. Secondarily, the recurring use of \textit{décors} can be deduced from archival sources that indicate objects used on stage and materials used for the construction of the stage design in a specific season and opera house. Engravings included in some librettos, which usually depict the stage design, or drawings made by the stage architects are not discussed here, because they do not efficiently contribute to the pasticcio topic.

\textsuperscript{4} The Metastasian vocabulary describes these surroundings as \textit{acquedotti, anfiteatri, appartamenti, armerie and sale d’armi, atri, boschi, camere, campagne, campi di battaglia (militaria), capanne, carceri (prigioni, fortezza, luoghi angusti, torri etc.), città murate, cortili, deliziose, gabinetti, gallerie, giardini (orti, edifici di verdure etc.), grotte, logge, luoghi magnifici, luoghi vari, marine, montuose, orti pensili, padiglioni, pagoda, parchi, piazze, porti, portici, regge, rovine, sala, serragli di fiere, templi and valli. For a more precise analysis of the stage directions conceived by the poet see the database METASTASIO, \textit{Drammi per musica}, http://www.progettometastasio.it, 23.04.2019.

\textsuperscript{5} Concerning stage designs in the \textit{drammi per musica} by Apostolo Zeno and Pietro Metastasio see \textit{Sutherland 1999}, pp. 113-131.
Despite the consistent use of the same Metastasian stage directions in different versions of the drama, the way in which stage directions were re-designed and constructed on stage could be quite individual, depending on the stage designer’s ideas. These ideas could add several different meanings to the stage design and are therefore not to be understood as pasticcio.

1. Adaptation of private and public décor in different dramas

The scenographic spaces in the *drammi per musica* by Metastasio are divided into private and public settings that have their own dramaturgical significance. In different Metastasian surroundings different actions are carried out and different languages are spoken with different vocabulary. The number of the *dramatis personae* and the kind of arias sung in private and public settings are different.

The cabinet (*gabinetto*), which in Metastasian drama is a small room furnished for private and personal use in an elegant building or apartment, can be taken as an example of a private space. It is present in *Didone abbandonata* (1724), *Semiramide riconosciuta* (1729), *Alessandro nell’Indie* (1730), *Artaserse* (1730), *Demetrio* (1731), *Demofoonte* (1733), *Zenobia* (1737), *Ipermestra* (1744), *Antigono* (1744), *Il trionfo di Clelia* (1762) and *Ruggiero* (1771). In the cabinet, feelings of love, grief, jealousy and hatred are expressed, secrets are entrusted or intrigues are prepared. For instance, in *Didone abbandonata* the sequence that plays in the “Gabinetto con sedie” (II,14-II,17) has Didone, Enea and Iarba on stage. It is a typical *liaison des scènes* with an increase and a decrease of the number of persons on stage. This sequence prepares the tragic ending of the opera: in the cabinet Didone entrusts to the audience that, uncertain of her fate, she no longer wants to live. Though she decides to get help from Enea, being herself unable to opt between suicide or marriage with Iarba. Enea wants to avoid the suicide of his lover, but his jealousy is inevitable when Didone asks for Iarba’s hand. Accused of being a barbarian, Iarba, in the musical setting of Domenico Sarro, expresses his personal feelings in a march-like aria (“Chiamami pur così”) and Didone remains with mixed feelings of

---

6 It is a procedure, theorized in French classical dramaturgy in 1657 but also commonly practiced in other theatrical traditions and in other eras, to ensure that the scene never remains empty, and therefore to avoid gaps in the performance of the action (unity of action, time and place) and in the concatenation of the scenes: the action must be designed in such a way that at least one character remains in the scene as another comes and goes. Within a sequence, the three Aristotelian units are only guaranteed by the fact that at least one figure always remains on the stage. The *liaison des scènes* can be interrupted only at the conclusion of a sequence or an act.

anger and peace at the end of the sequence (“Va lusingando amore”). While in Didone two lovers and one adversary are present on stage, in Semiramide riconosciuta four lovers are involved in the sequence of the “Gabinetti reali” (III,6-III,11). Semiramide, Scitalce, Tamiri and Mirteo all sing an aria stating their individual humors: In “Fuggi dagli occhi miei” (III,7) irritation and anger are Semiramide’s answer to the second rejection by Scitalce. In “Odi quel fasto” (III,9) Scitalce reacts with anger to Mirteo’s accusations and challenges him to fight. In “D’un genio che m’accende” (III,10) Tamiri assures Mirteo of her love and in “Sentirsi dire” (III,11) Mirteo sings of agony, suffering and pain. All these feelings are related to love and are similar, for example, to the second sequence of the third act (III,5-III,7) in Artaserse. In contrast, in Alessandro nell’Indie the “Gabinetti reali” (II,1-II,4) are private spaces where the adversaries Poro, Gandarte and Erissena conceive an intrigue against the hero and protagonist Alessandro. Poro and Gandarte secretly discuss a way of finding him alone, without his army and without defense. Erissena, who would like to be part of this plan but is rejected by her brother Poro, is offended (“Non sarei sì sventurata” II,3) and Poro’s unconventional soul is manifested in his aria of comparison (“Senza procelle ancora” II,4). It is evident that although the plot in the sequences of these three dramas is different, the private atmosphere of the setting in the cabinet remains the same.

The actions and notions of a great number of persons involved in public spaces are conceived in a different and more political manner. Kings and queens in their official capacity participate in such public plots with political implications, as well as ministers and lictors. Compared to the private settings, a public space must be imagined as a large-scale setting. Although in many dramas a hall, magnificent place or palace are scenes that typically were adopted (see for example Table 4b), every drama had its specific scenographic requirements: various types of extras and embellishments could be seen, such as guards, dancers, pages and riders. Depending on whether it is an internal or external space, the public space can present, respectively, banquets and furnishings, triumphal chariots and animals, among others. In some cases, the performance of military or festive symphonies and the presence of choirs and dances contribute to the creation of the official and public sphere of the action.

For example, in Semiramide riconosciuta (II,1-II,6) all dramatis personae gather in the royal hall illuminated at night (“Salone regio illuminato in tempo di notte.”). It is decorated with various sideboards and with transparent vases, and a great table is prepared in the middle of the hall with four seats and a chair for Semiramide. Sibari’s announcement to the ministers initiates the official festive dinner in occasion of Tamiri’s selection of her groom. This hall is not only the celebratory space where in honor of Tamiri’s upcoming wedding a joyful symphony is played, a choir is sung and dances are

---

8 For an analysis of the musical setting by Leonardo Vinci (Rome 1729) and Nicola Porpora (Venice 1729) see Blichmann, 2012, pp. 231-233.
9 Cf. Ibid., pp. 370f.
10 Sibari “Ministri, al re sia noto che già pronta è la mensa.” […] Semiramide “Ecco il luogo o Tamiri / ove gli altrui sospiri / attendono da te premio e mercede.”
performed, but also the dangerous space where the unsuccessful attack on Scitalce takes place. The prince accuses his adversaries and the queen in a typical public or dialogical aria – arias that are sung in the presence of other persons and/or are addressed to them – (“Voi che le mie vicende” II,3). In Artaserse (II,8-II,15) the great hall of the royal council (“Gran sala del real consiglio”) has a throne on one side, seats on the other side for the representatives of the Persian kingdom and a small table as well as a chair to the right of the throne. Artaserse is preceded by a part of the guards and representatives of his kingdom and followed by the remaining guards and Megabise. All the persons of the plot will gather in this crucial sequence for Arbace because it will decide his fate. Uncertain in his verdict, the king transfers his decision-making power to his general and the father of the victim, Artabano, who condemns his son to death (“Io condanno il mio figlio. Arbace mora.”). Arbace’s farewell recitative and the aria “Per quel paterno ampesso” form an emotional highlight of the sequence that is followed by three arias in which Mandane condemns Artabano’s inhumanity (“Và tra le selve ircane” II,12), Semira judges Artaserse’s weakness and his bad government (“Per quell’affetto” II,13), Artaserse is judged to have acted graciously and rationally (“Non conosco in tal momento” II,14) and Artabano announces his stratagem. His aria “Così stupisce e cade” (II,15) which concludes the most important sequence of the opera is all about his political intrigue and his own career.12

Among the other public halls in the Metastasian drama are the “Hall on the ground with chairs” (“Sala terrena con sedie” Adriano in Siria, III,1-III,8), the “Hall on the ground with gardens” (“Sala terrena corrispondente a’ giardini” Attilio Regolo III,1-III,8) and the “Great hall illuminated at night with several apartments also illuminated” (“Gran sala illuminata in tempo di notte corrispondente a diversi appartamenti parimente illuminati” Achille in Sciro, II,7-II,12) with a table in the center, sideboards around and loggias filled with musicians and spectators. All these halls, used by Metastasio more than once, are characterized by action with great scenic purpose, a large number of people and a dramaturgy that privileges dialogical arias.

2. Adaptation of décor in specific dramas and consecutive productions

In Metastasio’s first dramma per musica written in 1724 for the Neapolitan Teatro San Bartolomeo and performed with music by Domenico Sarro and scenography by Giovanni Battista Oliverio, one of the most significant sequences is the first one (I,1-I,8). In this sequence, the action is set in a magnificent place designed for a public audience with a throne on one side and a view of the city of Carthage which is under construction (“Luogo magnifico destinato per le publiche udienze con trono da un lato; veduta in prospetto della città di Cartagine che sta in atto edificandosi”). In other versions of

11 For a more detailed analysis of the sequence see BLICHMANN, 2012, pp. 146-149.
the drama that were produced in subsequent years, as well as throughout the whole 18th century, the Metastasion description of the magnificent place is usually taken over literally from the Neapolitan version (1724). In Table 1 are listed only the most significant examples of how the stage direction of the first sequence in *Didone* was slightly or considerably enlarged or reduced: in Rome (1726) an abbreviated version of the stage direction is given: “The city of Carthage, which is in the process of construction with a magnificent place” (“La città di Cartagine, che sta edificandosi con luogo magnifico”). Although the throne is not mentioned in the stage direction it was present on scene as we see from the stage direction in scene I,5: “While Didone, served by Osmida, goes to the throne […]” (“Mentre Didone servita da Osmida va sul trono […]”).13 In the 1732 Roman performance – and afterwards in Florence in 1753 and 1759 – the scenography of the first sequence appears not to show the city of Carthage. The throne is not specified on one side of the stage and could therefore be seen from a central perspective.14 The performances in Parma (1745) and Munich (1760) seem to omit the fact that the city of Carthage is under construction. Alterations of stage direction and design can be found in the performances in Reggio Emilia (1725) which were taken over in Milan (1729), Bologna (1735) and Cesena (1743). The “magnificent place” was changed to a “large atrium” probably due to some existing stage decoration in the theaters of these cities.15

The most significant modifications known to us for the first stage direction of Metastasio’s *Didone abbandonata* are those made at the Teatro della Fortuna in Fano (1745), which were then adopted in a Venetian performance in 1770. The only detail left over from previous versions is the view of the city of Carthage, but in the Fano version it is located near a harbor with ships. The rest of the stage direction is completely different: a field at night with Trojan tents and Aeneas sleeping in a great pavilion was created on stage. Interestingly, light effects are described. The sun could be seen rising and little by little the whole scene became illuminated. Afterwards, the bridge of the city descended and Selene and Osmida came out of Carthage. Therefore, the action of the first sequence was performed not in a magnificent place with a throne, but in the field with Trojan tents. These alterations, to quote the note to the reader in the libretto, “were necessary to accommodate them to the circumstances of the time, the theater and the singers”.16

14 “Magnificent place intended for public audiences with throne, view of the city of Carthage.” (“Luogo magnifico destinato per le pubbliche udienze con trono, veduta della città di Cartagine.”) Id., 1732.
15 In the Milan version ten years later in 1739 in the same theater the original stage direction was restored.
16 “Note to the reader. The mutations and shortenings that were made to the present drama of Signor Abbate Pietro Metastasio were necessary to accommodate them to the circumstances of the time, the theater and the singers […]” (“Avviso al lettore. Le mutazioni e gli accorciamenti che fatti si sono al presente dramma del Sig. Abbate Pietro Metastasio furono necessari per accomodarsi alle circostanze del tempo, del teatro e de’ cantanti medesimi […]”) Metastasio, 1745c, p. V.
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This was a common general formulation used in the cautions to the spectator in order to avoid further and more detailed explanations of the alterations to text and stage. It is also quite possible that these served as pretexts and that such changes were motivated by other more enigmatic reasons. In this case the alterations probably have to do with the dedicatee, Giacomo Oddi who, three months before the performance of Didone at Fano in July 1745, was appointed cardinal of St. Jerome of the Croats by Benedict XIV. In the dedication text his glorious delegations as apostolic legate and nuncio are compared with the expeditions of the Trojan Enea, and it is probably for this reason that the opera begins with the scene of a nighttime Trojan camp and the great pavilion of Enea.

Usually the main statement of this first sequence in Didone abbandonata remains unchanged: the arrival of the king of the Moors, Iarba, in Carthage is designed as a large reception scene. In scene I,3 Osmida announces Iarba who is disguised as ambassador Arbace. From Osmida’s proclamation it emerges that the haughty king will ask for Didone’s hand. Even before Iarba’s arrival, the female protagonist, whose heart belongs to Enea, realizes that she will not marry him. Iarba and his Moorish entourage arrive in scene I,5 together with tigers, lions and other gifts offered to the queen of Carthage who proceeds to the throne served by Osmida. The sequence contains six arias sung by all the persons involved in the plot (Enea, Selene, Didone, Osmida, Iarba and Araspe). But considering the productions over a long period of time, the aria texts of the female and male protagonists Didone (“Son regina e son amante”, I,2) and Enea (“Dovrei… ma no…” , I,1) in general remain constant. Only in the Fano version (1745) is Enea’s aria adapted from Achille in Sciro:

Achille I,14 (Achille in Sciro, Vienna 1736)

Risponderti vorrei
ma gela il labbro e tace;
lo rese amor loquace,
muto lo rende amor.

Amor che a suo talento
rende un imbole audace
e batte in un momento
quando gli piace un cor.

Enea I,3 (Didone abbandonata, Fano 1745)

Risponderti vorrei
ma gela il labbro e tace;
lo rese amor loquace,
muto lo rende amor.

Amor... oh Dio, direi...
ah che parlar non oso!
quel che ho nel cor nascoso,
tu non comprenidi ancor?

The arias of the other dramatis personae are deleted, replaced by other arias or not set to music, following the normal practices of Italian opera seria production in the early 18th century (Table 2).\textsuperscript{17}

Several arias were cancelled. Considering some performances of Didone abbandonata between 1724 and 1773 indicated in Table 2 it is evident that in addition to the removal of Selene’s aria “Dirò che fida sei” in Venice 1725 and 1747 (VE25/VE47), in

\textsuperscript{17} Blichmann, 2012, pp. 158-166.
Ferrara 1733 (FE33) and Lisbon 1741 (LI41) the aria sung by Osmida “Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno” was revoked in Venice 1747 (VE47), and that by Iarba “Fra lo splendor del trono” was removed in Venice 1741 and 1757 (VE41/VE57) and Madrid 1752 (MAD52) and not set to music in Milan 1755 (MI55). Araspe’s aria was cancelled for the performances in Lisbon 1741 (LI41), Fano 1745 (FA45), Lisbon 1753 (LI53), Venice 1757 (VE57), Reggio Emilia (1752) and Turin 1773 (TO73). The eliminations in Reggio Emilia, Fano, Lisbon and Turin are due to the removal of the whole scene I,8, Araspe’s monologue.

Arias were altered for Osmida and Araspe. Osmida’s aria “Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno” was transformed into “Farò, che a te costante” in Parma (1745), into “Basta così, t’intendo” – an adaptation of Arpalice’s aria from Metastasio’s Ciro riconosciuto (Vienna 1736) in scene I,2 – in Cremona (1756) and into “Allo splendor del trono” in Venice (1757). This last mentioned aria was originally planned by Metastasio for the character of Iarba, who, in this 1757 Venetian performance sang no aria in scene I,7.20 For the Roman performance in 1726 Osmida’s aria was in part retained and was in part altered by the poet. Metastasio’s first contract with the Teatro delle Dame in this Carnival season was for the adaptation of Didone abbandonata.21 His alteration replaced the first stanza (RM26) with the second stanza (NA24) and adapted some vocabulary from the incipit of the aria. Nevertheless, the renewed aria “Grato rende il fiumicello” was not intended to be set to music by Leonardo Vinci:

---

19 In fact, only the first two verses of Osmida’s aria are taken over from Arpalice’s aria: “Osmida Basta così, t’intendo, / già ti spiegasti appieno. / Per te vedrò sereno / Il giorno a folgorar. // Eccomi qual mi vuoi / son pronto a cenni tuoi, / Purché debba regnar.”
20 For aria migrations in several Didone-librettos between 1724-1758 cf. GIALDRONI, 2004.
21 “Expenses for poets and librettos. To give on 31 January [1726]. 65 Scudi payed to Signor Marchese Paolo Maccarani for the value of a watch with a boxand a golden chain given to the poet Signor Metastasio for having adjusted the libretto of Didone” (“Spese di poeti e libretti Dare adi 31 gennaio [1726] scudi di moneta 65 pagati al signor marchese Paolo Maccarani per prezzo di un orologio con cassa e controcassa e catena d’oro donato al signor Metastasio poeta per aver accomodato il libretto della Didone”), I-Rasmom, CT424, c. 58 ls (left side). For a more detailed analysis concerning the theater and the operas represented there see for example BLICHMANN, 2012, 2018 and 2019; ERKENS, 2018; MARKUSZEWSKA 2013, 2016a-b, 2018 etc.
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Osmida (Naples 1724) Osmida (Rome 1726)

Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno
e al tuo sdegno, al tuo desio
l’ardir mio ti scorgerà.

Così rende il fiumicello,
mentre lento il prato ingombra,
alimento all’arboscello
e per l’ombra umor gli dà.

Grato rende il fiumicello,
mentre lento il prato ingombra,
alimento all’arboscello
ed io servo al gran disegno,
che al tuo Re caro ti fà.

Araspe’s aria “Se dalle stelle tu non sei guida” was transformed into “Se agli affanni ci condanna” (Parma 1745). In Venice (1730) and in Cremona (1756) the same aria was replaced by “Infelice e sventurato” (I,8) but indeed in the original version and other versions of the opera this aria was sung by Araspe in scene I,14, showing the similar effect of misfortune.22 Even though in the libretto this text was not attributed to the author, “Infelice e sventurato” was written by Metastasio for the Neapolitan performance in 1724 and then adapted to the 1730 Venetian version:

Naples 1724 (I,14) = Venice 1730/Cremona 1756 (I,8)

Araspe

Infelice e sventurato
potrà farmi ingiusto fato
ma infedele io non sarò.
La mia fede e l’onor mio
pur fra l’onde dell’oblio
agli Elisi io porterò.

The action that takes place in the “Luogo magnifico” is relatively unaltered in almost all the versions of this drama. Only in the Lisbon, Fano, Reggio Emilia and Turin performances were the last monologues cancelled. In the first sequence of Didone abbandonata, however, there is a detail that is evident only in the Roman version of 1726, in the score by Leonardo Vinci.23 Vinci introduced a march-like symphony (“marchia”) that was played concurrently with the arrival of Iarba and his Moorish entourage.24 This is evident in the score at the end of scene I,4 (Example 1):

---

22 “All those arias that are not by the author are marked with a *” (“Tutte quelle arie, che non sono dell’autore sono contrassegnate con una *”) Metastasio, 1730, p. 7.
Example 1: Leonardo Vinci, Didone abbandonata, Rome 1726, arrival of Iarba and his Moorish entourage.

Scene I,4

*Didone e Ormisda*

Didone Venga Arbace qual vuole, suppliche o minaccioso ei viene invano. In faccia a lui pri' che tramonti il sole ad Enea mi vedrà porger la mano. Solo quel cor mi piace, sappialo Iarba.

Osmida Ecco s'appressa Arbace.

---

Scene I,5

Stage direction in the libretto: Stage direction in the score

“Iarba under name of Arbace and Araspe with retinue of Moors, extras bringing gifts to present to the queen and the above-mentioned.”

“The idea of the military symphony was taken over and set to music in other versions, for example in Fano (1745). As already observed, it is certainly the most anomalous version as it concerns not only the stage direction of the first sequence. Apart from the clarifications given in the notice to the reader we do not know what the real reasons were for this caption being completely different from the other versions of *Didone*. However, due to these changes of scene the opera also begins differently from other versions with


27 The Fano version has in Act I one sequence more than the original and several other versions – at its end a stage set representing a wood (“boschetto”) was introduced. The harbor in Act III beyond the boats was embellished with a huge “sumptuous ship.” *Metastasio*, 1745c.

28 “Avviso al lettore”, cf. n. 16.
a monologue sung by a dreaming Enea. It is at least imaginable that this new recitative, introduced as scene I,1 may have been requested by the performer of the male protagonist Gioachino Conti (Gizziello), the most famous singer of the Fano cast. However, in Fano Iarba and Araspe arrive on horses while a military symphony is played. Due to its setting in a field, Didone goes to sit not on the throne like in the other previous versions, but under a tent: “Iarba under the name of Arbace and Araspe on horseback, followed by Moors, extras who bring gifts to present to the Queen [...]. During the entrance there is a military symphony. Didone, served by Osmida, goes to sit under the great pavilion. Iarba and Araspe dismount [...].” 29 In the version of *Didone abbandonata* by Baldassare Galuppi for the performance at the Teatro del Buon Retiro in Madrid (1752) Iarba and Araspe also arrived on horse and a symphony was performed on stage. In the libretto adapted for this occasion by Metastasio – doing a favor to his friend and impresario of the Royal Theater in Madrid, Carlo Broschi (Farinelli) – the stage direction, now much more detailed than before, indicates the march with barbarian instruments:

“While at the sound of barbarous instruments, Iarba and Araspe on horseback are seen coming from afar with followers of Moors and other nations, extras who lead tigers, lions and bring other gifts to present to the queen, Didone served by Osmida goes to the throne, to the right of which remains Osmida. Two Carthaginians take the pillows for the ambassador and place them in the distance but facing the throne. Iarba and Araspe dismounting from the horse stop at the entrance and not heard by others talk to each other.” 30

While most versions of the *Didone abbandonata* respected Metastasio’s indications for the first sequence of the “luogo magnifico” – the placement of the throne on one side of the stage and the view of the city of Carthage under construction – some versions offer slight deviations, others an alteration of place – the magnificent place becomes a great atrium – and others a completely different caption (Table 1). Despite these more or less substantial differences regarding the captions, the aria texts in this sequence remain identical in most of the examined librettos (Table 2).

29 “Iarba sotto nome d’Arbace ed Araspe a cavallo, con seguito de’ mori, comparse che portano doni per presentare alla regina [...]. In tempo della marcia s’ode sinfonia militare. Didone servita da Osmida va a sedere sotto il gran padiglione. Iarba ed Araspe smontano da cavallo [...].” Metastasio, 1745c, p. 7.

30 “Mentre al suono di barbari stromenti si vedono venire da lontano Iarba ed Araspe a cavallo con seguito di mori ed altre nazioni, comparse che conducono tigri, leoni e portano altri doni per presentare alla regina, Didone servita da Osmida va sul trono, alla destra del quale rimane Osmida. Due cartaginesi portano fuori i cussini per l’ambasciatore affricano e li situano lontano ma in faccia al trono. Iarba ed Araspe smontando da cavallo si fermano sull’ingresso e non intesi dicono fra loro [...].” Metastasio, 1752b, scene I,5.
3. Adaptation of décor in different dramas in a specific theater throughout a single season

In Italy, there were very few theaters that renewed their stage designs every season and for each opera production. The Teatro di San Carlo in Naples, the Teatro Regio Ducale in Milan, the Teatro Regio in Turin and the theater in Parma did so exclusively for opera seria. In most theaters, however, endowment scenes (“scene di dotazione”) were in use. These scenes served for several seasons and every season they were completely or partially renewed or enriched for the new productions. The standard equipment of the endowment scenes was actually sufficient to stage most of Metastasio’s dramas, while for the others a few additions and some adaptations were sufficient. The common subjects of endowment scenes coincided with the subjects of Metastasio’s stage designs, as will be shown by the example of the Teatro delle Dame.

_Ezio_ (music by Pietro Auletta) and _Semiramide riconosciuta_ (music by Nicola Porpora) were both staged at the Roman Teatro delle Dame in 1729. Although _Ezio_ had its first performance in the Venetian Teatro di San Giovanni Grisostomo in November 1728, the drama was written by Metastasio in Rome for the Roman stage, but sent to Venice for its premiere: “Poets Expenses. On the first of December 300 coins paid October 18 by contract to Pietro Metastasio, for the libretto entitled _Ezio_, which he handed over to us and which we communicated to the Signori Grimani of Venice, who will have to give us their second libretto version made by Metastasio [...]” Ezio then was performed as the first opera of the Roman season between 2 and 30 January 1729, while _Semiramide riconosciuta_ was the second opera and staged between 6 and 28 February.

Both dramas are quite different: _Ezio_ is a historically inspired drama about the Roman general Ezio. The illustrious captain of the imperial armies under Emperor Valentinian III, returning victorious from the famous battle of the Catalaunian plains, was unjustly accused by the emperor and condemned to death. The drama recounts the impostures of the Roman patrician Maximus, who unsuccessfully sought Ezio’s help in killing the hated emperor, constantly concealing his vengeful intention. In contrast, _Semiramide riconosciuta_ is a mythologically inspired drama that tells the legend of Semiramide ascalonita, whose mother was believed to be a nymph. Semiramide came to be consort of Nino, king of the Assyrians. After his death Semiramide reigned in virile dresses, impersonating Nino, her little son. Finally recognized as a woman, her subjects worshipped her prudence and value in the kingdom. The main action of the drama is concerned with the pursuit of Semiramide’s identity.

33 I-Rasmom, CT424, c. 64 and 70.
There are important differences between the historical, military and political plot in Ezio and the mythological plot in Semiramide which centers above all on interpersonal relationships and love. The stage directions for the two operas also differ, but even so parallels conceived by Metastasio are evident and were realized in the stage designs by Pompeo Aldobrandini, who was active in this theater in the Carnival season of 1729 (Table 3).34

Even though the dramatic action of both operas takes place in different surroundings, Ezio in Rome and Semiramide riconosciuta in Babylonia, the stage directions of the first opera were adapted for the second with some alterations in the description of the specific Roman and Babylonian settings as well as wording and phrasing alterations: although the scenery of the first sequence of Ezio shows a part of the Forum Romanum and the view of Rome illuminated at night, for Aldobrandini it must have been easy to adapt the triumphal arches (“archi trionfali”) of the first to an architecturally similar great portico (“gran portico”) in the second opera. Furthermore, an analogous item in both sequences is the throne on one side (“trono [imperiale] da un lato”) of the stage. Thereafter, the second sequence in Ezio shows the rooms of Valentinian (“camere”) that were adapted for the apartments (“appartamenti”) and the cabinets (“gabinetti”) in the fourth and sixth sequences in Semiramide. The palatine gardens (“orti palatini”) showing espaliers of flowers, fountains and waterfalls (Ezio, sequence III) were adapted to the hanging gardens (“orti pensili”) and to the “countryside with garden” (“campagna […] mura de’ giardini”) of sequences II and V of Semiramide. Typically, the ledger books of the Teatro delle Dame specify for which opera of the season the material for the scenography was used,35 but did not specify the silver consumed for the garden scenographies in the carnival season of 1729. It can therefore be presumed that the material for the garden scenes was also used for Ezio’s palatine gardens and for Semiramide’s hanging and countryside gardens:

“Expenses for stage renovations and scenes. Expenses […] [7 January 1729] 3,20 coin shields paid to said [Giovanni Battista Porciani] for reimbursement of a silver consignment to silver the garden canvases, […]; [7 January 1729] and on 24 December 8,50 coin shields were paid to Mario Labanti Batticoro for a lot of silver beaten and delivered to Giovanni Battista Porciani, […]; [7 January 1729] and on 24 December 4 coin shields were paid to the aforesaid for 1600 pieces of silver for the scenes […].”36

34 For his effort as scenographic painter he received 1200 scudi di moneta. Ibid., c. 23 ls.
35 For example, under the heading “Spese diverse” the chandeliers used as props were expressly for the first opera, Ezio: “[1 April 1729] 15 coin shields are given to Giovanni Domenico Barile for the chandeliers given on stage during the first work” (“[1 aprile 1729] si fanno buoni a Giovanni Domenico Barile 15 scudi di moneta per li lampadari dati in servitio nel palco nella prima opera”), ibid., c. 60 rs.
36 “Spese per riattazioni di palco e scene. Dare […] [7 gennaio 1729] 3,20 scudi di moneta pagati a detto [Giovanni Battista Porciani] per rimborso di una partita d’argento per inargentare li teloni del giardino, […]”; [7 gennaio 1729] e fu li 24 dicembre 8,50 scudi di mo-
The gallery (“galeria”) in Ezio (sequence III), seen from an architectonical point of view, was probably different in comparison to the hall (“sala”) in Semiramide (sequence IV). Nonetheless the scenography for this second opera could have been adapted from the first with some prospective alterations. Both stage directions allow us to imagine a similar atmosphere, on the one hand with statues, mirrors and seats (Ezio), and on the other hand with sideboards, transparent vases, a large table set in the center of the hall with four seats and a chair (Semiramide). The difference from a scenographic point of view is that the hall in Semiramide is intended to be a closed space arranged for a dinner. The gallery in Ezio, in contrast, was created as an open space equipped with a large balcony. The prospectus showed the view of Rome. And finally, we can presume that the amphitheater (“anfiteatro”, Semiramide, sequence VII) was adapted from Ezio’s magnificent atrium (“atrio magnifico”, sequence V) due to the iron gates present in both stage directions, closed in Semiramide, open and leading to several prisons in Ezio. The Capitol (“campidoglio”) in sequence VI of Ezio probably could not be adapted to any of the stage designs in Semiramide because of its specific and exclusively Roman architecture.

Furthermore, in sequence I of both operas a particularly interesting item for pasticcio practice and transformative use deserves attention: in scene I,2 each of the operas requires war instruments (“istromenti bellici”/“istromenti barbari”) followed by the Roman general, Ezio, with slaves, victorious soldiers and other people in Ezio and by the princes of three different nations, Mirteo, Ircano and Scitalce, with their retinue in Semiramide.\(^\text{37}\) Even though the music for these two marches could not have been the same as their respective composers, Pietro Auletta and Nicola Porpora, were different, the musicians on stage – who received 97 scudi in total for their participation – for the
triumphant arrival in the first opera were also engaged for the celebratory entrance of the princes in the second:

“Expenses of players on the stage for the two operas, Expenses on March 5 [1729] 15 coin shields paid to Carlo Volmini oboe for honorary promised to him in policy withdrawn, [...]; on the aforesaid day 15 coin shields paid to Giuseppe Braconier hunting trumpet for honorary promised to him in policy withdrawn, [...]; on the aforementioned day 15 currency shields paid to Giovanni Belmonte oboe for a fee promised to him in a policy withdrawn, [...]; on the aforementioned day 15 coin shields paid to Pier Francesco Adriani bassoon for honorary promised to him in policy withdrawn, [...]; on the aforementioned day, 15 coin shields paid to Baldassare Bombelli, the oboe player for the honorary promised to him in policy withdrawn, [...]; on the 14th of the aforementioned month 12 coin shields paid to Andrea Mancini tympanum who played in both operas [...].”

The musicians who participated in both operas were Carlo Volmini, Giovanni Belmonte and Baldassare Bombelli on the oboes, Giuseppe Braconier on the hunting trumpet, Pier Francesco Adriani on the bassoon and Andrea Bombelli on the drum. Even though we are not in possession of the musical score by Auletta to ascertain the triumphal march in Ezio, the score of Porpora for Semiramide gives us an idea of how the festive arrival of the princes, set to music in D major and a Grave tempo, was performed musically (Figure 1). From the music manuscript it appears that not all the instruments that participated in the “Marchia” in scene I.2 were seen on stage. The hunting horns, the violettas, violoncello and harpsichord accompanied the stage musicians from the orchestra. On a larger scale the adaptation of such endowment scenes was not only used in a specific theater in an identical season but could be expanded over several years, as explained in the next paragraph.

---

38 “Spese di sonatori nel palco per le due opere, Dare adì 5 marzo [1729] 15 scudi di moneta pagati a Carlo Volmini oboe per onorario promessole in polizza ritirata, [...]; adì detto 15 scudi di moneta pagati a Giuseppe Braconier tromba da caccia per onorario promessole in polizza ritirata, [...]; adì detto 15 scudi di moneta pagati a Giovanni Belmonte oboe per onorario promessole in polizza ritirata, [...]; adì detto 15 scudi di moneta pagati a Pier Francesco Adriani fagotto per onorario promessole in polizza ritirata, [...]; adì detto 15 scudi di moneta pagati a Baldassare Bombelli sonatore di oboe per onorario promessole in polizza ritirata, [...]; adì 14 detto 12 scudi di moneta pagati ad Andrea Mancini timpanum che ha sonato tutte due le opere [...],” I-Rasmom, CT424, c. 73 ls.
Figure 1: Nicola Porpora, Semiramide riconosciuta, Rome 1729, Act I, Scene 2 (I-Nc, Rari 7.2.19, fols. 15v-16v).
4. Adaptation of décors of different dramas in a single theater in different seasons

Starting with the carnival season of 1726 and continuing in subsequent years, the impresario of the Teatro delle Dame engaged several architects – Alessandro Mauri (1726 and 1728), Pietro Baistrocchi (1727), Pompeo Aldobrandini (1729) as well as Giovanni Battista Oliverio and Pietro Orte (1730). They constructed the stage designs for Didone abbandonata, Valdemaro (1726), Siroe re di Persia, Gismondo re di Polonia (1727), Catone in Utica, Ipermestra (1728), Ezio, Semiramide riconosciuta (1729), Alessandro nell'Indie and Artaserse (1730). All ten operas were based on nine scene types and almost all of them – if not taken over from the operas performed earlier in the 1720s – were created by the first set designer Alessandro Mauri for the first carnival season after the Holy Year. After the reopening of the renovated theater in 1725 all these types of scene were probably also in use during consecutive seasons when they could be slightly or substantially changed by the other set designers. These types are the “magnificent place”/“palace”, the “courtyard”/“atrium”, the “temple”/“pavilion”, the “apartment”/“cabinet”, the “harbor”, the “woods” (arborata)/“countryside”, the “garden” and the “prison” (Table 4, season 1726). These décors were also sufficient for the carnival season in 1727. Only in 1728 did Metastasio require a completely new design never used before for the representation of Catone in Utica, the “ruins” in the third sequence in Act I (“Fabbriche in parte rovinate vicino al soggiorno di Catone”). We can suggest that the architect Alessandro Mauri created all nine scene types for the Metastasio dramas performed in the Teatro delle Dame, since Mauri was engaged not only in 1726 but also in 1728. The other architects and scenographers had the task of renewing and adapting these scenes for the new dramas, specifying the venues and organizing some details in the stage design. In fact, all the nine sets could be transformed into alternative scenery (Table 4 a-i). Besides the special Roman places like the Capitol and the Forum Romanum in Ezio, maybe conceived exclusively for the 1729 season by Aldobrandini, only one other specific place can be distinguished in Table 4. The “luogo di tribunali” (Valdemaro) could be adapted from atriums, if they had a circular form, otherwise from apartments or the cabinet, if they had a rectangular form.

The scene type most often in use in all the operas performed in the Teatro delle Dame over these five years was the apartment (20 times), which was easily transformable into a cabinet, a room, a chamber, a gallery or, with some adaptations like helmets and armor for the representations see BLICHMANN, 2019 and 2018; MARKUSZEWSKA, 2018, 2016a, 2016b and 2013.

39 Three of these dramas were not written by Metastasio but by Apostolo Zeno (Valdemaro), Francesco Briani (Gismondo) and Antonio Salvi (Ipermestra).
40 The operas performed between 1720 and 1724 are Amore e Maestà and Faramondo (1720), Eumene and Artaserse (1721), Sofonisba and Flavio Anicio Olibrio (1722), Cosroe and Adelaide (1723), Farnace and Scipione (1724). For these representations see BLICHMANN, 2019 and 2018; MARKUSZEWSKA, 2018, 2016a, 2016b and 2013.
41 I-Rasmom, CT421, c. 12 ls
into an armory (Table 4a). Most of them are royal settings, while in Ezio the chambers are specified as imperial spaces due to the historical plot. Only two of them were not described in more detail (Valdemaro). All the other stage sets of this type are specified in some way: three of them were ground floor apartments – in Siroe corresponding to the gardens – five had seats, three had statues, two had tables and one set was furnished with a bed, a fountain, mirrors and paintings. In Ezio the prospect of the gallery showed a large balcony with a view of Rome.

The magnificent place or the royal palace used in Acts I and III in Didone was probably not only renewed for Siroe, Catone and Artaserse, but with high probability it was also adapted for the halls necessary in Valdemaro, Gismondo, Ipermestra and Artaserse and salons required in Valdemaro, Ipermestra and Semiramide (Table 4b). All in all, this type of scene was used 13 times in five years. It was a typical public setting and was often equipped with a throne, seats and a table serving great gatherings of all dramatis personae. In Siroe and Artaserse this equipment provided the framework for the coronation of the protagonists. In Semiramide the hall was illuminated, and the board and the seats were used for the wedding banquet. In some scenographies the view of a city or a field was depicted (Didone, Ipermestra), while others were decorated as a “spring palace” (Valdemaro). The great golden horse machine erected to Mars and the altar in the middle of the stage with the simulacrum of the Sun were additional décors in Valdemaro and Artaserse.

The atrium, courtyard and arcades used about ten times (Table 4c) were apparently reused without major changes. In Ezio the atrium was equipped with a prospect showing iron gates that led to several prisons. The most elaborate scenography shows the great arcades of the royal palace in Semiramide situated on the banks of the river Euphrates. On one side a throne was positioned, to the left of which four seats were placed. In the middle of the stage was placed an altar with the simulacrum of Belo, the Deity of the Chaldeans. A large bridge with statues, ships on the river and a view of tents and soldiers on the other side of the river were other decorations which Pompeo Aldobrandini created for this performance.

The royal gardens created for Valdemaro were reused nine times as delightful places, parks, vegetable gardens or fences (Table 4d) and were adorned with fountains, sepulchers, palms and cypresses. The trees were also used in Ipermestra and recycled in Alessandro, which also had a temple dedicated to Bacchus. The vegetable gardens in Semiramide and Ezio were specific ones and had to create a connection to the hanging gardens of Babylon and the Palatine gardens in Rome, which were ornamented with boulevards, espaliers of flowers, fountains, water falls, grotesques and statues. In Artaserse the nighttime garden was situated inside the palace of the kings of Persia with several apartments and a view of the palace.

For the typology of the temple or pavilion – both small buildings of circular and round base, often with a single ambience and located outside of a main building – which was used nine times in all between 1726 and 1730, a distinction must be made between external and internal architecture (Table 4e). In Didone, Gismondo (Act II), Siroe and Alessandro (Act III) the point of view of the temple or pavilion is an internal one and
exposed in its interior architecture as *simulacrum* of a Deity, a throne, other furniture and a stake that lights up. In *Gismondo* the pavilion was decorated with flags inside, but a space for the army was left around it. In contrast, the pavilions and temples in *Valdemaro, Gismondo* (Act I), *Ipermestra* and *Alessandro* (Act I) were architectural structures seen from the outside, with the possibility of also seeing the interior space. Usually these sets were closely connected with war scenes, battlefields and soldiers. The temple in *Alessandro*, which is situated within a fence of palms and cypresses in Cleofide’s palace, is an exception. Furthermore, the temples had to be different by virtue of the deities (Neptune, Bacchus etc.) to whom they were dedicated. Thanks to the altered decoration the symbolism and meaning of the sequence became different.

The woods (“arborata”) created for *Didone* were adapted into large countryside places or forests, or showed the inner part of a city wall in the other operas. Typically, it was a location between cities and harbors, settings on a river with ships and settings where battles took place (Table 4f). The most developed setting is the one in *Alessandro*, where ancient factories with tents and military housing, a bridge over the Idaspe river, a military camp, elephants, towers, covered wagons and war machines were shown in the countryside. In fact, this typology of scenes as well as the typology of the pavilion, the countryside places, the arcades and the ruins correlate with battle or war scenes near a harbor or a shore. They belong to the scenes divided into two distinct spaces as can be deduced from the Table 4c, e, f, g, i, where ‘mixed’ stage decorations are marked with a star (*). In *Catone in Utica* further scenographic details are various islands on a river that communicate with each other through different bridges.

Last but not least, the dark ambience of the prison used in *Valdemaro* was adapted in the other performances as a jail, a narrow place enclosed in a castle and aqueducts. In *Catone in Utica*, for example, the set was reduced for the use of an underground road leading from the city to the harbor.

---

43 The addition of a more specific description of the temples can give a different meaning to the ambience. In Metastasian drama can be found numerous types of temples that all have a different symbolism: The “Tempio di Nettuno” (*Didone abbandonata*, I,15) is related to the sea and the water, the “Tempio dedicato al Sole” (*Siroe re di Persia*, I,1; *Il Demetrio*, III,12) and the “Tempio di Apollo” (*Demofonte*, II,9) can be associated with the sun, the “Tempio di Giove Statore” (*La clemenza di Tito*, I,5) is connected with the very origins of ancient Rome (cf. BLICHMANN, 2015, p. 139) and in contrast the “Tempio di Giove Olimpico” (*L'Olimpiade*, III,6) is related to the largest Doric temple ever constructed. The “Tempio di Bacco” (*Alessandro nell'Indie*, I,6; *L'Issipile*, I,1; *Achille in Sciro*, I,1), is correlated with the god of grape-harvest and fertility while the “Tempio di Venere” (*L'Issipile*, III,8) and the “Tempio di Diana” (*Ciro riconosciuto*, III,14) are to be associated with the Roman goddess of love and hunting, the “Tempio di Ercole Tirio” (*Il re pastore*, III,7) with the God Melqart and the Phoenician legend of the columns of Hercules. All these different temples on stage were characterized with their own specific symbols. Cf. no. 45.

In summary, from the previous considerations it should have become clear that the stage directions in the *drammi per musica* by Metastasio were almost always identical or adapted, as discussed for the different versions of Metastasian dramas. The adaptation of the stage directions in these non-pasticcio versions was a really handled practice. This ultimately facilitated the handling and realization of pasticcios because stage directions and stage designs could be adapted easily. However, when adopting a specific sequence of scenes from the initial version into the pasticcio version, attention had to be paid to the fact that the corresponding stage direction and set design were also adapted. It can also be emphasized that the stage directions in Pietro Metastasio’s *drammi per musica* are almost always retained literally. But in terms of stage design and decoration two different forms of adaptations can be distinguished. Endowment scenes were the basis of stage sets in a specific theater created by an architect, reused during other seasons, adapted to specific needs of the performances and re-decorated by other scenographers.\(^{45}\) In contrast, a specific Metastasian *dramma per musica* performed in different theaters at different times, despite identical stage directions, could offer a different set design due to the particular endowment scenes present in every individual theater.\(^ {46}\) This means that, although Metastasio’s stage directions were not usually modified over time and in different metropolises, every single opera house had to adapt these stage directions bearing in mind its particular material, aesthetic or political needs,\(^ {47}\) especially if it was viewed by sovereigns to whom was dedicated the *dramma per musica*.\(^ {48}\) In such cases opera performances were a medium of political communication, which, in a striking way, enabled the consolidation and proclamation of power. European monarchs as organizers, with the help of their impresarios and architects, steered the impact of opera performances as *instrumentum regni* by also emphasizing explosive messages visually, by means of performative symbols on stage.\(^ {49}\)

\(^{45}\) Cf. chapter 3 and 4.

\(^{46}\) Cf. chapter 1 and 2.

\(^{47}\) Without offering a precise discussion in this context, such scenographical divergences can be observed for the first stage set in *Didone abbandonata* for Dresden-Hubertusburg 1742, Lisbon 1753 and Turin 1773. For a comparison see Tables V, VII and XVII in Verardo Tieri, 2004, pp. 638, 640, 652.

\(^{48}\) For example, the performance of *La clemenza di Tito* in Lisbon 1755 and Turin 1760 had different needs, depending on the dedicatees – Joseph I, King of Portugal, and Charles Emmanuel III, Duke of Savoy – and relating to the architectonical conception of the stage design for the second sequence, the “Atrium of the Temple of Jupiter Stator” (“Atrio del Tempio di Giove Statore”). Blichmann, 2015. For the stage design cf. in particular *ibid.*, p. 142 (Image 4) and p. 152 (Image 10).

\(^{49}\) A particular case study on decorative details in the last stage set (“Magnificent place that introduces in a vast amphitheater”/“Luogo magnifico, che introduce a vastissimo anfiteatro”) of *La clemenza di Tito* (Lisbon 1755) is considered in Blichmann, 2017.
### Appendix

*Table 1: Pasticcio practice and differences in stage directions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and year of performance</th>
<th>Stage direction (content differences in italic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naples 1724 [NA24]</td>
<td>Luogo magnifico destinato per le pubbliche udienze con trono da un lato; veduta con prospetto della città di Cartagine che sta in atto edificandosi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggio Emilia 1725 [RE25]</td>
<td><em>Grand’atrio</em> con trono per le pubbliche udienze, ed in lontano la città di Cartagine che sta edificandosi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome 1726 [RM26]</td>
<td>La città di Cartagine che sta in atto edificandosi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan 1729 [MI29]</td>
<td>= RE25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome 1732 [RM32]</td>
<td>Luogo magnifico destinato per le pubbliche udienze con trono, veduta della città di Cartagine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna 1735 [BO35]</td>
<td>= RE25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesena 1743 [CE43]</td>
<td>= RE25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma 1745 [PA45]</td>
<td>Luogo magnifico destinato per le pubbliche udienze con trono da un lato.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence 1753 [FI53]</td>
<td>= RM32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence 1759 [FI59]</td>
<td>= FI53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich 1760 [MU60]</td>
<td>= PA45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1770 [VE70]</td>
<td>= FA45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Examples of aria sequences in *Didone abbandonata* (“Luogo magnifico”, I,1-I,8) (for abbreviations see Literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>VE25</th>
<th>RM26</th>
<th>MI29</th>
<th>VE30</th>
<th>FE33</th>
<th>ME33</th>
<th>MI39</th>
<th>LI41</th>
<th>VE41</th>
<th>DR42</th>
<th>FA45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enea Dovei…..</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ma no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selene Dirò che fida sei</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didone Son regina e son amante</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmida Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iarba Fra lo splendor del trono</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araspe Se dalle stelle tu non sei guida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0/x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aria** table continues...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>BR45</th>
<th>PA45</th>
<th>VE47</th>
<th>VE48</th>
<th>RE52</th>
<th>MA52</th>
<th>LI53</th>
<th>MI55</th>
<th>CR56</th>
<th>VE57</th>
<th>TO73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enea Dovei…..</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ma no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selene Dirò che fida sei</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didone Son regina e son amante</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmida Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iarba Fra lo splendor del trono</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araspe Se dalle stelle tu non sei guida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x same aria; - cancelled aria; = cancelled scene; o altered aria; ,, aria altered/not set to music
Table 3: Stage directions in Ezio and Semiramide riconosciuta, Rome, Teatro delle Dame, 1729 (adaptations in italics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Ezio</th>
<th>Semiramide riconosciuta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Music: Pietro Auletta</strong></td>
<td><strong>Music: Nicola Porpora</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Parte del Foro romano con <em>trono</em> imperiale da un lato, vista di Roma illuminata in tempo di notte con <em>archi trionfali</em> ed altri apparati festivi, preparati per celebrare le feste decennali e per onorare il ritorno d’Ezio vincitore d’Attila</td>
<td><em>Gran portico</em> del palazzo reale corrispondente alle sponde de l’Eufrate; <em>trono</em> da un lato, alla sinistra del quale un sedile più basso, in faccia tre altri sedili; ara nel mezzo col simulacro di Belo deità de’ Caldei, gran ponte praticabile con statue, navi sul fiume, vista di tende e soldati su l’altra sponda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
<td><strong>Camere imperiali istoriate di pittura.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Orti pensili.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III</strong></td>
<td><em>Orti</em> palatini corrispondenti agli appartamenti imperiali con viali, spalliere di fiori e fontane continue, in fondodauce d’acque, innanzi grotteschi e statue.</td>
<td><em>Sala regia</em> illuminata in tempo di notte; varie credenze d’intorno con vasi trasparenti, gran mensa imbandita nel mezzo con quattro sedili d’intorno ed una sedia in faccia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV</strong></td>
<td><em>Galleria</em> di Statue e specchi con <em>sedili intorno</em>, fra’ quali uno innanzi dalla mano destra capace di due persone, gran balcone aperto in prospetto, dal quale vista di Roma.</td>
<td><strong>Appartamenti terreni.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td><em>Atrio magnifico</em> con <em>cancelli</em> di ferro in prospetto che conducono a diversi prigioni.</td>
<td>Campagna su la riva dell’Eufrate con navi che poi sono incendiate; mura de’ giardini reali da un lato con cancelli di ferro aperti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI</strong></td>
<td>Campidoglio antico.</td>
<td><strong>Gabinetti reali.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>Anfiteatro con cancelli</em> chiusi dai lati, trono da una parte.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenography by Pompeo Aldobrandini.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Luogo</th>
<th>Cortile</th>
<th>Tempio</th>
<th>Riva</th>
<th>Sala d’Armi</th>
<th>Camera</th>
<th>Foro romano</th>
<th>*Portico/Riva</th>
<th>Rive</th>
<th>Giardino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Padiglioni</td>
<td>Atrio</td>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>Appartamenti</td>
<td>Città murata</td>
<td>Campagna</td>
<td>Camere</td>
<td>Orti pensili</td>
<td>Recinto</td>
<td>Reggia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salone</td>
<td>Portici</td>
<td>Fabrìche</td>
<td>Prigione</td>
<td>Padiglione</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II</td>
<td>Appartamenti</td>
<td>Campagna</td>
<td>Deliziosa reale</td>
<td>*Padiglione/Riva</td>
<td>Riva</td>
<td>Parco</td>
<td>Orti palatini</td>
<td>Sala reggia</td>
<td>Gabinetti</td>
<td>Appartamenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atrio</td>
<td>Appartamenti</td>
<td>Stanze</td>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>Sala reggia</td>
<td>Galleria</td>
<td>Appartamenti</td>
<td>*Campagna/fabri-che/[riva]</td>
<td>Sala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabineto</td>
<td>Luogo di tribunali</td>
<td>Armeria</td>
<td>Atrio</td>
<td>Appartamenti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabinetti</td>
<td>Suborghi rovinati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III</td>
<td>Porto</td>
<td>Giardini</td>
<td>Giardino</td>
<td>Campagna</td>
<td>Cortile</td>
<td>Giardino</td>
<td>Atrio</td>
<td>*Campagna/Riva</td>
<td>*Portici/Giardini</td>
<td>Prigione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arborata</td>
<td>Carcere</td>
<td>Luogo angusto</td>
<td>Atrio</td>
<td>Acquedotti</td>
<td>Padiglione</td>
<td>Campidoglio</td>
<td>Gabinetti</td>
<td>*Recinto/Tempio</td>
<td>Gabinetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regia</td>
<td>Sala</td>
<td>Luogo</td>
<td>Sala</td>
<td>Luogo</td>
<td>Salone reggio</td>
<td>Anfiteatro</td>
<td>Luogo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* mixed stage sets
### Table 4a: Appartamento – Gabinetto – Stanza – Camera – Galleria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td><em>Didone abbandonata</em></td>
<td>Appartamenti reali con tavolino.</td>
<td>Gabinetto con sedie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td><em>Gismondo re di Polonia</em></td>
<td>Revi appartamenti di Primislao – Armeria corrispondente alle stanze di Cunegonda, dove sono le statue dei re e principi della Polonia.</td>
<td>Stanze terrene con fontane e statue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td><em>Catone in Utica</em></td>
<td>Sala d’armi.</td>
<td>Camera con sedie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td><em>Ezio</em></td>
<td>Camere imperiali istoriate di piture.</td>
<td>Gallaria di statue e specchi con sedili intorno, fra’ quali uno innanzi dalla mano destra capace di due persone, gran balcone aperto in prospetto, dal quale vista di Roma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Semiramide riconosciuta</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appartamenti terreni.</td>
<td>Gabinetti reali.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td><em>Alessandro nell’Indie</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabinetti reali. – Appartamenti nella reggia di Cleofide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Artaserse</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appartamenti reali.</td>
<td>Gabinetti negli appartamenti di Mandane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4b: Luogo magnifico – Reggia – Sala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Didone abbandonata</td>
<td>Luogo Magnifico destinato per le publiche udienze con trono da un lato, veduta in prospetto della città di Cartagine che sta in atto edificandosi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regia con veduta della città di Cartagine in prospetto che poi s’incendia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td>Salone imperiale con trono e sedili minori all’intorno.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gran Sala che rappresenta la reggia della primavera tutta di fiori adornata. Machina in lontano di gran Cavallo d’oro eretto a Marte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Gismondo re di Polonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sala regia con trono.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siroe re di Persia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luogo magnifico nella regia destinato per la coronazione di Medarse, ove segue poi quella di Siroe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Catone in Utica</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luogo magnifico nel soggiorno di Catone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td>Sala regia con sedie e trono.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salone regio e veduta di gallerie da cui in lontananza si scorgono da una parte le mura della città diroccata e dall’altra il campo di Linceo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Semiramide riconosciuta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salone regio illuminato in tempo di notte.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Reggia.</td>
<td>Gran sala del real consiglio con trono da un lato, sedili dall’altro per i grandi del regno, tavolino e sedia alla destra del suddetto trono.</td>
<td>Luogo magnifico destinato per la coronazione d’Artaserse, trono da un lato con sopra scettro e corona, ara nel mezzo con simulacro del Sole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4c: Atrio – Cortile – Portico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td><em>Didone abbandonata</em></td>
<td>Cortile.</td>
<td>Atrio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td>Atrio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td><em>Gismondo re di Polonia</em></td>
<td>Portici reali.</td>
<td>Atrio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td><em>Catone in Utica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cortile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td>Atrio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Ezio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Atrio magnifico con cancelli di ferro in prospetto che conducono a diversi prigioni.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Semiramide riconosciuta</em></td>
<td><em>Gran Portico</em> del palazzo reale corrispondente alle sponde de l’Eufrate. Trono da un lato, alla sinistra del quale un sedile più basso, in faccia tre altri sedili. Ara nel mezzo col simulacro di Belo deità de’ Caldei, gran ponte praticabile con statue, navi sul fiume, vista di tende e soldati su l’altra sponda. (cf. table 4g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td><em>Alessandro nell’Indie</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Portici de’ giardini reali. (cf. table 4d)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4d: Deliziosa – Giardino – Parco – Orto – Recinto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Giardini reali.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Siroe re di Persia</td>
<td>Deliziosa reale con acquie</td>
<td>Giardino.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Catone in Utica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td>Viale di palme e di cipressi nel parco reale co’ sepolcri de’ re d’Argo, quello d’Ipermestra e sua iscrizione.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parte remota del reale giardino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Ezio</td>
<td>Orti palatini corrispondenti agli appartamenti imperiali con viali, spalliere di fiori e fontane continue, in fondo cadute d’acqua, innanzi grottesche e statue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semiramide riconosciuta</td>
<td>Orti pensili.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Alessandro nell’Indie</td>
<td>*Recinto di palme e cipressi con piccolo tempio nel mezzo dedicato a Bacco nella reggia di Cleofide. (cf. table 4e)</td>
<td>*Portici de’ giardini reali. (cfr. table 4c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Giardino interno nel palazzo de’ re di Persia corrispondente a diversi appartamenti, vista della reggia, notte con luna.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4e: Padiglione – Tempio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Didone abbandonata</td>
<td>Tempio di Nettuno con simulacro del medesimo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td>Campi di battaglia trincerati con Padiglioni ed illuminati di notte.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Gismondo re di Polonia</td>
<td>*Veduta della città di Varsavia posta su la riva della Vistula, sopra di cui un gran ponte. In distanza si veggono padiglioni di Gismondo e lungo il fiume varii navigli, da un de’ quali sbarca il suddetto Gismondo con Otone suo figlio, ricevuto da Ernesto, che esce dalla città con seguito de’ cittadini e da Ermano, che viene dai padiglioni con molti soldati. (cf. table 4g)</td>
<td>Padiglione reale con trono alla parte e tavolino, sopra cui stanno le bandiere delle provincie per le quali deve Primislao prestar l’omaggio a Gismondo, al di fuori stanno schierati gli eserciti polacco e lituano.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siroe re di Persia</td>
<td>Gran Tempio dedicato al Sole con ara e simulacro del medesimo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campo di Linceo con Padiglione reale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Alessandro nell’Indie</td>
<td>*Recinto di palme e cipressi con piccolo tempio nel mezzo dedicato a Bacco nella reggia di Cleofide. (cf. table 4d)</td>
<td>Gran padiglione d’Alessandro vicino all’Idaspe con vista della reggia di Cleofide su l’altra sponda del fiume.</td>
<td>Tempio magnifico dedicato a Bacco con rogo nel mezzo che poi s’accende.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>Setting in Act I</td>
<td>Setting in Act II</td>
<td>Setting in Act III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Didone abbandonata</td>
<td>Arborata tra la città e il porto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td>Vasta campagna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Gismondo re di Polonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vasta campagna per la battaglia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Catone in Utica</td>
<td>Parte interna delle mura di Utica con porta della città in prospetto chiusa da un ponte che poi si abbassa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td>Campagna tendata nelle vicinanze d’Argo con la veduta della città e levata del Sole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Semiramide riconosciuta</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Campagna su la riva dell’Eufrate con navi che poi sono incendiate. (cf. table 4g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Alessandro nell’Indie</td>
<td>*Campagna sparsa di fabbriche antiche con tende ed alloggiamenti militari preparati da Cleofide per l’esercito greco, ponte su l’Idaspe, campo numeroso d’Alessandro disposta in ordinanza di là dal fiume, con elefanti, torri, carri coperti e machine da guerra. (cf. table 4e and 4i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4g: Porto – Riva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Didone abbandonata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Porto di mare con navi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Gismondo re di Polonia</td>
<td>*Veduta della città di Varsavia posta su la riva della Vistula, sopra di cui un gran ponte. In distanza si veggono padiglioni di Gismondo e lungo il fiume vari navigli, da un de’ quali sbarca il suddetto Gismondo con Otone suo figlio, ricevuto da Ernesto, che esce dalla città con seguito de’ cittadini e da Ermano, che viene dai padiglioni con molti soldati. (cf. table 4e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Catone in Utica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alloggiamenti militari su le rive del fiume Bagrada con varie isole che comunicano fra loro per diversi ponti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Semiramide riconosciuta</td>
<td>*Gran Portico del palazzo reale corrispondente alle sponde de l’Eufrate. Trono da un lato, alla sinistra del quale un sedile più basso, in faccia tre altri sedili. Ara nel mezzo col simulacro di Belo deità de’ Caldei, gran ponte praticabile con statue, navi sul fiume, vista di tende e soldati su l’altra sponda. (cf. table 4c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Campagna su la riva dell’Eufrate con navi che poi sono incendiate. (cf. table 4f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>Setting in Act I</td>
<td>Setting in Act II</td>
<td>Setting in Act III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td><em>Alessandro nell’Indie</em></td>
<td>Campagna sparsa di fabbriche antiche con tende ed alloggiamenti militari preparati da Cleofide per l’esercito greco, ponte su l’Idaspe, campo numeroso d’Alessandro disposta in ordinanza di là dal fiume, con elefanti, torri, carri coperti e machine da guerra. (cf. table 4f and 4i)</td>
<td>Campo di battaglia su le rive dell’Idaspe, tende e carri rovesciati, soldati dispersi, armi, insigne ed altri avanzi dell’esercito di Poro, disfatto da Alessandro.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4h: Carcere – Prigione – Luogo angusto – Acquedotto**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Valdemaro</td>
<td>Carcere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Siroe re di Persia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luogo angusto e racchiuso nel castello destinato per carcere a Siroe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Catone in Utica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquedotti antichi ridotti ad uso di strada sotterranea che conducono dalla città alla marina con porta chiusa da un lato del prospetto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td>Prigione.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parte interna della fortezza, nella quale è ritenuto prigione Arbace, cancelli in prospetto, picciola porta a mano destra, per la quale si ascende alla reggia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4i: Rovina – Fabrica – Sobborgo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Setting in Act I</th>
<th>Setting in Act II</th>
<th>Setting in Act III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Catone in Utica</td>
<td><em>Fabrique</em> in parte rovinate vicino al soggiorno di Catone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipermestra</td>
<td><em>Sobborghi</em> della città rovinati e acquedotti demoliti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Alessandro nell’Indie</td>
<td>*Campagna sparsa di fabrique antique con tende ed alloggiamenti militari preparati da Cleofide per l’esercito greco, ponte su l’Idaspe, campo numeroso d’Alessandro disposta in ordinanza di là dal fiume, con elefanti, torri, carri coperti e machine da guerra. (cf. table 4f and 4g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Id., Didone abbandonata, Parma 1745a [PA45].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Brescia 1745b [BR45].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Fano 1745c [FA45].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Venice 1747 [VE47].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Venice 1748 [VE48].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Mantova 1752a [MA52].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Madrid 1752b [MAD52].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Reggio Emilia 1752c [RE52].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Florence 1753a [FI53].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Livorno 1753b [LI53].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Milan 1755 [MI55].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Cremona 1756 [CR56].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Venice 1757 [VE57].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Florence 1759 [FI56].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Munich 1760 [MU60].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Venice 1770 [VE70].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Turin 1773 [TU73].
Id., Siroe re di Persia, Rome 1727.
Id., Ezio, Rome 1729.
Id., Semiramide riconosciuta, Rome 1729.
Id., Alessandro nell’Indie, Rome 1730.
Id., Artaserse, Rome 1730.
SALVI, ANTONIO, Ipermestra, Rome 1728.
SARRO, DOMENICO, Didone abbandonata, Naples 1724; score: I-Nc, Rari 7.2.5.
ZENO, APOSTOLO, Valdemaro, Rome 1726.
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Let me begin with a historical example of the labelling of an opera as a pasticcio in the context of the manifold and often misinterpreted transfers between northern Germany and England during the 18th century. In his *Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte* of 1740, Johann Mattheson listed all the performances of Handel’s operas that to his knowledge had been produced in Hamburg up to that point, not without complaining about the inadequate handling of the musical works in question:

“The remaining Singspiele from Handel’s pen, as Rinaldo, 1715; Oriana, 1717; together with the just mentioned Agrippina, 1718; Zenobia, 1721; Muzio Scevola and Floridante, 1723; Tamerlan, Julius Cäsar and Otto, 1725; Richardus I, 1729; Admetus, 1730; Cleofida (also called by its correct name Porus) and Judith, 1732; lastly, Rodelinda, 1734, have been played here in Hamburg in his absence and [their scores] have been sent in from outside. Such was also the case with the music to Brockes’ Passion, which he also composed in England, and had sent here by post in an uncommonly close-written score. […]

While the Handelian operas are, most of them, composed to Italian words, yet they have been performed here partly in that language, but partly subjected to the greatest alterations through translation and interpolation. […] In all 19 or 20 of his dramatic pieces are known here in Hamburg, although in London there are perhaps still more, from which arias have been engraved there, and are somewhat expensive.”

---

1 “Die übrigen Singspiele von Händels Feder, als Rinaldo, 1715; Oriana, 1717; samt der ebenerwähnten Agrippine, 1718; Zenobia, 1721; Muzzio Scevola und Floridantes, 1723; Tamerlan, Julius Cäsar und Otto, 1725; Richardus I. 1729; Admetus, 1730; Cleofida, (sonst mit dem rechten Nahmen Porus genannt) und Judith, 1732, zuletzt die Rodelinda, 1734, sind in seiner Abwesenheit hier in Hamburg gespielt, und von aussen eingesandt worden. Eine solche Beschaffenheit hat es auch mit der Brockeschen Passions-Musik, die er gleichfalls in England verfertiget, und in einer ungemein eng-geschriebenen Partitur auf der
Mattheson’s remarks contain not only important information on his own preoccupations with authorship issues, but also on the distribution of operas via post and printed sheet music. According to him, the separation between the score and its author resulted in the many “Einflickungen”, i.e. interpolations of arias which seems to have been quite a normal procedure in Hamburg. As can be seen in the example of Mattheson’s list of “Singspiele”, this practice was not explicitly labelled with the term “pasticcio” but was connected to the operatic genre in general.²

Yet, upon further inspection of Mattheson’s remarks on the treatment of Handel’s operas in Hamburg and their reception in other metropolises or courts, transregional differences of the early modern reception of pasticcios can be revealed. This can be shown by the example of the above-mentioned opera, Judith, which was performed in Hamburg from 1733 to 1737 in an arrangement by the then director of the Hamburg opera, Georg Philipp Telemann.³ Mattheson was incorrect in qualifying Judith as a “Singspiel” by Handel, since the main part of the music was taken from Fortunato Chell-eri’s L’innocenza difesa, even if this opera had already been readapted on several occasions: Chelleri’s opera was composed to a libretto by Francesco Silvani, which had first been performed with music by Giuseppe Maria Orlandini in Verona in 1714.⁴ Chelleri’s setting of L’innocenza difesa might have already been staged in Florence in 1721.⁵ In addition, a libretto which is very similar to Silvani’s version set to music by Chelleri but without any indication of the composer’s or librettist’s names survives. It was published

---

⁵ L’Innocenza difesa. Dramma per Musica da rappresentarsi in Firenze Il Carnovale dell’Anno 1721. Nel Teatro di Via della Pergola sotto la protezione dell’Altezza Reale del Serenissimo Grand Principe di Toscana. E dedicato all’Eccellenza illustrissima dell’Si­gnor Duca Francesco Bonelli [...]. In Firenze, Per Dom. Ambrogio Versi [...] 1721; online: http://bibliotecaestense.beniculturali.it/info/img/lib/i-mo-beu-70.h.6.7.pdf, 11.02.2020.
in Venice in 1722, before being performed once more as La Giuditta in Kassel in 1726 and finally as Die vertheidigte Unschuld/Die beschützte Unschuld in Brunswick and Wolfenbüttel in 1731. For the Hamburg production of 1733, Georg Philipp Telemann added three arias from Handel’s Lotario (London 1729) to Chelleri’s version, plus three arias newly composed by himself for the child role of Fabio, which until then had been a silent. Even if in this way Telemann continued the strong orientation towards Handel’s operas and the practice of recitative translations that were common in both Hamburg and Brunswick, there is no justification to consider the Hamburg Judith an opera written by Handel.


10 On the similarities of operatic productions in Brunswick and Hamburg and on Telemann’s relations to Brunswick see Poetzsch, 1993, pp. 63-69.
The complex production history of *L’innocenza difesa*, *La Giuditta*, *Die vertheidigte Unschuld* and *Judith* continued to provoke different genre attributions even in the second half of the 18th century, when the term “pasticcio” seems to have been attributed to the Hamburg *Judith* for the first time: in his description of Handel’s life from 1785, Charles Burney adopted Mattheson’s reflections on the Hamburg performances of Handel’s operas, but wondered if *Judith* was “an Oratorio, […] of which nothing is known in England”.11 Just a year later, in a German translation of Burney’s account, Johann Joachim Eschenburg, a “professor from Brunswick”, where Chelleri’s *Die vertheidigte Unschuld* had been performed, rectified Burney’s error with the following footnote: “The latter was not an oratorio, as M. B. supposes, but an opera, and this Judith is not the biblical one, but the wife of Louis the Pious. Nearly all the arias are in Italian, and the German recitatives are set by Telemann. It seems to be a mere pasticcio.”12

Burney’s error is remarkable, since even if he states that a *Judith* is not known in England (which is true since there is no Handel opera or oratorio entitled *Judith*), three oratorios called *Judith* had been performed in London between 1733 and 1761. The first of them had been composed by Willem de Fesch and was given at Lincoln’s Inn Fields in February 1733, right at the time of the Hamburg performance of the opera *Judith* and only one year after the performance of Handel’s first oratorio *Esther*.13

Let me briefly resume this little *tour d’horizon* between early 18th-century Hamburg, London and Brunswick in order to formulate the main question of my paper: firstly, each author contextualizes the genre of the opera, *Judith*, with the local repertoire best known to himself. Therefore, operatic pasticcio productions are mostly understood in the light of local operatic practices like the translations into German in Hamburg or the shift from opera to oratorio in London. Secondly, Mattheson and Burney qualify *Judith* in relation to the important role played by Handel as composer renowned throughout Europe. Due to this person-centered view, both authors concentrate on the distribution of Handel’s works in their entirety and not on the multi-composer dramaturgy of music patchworks like Telemann’s adaptation of Chelleri’s *Judith* for Hamburg. Mattheson, for example, acknowledged the honor that was paid to Handel in London. At the end of his Handel biography, in *Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte*, he reflected on the Handel statue in Vauxhall Gardens, which he had learned about in the English periodicals accessible in Hamburg.14 Against this background, it becomes clear that the term “pasticcio” is an

11 Burney, 1785, pp. 50f.
12 “Die letzte war kein Oratorium, wie Hr. B. glaubt, sondern gleichfalls eine Oper; und diese Judith ist nicht die biblische, sondern eine Gemahlin Ludwigs des Frommen. Die Arien sind fast alle italienisch, und die deutschen Recitative von Telemann gesetzt. Es scheint ein blosses Pasticcio zu seyn.” Burney/Eschenburg, 1785, p. XXIII.
14 At the end of his Handel biography, Mattheson writes: “[…] this has often been reported in the English court journals that a marble honor column and statue has been erected for him by some private persons in Vauxhall Gardens, that is already something. In these gardens, that are accessible for everybody to enjoy, many concerts for money are organized.” (“[…]}
anachronistic generic description for the opera practices of the early 18th century that evolved between complex cultural transfers, a widespread yet often misleading or incorrect literal and musical intertextuality, and a continuous crystallization of a person-centered conception of authorship. Consequently, the term was used only in the second half of the 18th century as has been shown here by the example of Eschenburg.

In the following study, I will address the aesthetic role of an operatic practice that was based on the compilation of arias written by different composers during the first half of the 18th century. How can the general structural features and aesthetic functions of early modern operatic ‘pasticcios’ be described from a historical point of view when those works seemed to be part of the general set of local operatic practices? And how can the transregional dimensions of such local practices be outlined? For this, I will first analyze the aesthetic value of operatic works compiled out of preexisting materials, which was reflected upon in the references to opera and oratorio in the caricatures and aesthetic treatises circulating in the musical world of early 18th-century London, i.e. where Mattheson and Burney supposed Judith to have been performed for the first time. In the second part, I will describe the transfers of such aesthetics from London to Hamburg before concluding with an analysis of Telemann’s Judith for the Hamburg opera between the dramaturgy of its libretto and the aesthetics connected to its musical structure made of arias by Chelleri, Handel and Telemann.

Judith in the context of the aesthetic discourses of 18th-century London relating to different arts

The motivation of a Hamburg arrangement of Judith with airs from Handel’s Lotario can surely be explained by Johann Gottfried Riemschneider’s engagement at Handel’s Royal Academy of Music in London for the 1729 performance of that opera. In 1732, just one year before the production of Judith, Riemschneider was back in Hamburg where he sang in Cleofida after Handel’s Poro. After having seen the London production of Lotario, Giuseppe Riva compared the singer to a boar by describing him as “a bass from Hamburg that has a voice more like a natural contralto than a bass, he sweetly sings in his throat and his nose, pronounces Italian like German, acts like a young wild

15 On the importance of the singer’s mobility for the production of pasticcios cf. the articles by Pelliccia (pp. 225-239), Over (pp. 285-328), Zsovár (pp. 425-446) and Ryszka-Komarnicka (pp. 621-657) in this volume.

boar and has a face looking more like a valet than like anything else. Beautiful, really beautiful!”\(^{17}\)

Such a contrasting, figurative and metaphorical description of an ‘imported’ Hamburg singer in London as a boar looking like a servant resembles the presentations of singers and composers in the many graphic prints and periodicals that circulated in the British capital. These prints dealt especially with the transfer of Italian opera to the London music life and the presence of Italian composers and singers there. As will be shown in the following passages, the confrontation of Italian and English opera provoked an extensive discourse on the formation of taste. This is especially true for William Hogarth’s graphic prints in London and of the intertextual as well as interconnected relations that surrounded them.

In relation to the English oratorio Judith that Burney took to be the origin of the Hamburg opera with the same title, William Hogarth published a graphic print entitled A Chorus of Singers, or The Oratorio (December 1732) even before the first performance of the version by Willem de Fesch and William Huggins (Figure 1).\(^{18}\) It shows four voices under the direction of Willem de Fesch who appears at the top of the picture as a conductor without wearing his wig. The center of the graphic is occupied by a person with a boar-like nose wearing a long wig. Around 1800, Johan Ireland and Georg Christoph Lichtenberg considered this figure to be an Italian (“A gentleman,—pardon me,—I meant a singer, in a bag-wig, immediately beneath his uplifted band, I suspect to be of foreign growth. It has the engaging air of an importation from Italy.”).\(^{19}\) Indeed, further graphics by Hogarth in this context illustrate that the ‘Italian’ in the center could be an allusion to Handel. Firstly, the second plate of Hogarth’s The Rake’s Progress (produced in 1732-1734, published 1735) shows Handel with a long wig at the harpsichord.\(^{20}\) This posture and portrait was later retaken by Joseph Goupy in his famous caricature, The Harmonious Boar, which shows Handel as a boar playing the organ (Figure 2).\(^{21}\) Secondly, antithetical to the with-and-without-wig contrast between an ‘Italian’ and an English composer in A Chorus of Singers, or The Oratorio, the image of a public musician without a wig would be used as well by Louis François Roubiliac for the Handel monument in Vauxhall Gardens which the French sculptor accomplished in 1738 under the guidance of Hogarth. In Vauxhall, this monument was placed under a

---


\(^{19}\) Ireland, \(^{1793}\), p. 280; Lichtenberg, 1805, p. 56.

\(^{20}\) Hogarth, 1735, Plate 2.

\(^{21}\) Goupy, 1743-44.
huge open arch that shows some similarities with the frontispiece of Mattheson’s *Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte* of 1740.\textsuperscript{22} By these resemblances, the graphic print *A Chorus of Singers, or The Oratorio* already hints at the complex intertextuality of early modern representations connected to music as an aesthetic but also as a political art. Yet a comprehensive view of the above-mentioned graphics shows that Hogarth’s prints allowed dialectic attitudes which were simultaneously ironic and admiring towards English and Italian composers in 18\textsuperscript{th}-century London. Thus, by describing Riemschneider as a boar looking like a servant, London musical critique integrated the singer into the local musical life where composers and musicians or singers constantly teetered between aesthetic completion and failure.

\textit{Figure 1: William Hogarth, A Chorus of Singers (1732), bpk / Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum.}

\textsuperscript{22} \textsc{Busch}, 2014, pp. 39-52. Cf. the title page of \textsc{Mattheson}, 1740.
Indeed, besides these more general resemblances that point above all to the national contours of ‘Italian’ and ‘English’ music in London, *A Chorus of Singers, or The Oratorio* shows an important element for the formation of musical taste in early modern London musical life. In contrast to the other singers, both de Fesch and Handel, the two composers representing Italian and English opera or oratorio, are wearing glasses. In addition, another figure on the right is holding a magnifying glass above his score. Following this, many caricatures of the time deal with magnifying glasses that sometimes turn into mirrors. This is also true for the Handel caricature *The Harmonious Boar*, which is a pasticcio as well, since the dwarf who holds a magnifying glass in front of Handel’s face was taken by Joseph Goupy from a copy of a drawing by Annibale Carracci. In Goupy’s caricature the magnifying glass can be interpreted as an invitation to study the pasticcio-like arrangement of elements in the left half of the graphic to form one’s taste instead of falling into mere gluttony. Such an invitation seems to be expressed in Hogarth’s *A Chorus of Singers, or The Oratorio* as well, since the print seems to play with the dialectic of musical involvement and analytical study of music. On the one hand, John Ireland and Lichtenberg already underlined the fact that Hogarth had successfully created a

\[\text{zur Nieden, 2019, p. 33.}\]

\[\text{zur Nieden, 2019.}\]
real musical image: “To paint a sound is impossible; but as far as art can go towards it, Mr. Hogarth has gone in this print. The tenor, treble, and bass of these earpiercing choristers are so decisively discriminated, that we all but hear them.”25 On the other hand, the graphic lines of the score merge with the drawing of the persons, thus hinting at an accurate construction of the musical image. In this way the graphic prints circulating in London were built upon one another, reflecting a dialectic formation of taste between Italian opera and (English) popular music theater as well as between the sensation of music and the study of musical scores.26 Such a study seems to rely on the magnifying glass as an instrument to see single items in detail and to enlarge them far from their usual contexts or to see them in contrast to differing objects and music practices.

Telemann’s reception of the London aesthetics in Hamburg

But what did this mean for the Hamburg productions of Handel’s operas in adapted versions? Even if we do not know exactly which subjects were discussed during the long-lasting friendship between Handel and Telemann, there are two connections to the above-described London aesthetics in the work and writings of Telemann. Firstly, Telemann was occupied with the aesthetics of the magnifying glass as well by reflecting on giants and dwarfs in the compositions that he addressed to a broader public. In 1728/29 Telemann included six pieces on Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* in *Der getreue Music-Meister*, among them a *Lilliputsche Chaconne* and a *Brobdingnagische Gigue*.27 In these pieces for two violins without bass, Telemann depicts the giants and dwarfs of Swift’s novel in the score. *Gulliver’s Travels* had been published in London in 1726 and translated into German by Telemann’s librettist Christoph Gottlieb Wend in 1727/28.28

By including some little pieces referring to *Gulliver’s Travels* in his instructive periodical *Der getreue Music-Meister*, Telemann addressed three problems that interested him in general: (1) a reflection on the parallelisms of music and painting, (2) the contrast between musical performances and the reading of librettos and scores (these were also constantly addressed in Luise Adelgunde Victorie Gottsched’s and Johann Adolph Scheibe’s translations and quotations of English periodicals who complained about the patchwork of stage designs and the appearance of different animals on the London stages),29 and (3) the grouping of single musical pieces in a collection addressed to a

25 Ireland, 1793, p. 279.
27 Telemann, 1728, pp. 32 and 36.
28 Hirschmann, 2007, p. 75.
broader public. In *Der getreue Music-Meister*, these problems are partially solved by the notational differences of single musical styles or generic norms that allowed one to distinguish the narrowly patched single pieces by eye. Moreover, Telemann stressed the importance of the musical notation by creating many figurative hints at certain passages in Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* in the *Gulliver Suite*: In the “Lilliputische Chaconne”, the tying to the ground of Gulliver’s body by the Lilliputians is visualized by 256 notes. In the “Brobdingnagische Gigue”, Gulliver tries to play a jig written in a white square notation on the giants’ spinet with two sticks in his hands that could have been visualized by the two violin bows in Telemann’s *Music-Meister*. In a nutshell, Telemann’s *Der getreue Music-Meister* was concerned with the above-mentioned dimension of musical notation as a basis for a thorough study of stylistic differences by a broader public. This study was also fostered by a visual extension of the dramaturgical dimensions in his musical manual that was published in consecutive parts.

Secondly, in spite of this mediated approach to the formation of public taste via a more dramaturgical reflection on dwarfs and giants in his music scores, Telemann appears to have had the same aesthetic interests and to have been part of the network of people occupied with William Hogarth’s concept of aesthetic beauty: above all, Telemann shared Hogarth’s interest in Louis Bertrand Castel’s ocular harpsichord of 1725. In 1739, Telemann published a *Beschreibung der Augen-Orgel oder des Augen-Clavicimbels, so der berühmte Mathematicus und Jesuit zu Paris, Herr Pater Castel, erfunden und ins Werk gerichtet hat*, where he stressed the fact that both colors and sounds apply to the issue of aesthetic reception due to their minimal differences and their shared qualities which might be discovered in detail by the recipient.

In 1753, William Hogarth also first planned a passage on that harpsichord for his *Analysis of Beauty. Written with a View of Fixing the Fluctuating Ideas of Taste*, that

---

30 Steven Zohn stresses the fact that, among other things, Telemann aimed at instructing a broad audience through variety. Zohn, 2017, p. 70. On the relationship of Telemann’s *Der getreue Music-Meister* to England see also Lange, 1997, pp. 116 and 121f.

31 Telemann, 1728, pp. 32 and 36. For Gulliver playing the giant harpsichord see Swift, 2002, p. 105.

32 “The sounds only please because of their pronounced difference, by their accordance and comparison. Colors are as manifold as sounds and have certain accordances. The eye may compose them, develop their comparisons and feel their order and disorder. Such a sensation generates the pleasure and stimulation in all things, and the real pleasure of music consists in the noticing of such difference immediately and bit by bit several times over a short duration.” (“Die Klänge gefallen nur durch eine deutliche Verschiedenheit, durch ihre Übereinstimmung und Vergleichung: Die Farben sind so mannigfaltig, als die Klänge, und haben gewisse Übereinstimmungen. Das Auge kann sie zusammenfügen, ihre Vergleichungen entwickeln und ihre Ordnung und Unordnung empfinden. Diß Empfinden verurhirsch et das Vergnügen und Anreizen in allen Dingen, und das eigentliche Vergnügen der Music bestehet in dem, solchen Unterschied augenblicklich, und nach und nach in kurzer Zeit mehrmals zu bemerken.”) Telemann, 1739.
he later cancelled. In this passage, emphasizing Telemann’s perception of the aesthetic value of the ocular harpsichord, he criticized the classic opinion “that colours and sound [are] of the same nature and that like dispositions of them both would answer the same purpose, i.e., that a jig in notes would be literally a jig in colours”, i.e. to declare oneself in favor of a reformation of taste through comparison and distinctness. Such orientation can also be underlined by the fact that Hogarth based his arguments on Roger de Piles’ *Principles of Painting* (London 1743), i.e. on one of the first writers who had given a definition of the early modern pastiche. In de Pile’s case, pastiche was strongly linked to comparison. Since Hogarth joined an ironic passage on cookery to his own theoretical reflection on beauty, he might well have alluded to the representation of Handel’s gluttony in Goupy’s print *The Harmonious Boar* that also stressed the importance of the magnifying glass.

In relation to Hogarth’s emphasis on comparison in opposition to a synthetic view of visual arts and music, there are some hints for the fact that Telemann was interested in the comparative dimension of single artistic objects or parts as well. Just one year after its publication in England, Hogarth’s *The Analysis of Beauty* was translated into German by the Leipzig scientist Christlob Mylius, a cousin of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. When Mylius traveled through Hamburg in 1753, he visited Telemann in his large garden “where there are many strange and beautiful plants” (“worin viel fremde und schöne Pflanzen sind”). At the same period, between 1750 and 1754, Handel kept on sending exotic plants from England to Telemann in Hamburg. In 1750, Handel wrote to Telemann:

“[…] I send you a box of flowers which the experts of these plants assured me to be chosen of a charming rarity, if they tell me the truth. You will have the best plants of all of England, the season is still proper to have flowers; You will be the best judge, I am waiting for your decision on it.”

---

33 GB-Lbl, Egerton Ms.3012, fols. i5r-i7r; also reprinted in Hogarth, 1997, pp. 131f.
34 Barlow, 2005, p. 16. On Roger de Pile’s role for the early modern theorization of pastiche as a genre cf. Hoesterey, 2001, pp. 4-6. To be able to conceive the artistic skill of a “pasticheur”, de Piles recommended a comparison with the original: “‘Tis the same with all pastici, and if we wou’d not be deceiv’d by them, we shou’d examine their *Goût* of Design, their Colouring, and the Character of their Pencils, with the Originals from whence they were taken.” Piles, 1706, p. 75.
36 Mylius, 1754.
38 “[…] je Vous envoye une Caisse de Fleurs, que les Connoisseurs de ces Plantes m’assurent d’etre choisies et d’une rareté Charmante, s’il medisent le vray. Vous aurez des plantes les meilleures de toute l’Angleterre, la saison est encore propre pour en avoir des Fleurs ; Vous en serez le meilleur Juge, j’attends Vôtre decision la dessus.” Letter by George Frideric Handel to Georg Philipp Telemann, 25 December 1750, in: Telemann, 1972, p. 343.
Exotic plants also play a central role in Hogarth’s Analysis of Beauty. Until now, his writings have been mostly analyzed in relation to his “lines of beauty”, i.e. the S-curved “waving lines”, but the first part of his analysis is explicitly dedicated to the variety and distinctness of aesthetic compositions that Hogarth explains by the example of the composition of different flowers. Here Hogarth wants to abandon the classical aesthetics of harmonious proportions. Instead, he opts for an inner variety of an aesthetically beautiful form thus recalling the general dialectics that were present in his prints as well. Not least, for the development of perfect shapes, Hogarth employs a zooming in and out of the objects in question:

“When you would compose an object of a great variety of parts, let several of those parts be distinguish’d by themselves, by their remarkable difference from the next adjoining, so as to make each of them, as it were, one well-shap’d quantity or part, as is marked by the dotted lines in figure ++ (these are like what they call passages in music, and in writing paragraphs) by which means, not only the whole, but even every part, will be better understood by the eye: for confusion will hereby be avoid-ed when the object is seen near, and the shapes will seem well varied, tho’ fewer in number, at a distance; as figure supposed to be the same as the former, but removed so far off that the eye loses sight of the smaller members.”

Following this kind of aesthetic approach, grounded in the tasteful reception of artistic intertextuality represented by the magnifying glasses in early 18th-century graphic prints, the question of whether Judith is a pasticcio or just an opera adaptation has to be modified: more than pointing at a special musical genre, the practice of patching different music into an opera seems to have been aligned with central aesthetic preoccupations in early modern London and Hamburg musical life. Instead of decrying the patch as “Einflickung” like Mattheson already did in 1740, its relevance for the formation of a dialectical taste must be examined based on the compositional handling of single passages, i.e. musical motives, styles and dramatic expressions by processes of augmentation and detailed variation in view of a well-balanced shape or dramaturgy. Following this approach, the size of the compiled or patched parts between little borrowings and inserted arias comes to the fore, so that a historically-informed research has to look at the impact of arrangements on larger or smaller scales.

Dramaturgical shifts and stylistic contrasts in Judith

How such aesthetics of comparison and contrast via diminution and augmentation are perceivable in the compositional processes of single operas is not easy to tell. Nevertheless, Hogarth’s theorization underlines the importance of single parts that form a harmo-

39 See e.g. Hogarth, 1753, pp. XIII and 76f.
40 Ibid., p. 42.
nious unity. This is why in the following paragraphs a musical analysis of single melodic and accompanimental formulas will be adopted. Such an analysis aims at detecting the stylistic as well as dramaturgical shifts provoked by the augmentation or diminution of single musical formulas or by the interpolation of new arias into Chelleri’s *La Giuditta*.

Telemann’s arrangement of Silvani’s *L’innocenza difesa* for Hamburg highly depended on Fortunato Chelleri’s *La Giuditta*, performed in Kassel in 1726. From this production a manuscript score of the first act survives. Apart from a few transpositions and the non-observance of Chelleri’s indicated cuts in the aria “Come in mare procella fra l’onde”, the music of this score is congruent with the music of the first act in the *Judith* score for the Hamburg production. That the main part of the arias of the second and third acts were also composed by Chelleri can be deduced from his *Cantate e arie con stromenti*, published during his stay in London in 1727. On the title page of the print Chelleri described himself as the *Kapellmeister* of the landgrave of Hesse-Cassel. The *Cantate e arie con stromenti* contain the arias “Pupille care del mio bel nume” (II,1), “Soffri costante breve tormento” (II,4) and “Piangi se pianger vuoi” (II,5) which are nearly identical with the Hamburg score of *Judith*. The only deviation concerns Chelleri’s corrections of “Piangi se pianger vuoi” in the second violins which the composer introduced between the first and second engravings of his London publication and which have not been retained in the Hamburg score. From this, we can deduce that the musical source for the Hamburg version might have well been the now lost second and third acts of the Kassel score dated 1726. This is also proven by the textual congruences between the Hamburg version and the librettos of Chelleri’s productions in Venice 1722.

A dramaturgical overview of Chelleri’s setting shows that the composer sought to characterize the different roles by common musical, melodic, and accompaniment patterns like broken chords, repetitions of single notes, unison sections, interpolations of short violin motives between the sung phrases, dotted or tripled rhythms, sequences of ascending and descending passages in various parts, intervallic leaps, etc. For example, from the beginning of the opera, Lotharius’ melodic lines are characterized by broken chords that are often accompanied by a unison bass. Chelleri exposes this feature right from Lotharius’ first entrance in the first aria (I,1), where he responds to Adalgisus with this melodic material. In Lotharius’ first individual aria (I,3), the unison broken chords are transformed into a contrapuntal setting between the sung line and the bass accompaniment which contrasts the unison settings of the following arias by Bernhard (I,4, with a violoncello solo accompaniment playing in unison with the sung part) and the first Telemann aria for the child role of Fabius (I,6, light unison accompaniment with some interpolated motives of the violins). Since the violin interpolations that were present in

41 Chelleri, 1726.
42 *Judith Gemahlin Kaiser Ludewig des Frommen*, 1732-1740.
Fabio’s aria are retaken in the following aria sung by Fabio’s mother Judith (also in I,6), it must be stressed that in comparison with Chelleri’s setting, Telemann emphasized Fabio as a musico-dramaturgically important role within the play, the violin interpolations otherwise being introduced by Judith and not by her son. Telemann’s dramaturgical shift can be underlined by the fact that, perhaps due to the restricted singing ability of the child role (until now, no further information has been passed down on the cast of the Hamburg Judith production), all three arias written by the Hamburg composer for Fabio’s role favor a unison accompaniment of the voice by the violin parts or a setting with voice and basso continuo only. For example, in Fabio’s second aria “Ach lass dich doch mein Flehn erweichen” (I,10) the violin part is very close to the singing voice. In this way, Telemann strengthened the musical feature of unison passages in the first act that otherwise would have been restricted for the most part to Lotharius’ first aria “Un raggio di speranza” (I,3).

In contrast to such a shift that emphasizes the close relation between Fabio and his mother Judith and that was obtained by an enlargement of an already prominent musical feature within the dramaturgy of the first act by the interpolation of Fabio’s arias, the overall structure of Chelleri’s version can be described as a constant intensification of the various musical patterns that culminate in the arias at the end of the third act. Such intensification is already perceivable in the central aria of the first act, i.e. the aria “Come in mare procella fra l’onde” sung by Lotharius right after Telemann’s compositional connection of Fabio’s and Judith’s arias in I,6. Here, not only the broken chords, but also the sequences of downward scales appear together with tone repetitions in a somehow unmotivated patchwork of those features. Nevertheless, by bringing together Lotharius’ main musical element (the broken chords) with features of other characters (sequences of downward scales in his son’s Adalgisus aria “Il mio cor già si consola” (I,2), tone repetitions in Asprando’s aria “Siegui pure con regio valore” (I,5), Chelleri creates a first dramaturgical climax before introducing a completely different musical setting in the final aria of the first act “Veggio il porto e veggio il lido” (octave leaps and fast alternating intervals of a second; the aria is sung by Lotharius’ son Adalgisus). In the second act, dotted and triple rhythms are frequently employed in alternation with a combination of broken chords and tone repetitions, before culminating in a reintroduction of unison passages and interpolated violin motives in the third act. Consequently, the third act shows the most comprehensive conglomeration of the employed features from broken chords over triple rhythms up to unison passages, sequences of downward and upward scales or tone repetitions (see Table 1).
Table 1: Musical features in Telemann’s arrangement of Judith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene</th>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>“Paratexts”, musical features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Sinfonia</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Tromba di caccia”, broken chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,1</td>
<td>Bacio à Padre la tua mano</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Broken chords, dotted violin motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>Il mio cor già si consola</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Interpolation of sequences of downward scales between the sung passages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,3</td>
<td>Un raggio di speranza</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Unison passages, broken chords, at the end counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4</td>
<td>O’con l’arrest o col consiglio</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Violoncello solo”, unison passages, long note values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>Sieguit pure con regno valore</td>
<td>Asprandus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Unison passages, sequences of upward scales, tone repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,6</td>
<td>Ich kässe Dir [die] Hand</td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>Telemann</td>
<td>Unison passages with interpolated violin motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qual sia qual core che in sen mi palpita</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>INTERPOLATED VIOLIN MOTIVES, sequences of upward scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,7</td>
<td>Ti sovenga di quel sangue</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Oboe”, broken chords, sequences of downward scales, tone repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scherza in mar la navicella</td>
<td>Gildippe</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>“Sung by Sig.ra Strada in Lotharius”, “Hautb. 1 et 2”, after the segno “pianissimo senza Cembalo e Bassons” Downward scales in coloraturas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,8</td>
<td>Viva il Pio Felice Augusto [e Giusto]</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Corni di caccia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>Ach lass dich doch mein Flehn erweichen</td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>Telemann</td>
<td>violin part is close to the sung part, interpolated violin motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>Veggio il Porto e veggio il lido</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Octave leaps, fast alternating interval of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,1</td>
<td>Papille care del mio bel nume</td>
<td>Gildippe</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Triple rhythm, sequences of downward scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>Questo nome troppo offenende</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>Octave leaps, fast alternating interval of a second, dotted rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>Fra gl’allori di mia chioma</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>Dotted rhythm in coloraturas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,4</td>
<td>Soffri costante breve tormento</td>
<td>Asprandus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Broken chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act, Scene</td>
<td>Aria</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>“Paratexts”, musical features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>Der theuren Mutter klugen Willen</td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>Telemann</td>
<td>Only with b.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piangi se piangeri vuoi</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Con sordine e flauti traversiere insieme”, dotted rhythm, short downward and upward scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>L’innocenza difendete</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“Flauti e violini/senza flauti”, dotted rhythm, short downward and upward scales, interpolated motive with tone repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>Amoretti Vezzozetti</td>
<td>Gildippe</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“Oboe solo, bassono”, dotted rhythm, interpolated violin motives, tutti passages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10</td>
<td>Par che mostri, e calma, e lido</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>Broken chords, tone repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,12</td>
<td>Come il vago ruscelletto</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>Broken chords, tone repetitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,1</td>
<td>Questo braccio e questo petto</td>
<td>Asprandus</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“La braccio con basso”, virtuoso bass line, wide leaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Di Tiranno il nome accetto</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>Broken chords, unison passages, tone repetitions, downward scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In dolce, calma e bella</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>Triple rhythms, fast alternating interval of a second, tone repetition, wide leaps, broken chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>Mostra che m’ami</td>
<td>Adalgisus/Gildippe</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“Oboe soli”, octave leaps, triple rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Sia speme o inganno</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>Sequences of downward leaps, interpolated violin motives with broken chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Vedrò più liete e belle</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>“Sung by Sig.r Fabius in Lotharius S. Hendel”, dotted rhythm, broken chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arma lo sguardo d’un dolce dardo</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>“Sung by Sig.ra Merighi in Lotharius”, unison passages, downward scales, interpolated violin motives with broken chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Festeggia in questo di la pace</td>
<td>Chor</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“Trombe e corni da caccia”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of such an analysis, the interpolation of Handel’s arias can also be discussed. In the first act, Telemann placed the Handel aria “Scherza in mar la navicella” between two arias sung by Judith. By doing this, he replaced Chelleri’s aria “Son qual
nave in mezzo all’onde” that had been part of the Brunswick production of 1731.46 This aria has come down to us in an undated copy from the 18th century.47 It is characterized by a drumming bass accompaniment (Trommelbass) and by tone repetitions. Thus, in the original version by Chelleri, the composer decided to elaborate a melodic feature of the central aria of the scene, i.e. Lotharius’ “Come in mare procella fra l’onde”. In contrast to Chelleri’s tone repetitions, Telemann sought to emphasize the instrumentation of the central scene by the employment of oboes. This is not only deducible from the omission of Chelleri’s cut of a repetition of a passage played by the oboes in Lotharius’ “Come in mare procella fra l’onde”,48 but also from the fact that besides a passage “pianissimo senza Cembalo e Bassons”, Handel’s aria “Scherza in mar la navicella” provides for two oboes (“Hautb. 1 et 2”) which shadow the melody of the voice part but without playing it as a unison. Thus, looking at the overall dramaturgy of the opera, via the emphasis on the oboes in Handel’s “Scherza in mar la navicella”, Telemann established a full symmetry of the dramaturgical organization that seemed to have been already planned by Chelleri: while the beginning, the climax and the end of the opera were accentuated by the trumpets and horns, the first and third part of the opera (I,1-I,11 and II,7-III,9) now contained two arias with oboes and thus perfectly surrounded the arias now accompanied by flutes in the second act (Table 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene</th>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Sinfonia</td>
<td>Bacio ô Padre la tua mano</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Tromba di caccia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,1</td>
<td>Il mio cor già si consola</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,3</td>
<td>Un raggio di speranza</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4</td>
<td>O’ con l’armi, o col consiglio</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“violoncello solo”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>Siegui pure con regio valore</td>
<td>Asprandus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,6</td>
<td>Ich küsse Dir [die] Hand</td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>Telemann</td>
<td>“unisoni”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qual sia qual core che in sen mi palpita</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Come in mare procella fra l’onde</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Oboe”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,7</td>
<td>Ti sovenga di quel sangue</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 Cf. above p. 165.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene</th>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,8</td>
<td>Viva il Pio Felice Augusto [e Giusto]</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Hautb. 1 et 2”, after the <em>segno</em>: “pianissimo senza Cembalo e Bassons”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>Ach lass dich doch mein Flehn erweichen</td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>Telemann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>Veggio il Porto e veggio il lido</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,1</td>
<td>Pupille care del mio bel nome</td>
<td>Gildippe</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>Questo nome troppo offende</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>Fra gl’allori di mia chioma</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,4</td>
<td>Soffri costante breve tormento</td>
<td>Asprandus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>Der theuren Mutter klugen Willen</td>
<td>Fabius</td>
<td>Telemann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piangi se pianger vuoi</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td>“Con sordine e flauti traversiere insieme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>L’innocenza difendete</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“Flauti e violini”, “senza flauti”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>Amoretti Vezzosetti</td>
<td>Gildippe</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“oboe solo”, “bassoon”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10</td>
<td>Par che mostri, e calma, e lido</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,12</td>
<td>Come il vago ruscelletto</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Chelleri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,1</td>
<td>Questo braccio e questo petto</td>
<td>Asprandus</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Di Tiranno il nome accetto</td>
<td>Lotharius</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In dolce, calma e bella</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>Mostra che m’ami</td>
<td>Adalgisus/</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“oboe soli”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Sia speme o inganno</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Vedrò più liete e belle</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arma lo sguardo d’un dolce dardo</td>
<td>Adalgisus</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Festeggia in questo di la pace</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>[Chelleri]</td>
<td>“Trombe e corni da caccia”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Telemann’s augmentation of the sonic element of instrumentation (unison passages and oboes) results in a reorganization of the general dramaturgical structure but also of the dramaturgical constellation of the different characters. Telemann’s interpolations of Handel’s aria in the first act shifted the zoom from Lotharius to other (female) characters of the opera like Judith or her daughter Gildippe who sang the Handel aria in
question. Through the addition of three arias written by himself for the child role of Fabio, Telemann also balanced the overall dramaturgy of the opera by enlarging the plot through the relation between Fabio and Judith in the first act. This constellation was then to be replaced by the personal conflicts and love relationships between Gildippe, who is meant to marry Lotharius’ son Adalgisus, as well as Bernhard, who is said to have a love relation with Judith in the following acts.

Above all, such a balancing of the different constellations of characters can also be traced in relation to the interpolation of the other two arias by Handel at the end of the third act, sung by Judith and Adalgisus. Especially with Handel’s aria “Arma lo sguardo d’un dolce dardo”, Telemann demonstrates the London composer’s virtuosity in harmonizing Chelleri’s already mobilized musical features of unison passages, downward scales, interpolations of violin motives, broken chords and dotted rhythms. All these features are present in the last two arias by Handel and thus make up a final climax within the musical dramaturgy created by Chelleri. In addition to that, by transposing Handel’s aria “Arma lo sguardo d’un dolce dardo” a third up, Telemann eventually created a last reminiscence of the child role of Fabio, even if such a transposition might only have responded to the technical and vocal capacities of the singer in charge of Adalgisus’ role.

It is worth noting that Handel’s arias not only combined Chelleri’s musical features which belonged to the general repertoire of melodic and accompanimental formulas of the time. Indeed, Handel’s arias contrast with Chelleri’s music by their characteristic motives that the London composer created out of the named musical features for each of the two arias. As it happens, all three Handel arias begin with a sequence or a variation of a concise motive instead of being based on sequences of upward and downward scales or on tone repetitions in various forms. While Chelleri’s aria “Come in mare procella fra l’onde” depicted the textual metaphor of a ship on the sea by regular waving motives, Handel’s aria “Scherza in mar la navicella” combines the atmosphere of an upcoming storm with the musical expression of jokingly unsteady melodic lines. On the basis of such contrasts, Telemann not only fixed the musico-dramaturgical structure of Chelleri’s La Giuditta by enlarging the dramaturgical ends that Chelleri had already set up, but also pointed to stylistic differences between Chelleri and Handel in their dealing with common compositional features.

When perceiving the handling of the musical features in “Scherza in mar la navicella” that was very different from Chelleri’s often mere juxtapositions of those melodic and accompanimental elements, the contrasting of the two aria styles might have well initiated comparisons that generated a more detailed understanding of compositional motives and their combinations. In any case, such a confrontation reflects the composition of different standards of styles in the graphics and caricatures that have been analyzed above. Parallel to the magnifying glasses, one might speak of a zooming in on the musical features by listening to different standards of style.

49 While doing this, Telemann might have strengthened a development that had already been fostered by Chelleri, cf. Gottwald, 1997, pp. 834f.
That Telemann wanted to stress such stylistic contrasts becomes clear when re-tracing the process of the dramaturgical reworking undertaken by himself. As the libretto print shows, in the beginning, Telemann and his librettist Johann Georg Hamann had planned to place a newly composed aria on a German translation of Handel’s aria “Vedrò più liete e belle” in the first act which would then reappear in its original Handelian version at the end of the opera.\footnote{\textit{Judith, Gemahlin Kayser Ludewigs des Frommen; oder Die Siegende Unschuld, in einer Opera auf dem Hamburgischen Schau-Platze Ao. 1732 vorgestellet.} Hamburg 1732, I,2 and III,7 (unpaginated). The text of the aria “Die Kraft der schönen Augen” is a free translation of Handel’s “Vedro più liete e belle” into German. The translation of the aria in the third act differs from the rhymed and metrically unified translation inserted into the first act.} Finally, Telemann chose to omit a new German aria and to bundle the original Handelian version in Italian with another virtuoso Handel aria at the end of the third act. Since this second aria entitled “Arma lo sguardo” also combined stormy and joking moods, especially in the line “poi nel suo core del folle amore si ride”, Telemann recreated the contrast between a more regular aria and an aria with virtuoso coloraturas between rage and humor which had already characterized the dramaturgical moment of the first Handel aria in \textit{Judith}.\footnote{\textit{Judith Gemahlin Kaiser Ludewig des Frommen,} 1732-1740, pp. 115-117.} At the end of the drama, “Arma lo sguardo” not only reflects Adalgisus’ distrust of Judith, but once again the art of joking in music in situations of strong emotion. Furthermore, since the two arias were sung just before the great showdown of the piece in a \textit{mise en abîme} taking place in an amphitheater on the scene (III,8: “The scene presents an amphitheater with a throne on one side and balconies filled with the public”),\footnote{“Der Schau=Platz stellet ein Amphitheater vor, mit einem Thron an der Seite, und Logen voller Volck.” \textit{Judith, Gemahlin Kayser Ludewigs des Frommen; oder Die Siegende Unschuld, in einer Opera auf dem Hamburgischen Schau-Platze Ao. 1732 vorgestellet.} Hamburg 1732, III,8.} in some way, they represent a little individual piece within the large dramaturgy of \textit{Judith}. Therefore, the contrasting grouping of Handel’s arias augments a comparative view on the employed musical motives; it underlines Handel’s art of composing and it creates a supplementary dimension to the dramatic action in the libretto.

Finally, one has to stress the fact that Telemann’s reworking of Chelleri’s musical setting of \textit{Judith} on the sonic level did not diminish his attention to the contemporary tendencies in Hamburg operatic dramaturgy. That Telemann chose two arias by Handel with texts referencing the gaze (“lo sguardo”) and on the eye (“vedrò”) for the big final scene of the opera is not a coincidence: it conforms to the interest for the crossings of rationalistic and sensualistic world views in the Hamburg operatic dramaturgy of the time that were often addressed via the metaphors of the eyes and their failure or capacity to see the truth. This was especially the case in the librettos of Johann Georg Hamann who translated the Italian recitatives of \textit{Judith} into German. For example, in the central scene of the first act (I,6), the eye is connected to political power via the image of the “apple of the eye” (eyeball). The third act then stresses the parallels between love and political
power (e.g. III,4 and III,5). Finally, by the texts of the two Handel arias that Telemann and Hamann put into the third act, the shining of the beloved eyes in “Vedrò più liete e belle” (Judith) was confronted with the caution that is needed when being lured by a beautiful woman in “Arma lo sguardo” (Adalgisus). Even if the pronounced political orientation in the realm of the German enlightenment does not address the invitation to zoom in on several stylistically contrasting objects that was discussed in London and that seemed to interest Telemann as well, in his theoretical writings Hamann underlines the importance of the eyesight that he considers more advantageous than the power of the spoken word.54 In this way, by his particular interest in an extension of the sonic features of Chelleri’s La Giuditta that he achieved by fostering the presence of oboes and the high voice of a child, Telemann established a musical sensual dimension that was stressed in Hamann’s aesthetic approach in relation to the sense of sight.

**Conclusion**

Telemann’s handling of Chelleri’s La Giuditta might only be one way to respond to the aesthetics that circulated between London and Hamburg. In summary, Telemann’s version somehow oscillated between Hamburg operatic dramaturgy and an English-like attention to stylistic comparisons and consequently also for an aesthetic hierarchy of single composers. Actually, during the period of the reworking of L’innocenza difesa as La Giuditta, as printed single arias and as Die vertheidigte Unschuld, Chelleri was not very successful in establishing himself as an opera composer in London. And, as we have seen, Telemann took care to rework the whole dramaturgical structure by interpolating three arias by Handel and three arias by himself.55 Such a reworking might have been at the origin of Mattheson’s misunderstanding of Judith as an opera written by Handel, and indeed, the musical outline stressed Handel’s qualities as a renowned opera composer. Consequently, it can be presumed that not only operas written by a single composer paved the way for a constantly stronger notion of authorship, but that the compilation of operas with arias by different composers exerted an important influence on this cultural and social process. What is more, such a practice was not only aligned to central aesthetic issues of the 18th century, but also strongly linked to dramaturgical considerations in their different local configurations.
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2. Pasticcio vs. Pastiche
A Plea for a Readymade Ontology for the Musical Work

Alessandro Bertinetto

1. Introduction

The task of the ontology of art is to understand which are the entities that populate the art world and how they are constituted and articulated, explaining their properties. Since art is a historical and social human practice which depends on the cultural specificity of people and social groups, the understanding of artistic entities and the properties thereof is supposed to account for the rootedness of the artistic practices within the historical, social and practical contexts in which they acquire their significance.

Some of the entities – or entities’ elements, parts, or properties – that populate the art world can be allegedly easily individuated and recognized, because they are instanced in (or conveyed by) material objects they can be physically and spatially identified with. A statue, for example, is a work of art whose existence seems to coincide with, or at least depend on, its material support, at least because once the material support is destroyed, the artwork is destroyed as well. However, the statue is not reducible to its material support, and is dependent on the specific treatment of that material as well as on interpretive and evaluative practices in virtue of which that statue acquires its specific cultural aesthetic signification and its aesthetic value.1

New artistic entities emerge out of creative manipulation and arrangement of materials as well as new attributions of significance to items in human cultural practices. The birth of new artistic kinds may depend, in particular, on the appearance of new technologies capable of generating new media. Obvious cases have been photography, cinema and the Internet. All this suggests that artistic entities – works of art, artistic performances, and their properties – do not fluctuate in the ‘hyperuranion’ world of metaphysical objects. They are here among us, participating in the cultural developments and historical vicissitudes of humanity as well as, as many examples could show, in the often tragic events of human history. As they take part in the cultural history of humanity, art-

1 See Lamarque, 2010.
works’ value and meaning, as well as at least many of their ontological qualities, emerge from practices, relationships and cultural events that occur in the changing contexts of human life. This is the point of departure for the reflection on musical ontology that I am about to articulate in this article. The perspective from which I will address the topic is inspired by that artistic practice which is the thematic core of this book: the pasticcio.

2. Against musical Platonism

Nowadays, the idea of the dependence of the ontology of art on human practices is quite common. However, precisely in the field of musical ontology, many insist on supporting different positions, some of which are indefensible, in my opinion. In particular, supporters of the so-called musical Platonism believe that musical works are immutable entities, independent of space-temporal contexts and historical events. This view is the theoretical enemy against whom I aim to argue in this study.

Musical Platonists share with philosophers of other orientations and traditions the idea that the main problem of musical ontology is the relationship between the musical work and its performances. They believe that musical works, differently from performances, are not physical things or events and assume as indisputable that they are immutable, incorruptible, and unalterable. Moreover, they assume also that performances, interpretations, and renditions of a musical work do not alter or transform a musical work; they do not improve it or make it worse. Simply, they ‘portray’, convey, communicate, or manifest the musical work – and they can accomplish this in ways that can be more or less adequate, more or less right or wrong, more or less authentic or inauthentic. According to those assumptions, Platonists think that the solution to the problem (or ‘pseudo-problem’, as we could maybe already begin to call it) of the link between musical works and their performances can only be offered by metaphysics. In a nutshell, the solution to the problem should answer the question as to how the one (the musical work) can be multiplied in/by its performances without underlying transformations, thereby remaining the one and the same. Actually, once the mentioned assumptions are made, the solution to the alleged main problem of musical ontology is easily reached: it is the famous distinction between the unique ‘type’ and its multiple ‘tokens’. The relationship that holds between the musical work and its performances or interpretations is the same that holds, for example, between the eternal Platonic idea of a chair (which is the object of thought) and all the physical chairs (which are grasped through perception). The idea

6 In Plato’s thought a complication is offered precisely by art which, according to the Republic (Book X), famously constitutes a second level image of the real idea, i.e. the imitation of an imitation. The artistic rendition of Plato’s triple ontological articulation (idea, phe-
of the chair is unique and immutable: its physical occurrences manifest it without any modifications.

Unfortunately, however, the problems for this theory also begin here. Its starting point (which actually is another tacit assumption of this view) is that at the end of the day musical works are like visual artworks, like paintings and statues. Lydia Goehr registered this assumption in the title of her book about the ideology of the Werktreue: The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works. But the ideology is still alive, and widespread. It is displayed for instance in what composer and music director Peter Eötvös recently declared in the journal of the Musik Fest Berlin in reference to his rendition of Karlheinz Stockhausen’s Inori: “An interpretation should never be ‘free’ […]. The way in which INORI is composed is fixed: it should be realized as it is notated – like a picture hung onto a wall.”

The ideological assumption that musical works are like images hanging on the wall, meaning that they are like paintings and sculptures that must simply be displayed, has theoretical consequences: in my view, unhappy ones. Paintings and statues are manifested without undergoing changes. They are located in museums or other spaces (e.g., private homes or churches) and it seems natural to believe that their exhibition does not affect their meaning or their aesthetic value, and above all does not affect their ontological status. Every time they appear to an observer these works remain the objects they are.

Actually, even this idea may not be as correct as it could obviously appear. In fact, exhibition contexts could impact on the meaning and the value of artworks and, consequently, also on their ontological status. The change of the spatio-temporal and social context of reference of an artwork could therefore also entail an ontological transformation, more or less in the same way in which it can be said that a person is no longer the same person if transported in a context different from the usual one (if you need a clear and up-to-date example, think of how hard it is for immigrants to maintain or rebuild a personal identity that is acceptable and satisfying to them and of the social consequences that these difficulties produce). Moreover, the same way people grow old, artworks too, as mundane objects, age and suffer the passage of time. Sometimes they are irretrievably destroyed or lost. In these cases, they may be possibly restored or replaced. But, having been restored (like an old person who gets a facelift) or replaced (like a double that takes the place of the alleged original), it seems difficult to maintain that the artwork has remained the same, without having undergone transformations.

nomenon, artistic imitation) is displayed in the famous artwork by Joseph Kosuth One and Three Chairs (1965) which brings together a definition of chair (the idea), a real chair (the phenomenal reality), and a picture of a chair.

---

7 Goehr, 1992.
9 This raises the question of the authenticity of the work. On the topic cf. Giombini, 2018.
However, let’s grant, for the sake of the argument (and even though it is really hard to believe) that paintings and sculptures do not change in some significant way. Can we say the same about musical works? Are musical works simply manifested or displayed or portrayed in their performances in the way they really (and metaphysically) are, without undergoing changes? Have performances really no impact on musical works?

Nowadays there are actually musical works of which it can be said (in the same purely hypothetical way of paintings and sculptures) that they do not change as a consequence of the way they are displayed for aural perception. If we admit that a music album, in the form of an LP or a CD, is a musical work, and there are good reasons to believe that a Beatles album or a record by Miles Davis is such a musical work, a ‘phonographic’ musical work as it is now called by scholars, then it can also be said that the repeated instantiation of this work does not seem to modify its value and aesthetic meaning as well as its ontological status.

Of course, a phonographic musical work is more like a serial artwork than like a single piece, since it is available in several copies. But the fact remains that its repeated playback does not modify its ontological uniqueness (even if, to put it with an oxymoron, it is a multiple uniqueness).

However, even if we can concede that phonographic works are musical works in some ways similar to paintings and statues, the case of musical works for performance is completely different. Here the musical work, although notated in a score that provides instructions for its performance, is not identified by a material artifact. It would seem that it exists only when it is realized in performances that make it available to listeners. Thus, in order to maintain the analogy with pictures and sculptures, one should think of the hypothetical, bizarre situation in which sculptures and paintings existed only when perceived by their observers, having a sort of intermittent existence. Which seems quite odd.

To solve this strangeness, but without renouncing the analogy with artworks such as paintings and statues, Platonists have come up with the solution I mentioned earlier. The musical works for performance are unique and unchangeable metaphysical entities that are instantiated by physical realizations (the performances) that manifest them, while leaving them as they are, i.e. without impacting on their ontological fabric. Hence, in the end, the identity of Platonist’s musical works is even more rigid than that of paintings or

---

10 Arbo, 2013.
11 In this sense it is not a ‘simple allographic object’ in Goodman’s sense (cf. Goodman, 1968). It may be rather understood as a ‘multiple autographic object’ in Genette’s sense (cf. Genette, 1994).
12 Nevertheless, like a statue or a painting, every single LP or CD ages due to use and thus scratches, dust and other factors can damage it. While damaging the physical copy, they do not spoil however the music recorded in it, which, usually, can be listened to again through other physical supports: for example, another copy of the same album. I thank Gesa zur Nieden for this interesting suggestion.
sculptures, which after all, and as already noticed, undergo the passage of time and can be completely destroyed by natural events and human actions.

The conceptual acrobatics that these philosophers have to accomplish to explain how a metaphysical entity can be realized without undergoing transformations through their physical manifestations in the sounds of performances are very sophisticated. Although I do not want to dwell on it here, I certainly can point out the two main problems of these philosophical attempts.

(1) On the one hand, the assumption that the musical work for performance is an immutable entity not transformed by its performances is what it is: a simple assumption, which finds its justification in musical practices in force in a certain cultural situation, that of a certain historical tradition established within the Western culture, or at least within some influential Western cultural environments, more or less between the end of the 18th and the first half of the 20th centuries. The principle that regulates (or, better, regulated) these practices is known as Werktreue-Ideal: ‘truthfulness to the musical work’ (considered as unchanging entity). Its ideological generation is complex and depends on well-known factors of various kinds such as, for example, the emergence of ideas of author and artistic genius, of a certain social organization of musical activities and an economic and legal regulation of musical practices. The problem is that, almost forgetting the historical origin of these phenomena and based on a musicological perspective strictly linked to this Werktreue ideology, the dominant current of the philosophy of music, of which Platonism is the strongest and most explicit expression, pretended to consider the ideological assumption of the immutability of the musical work as a kind of dogma, a metaphysical factum, an undeniable truth.13

(2) On the other hand, the solution to the main problem arising from such an assumption (the understanding of the relation between the musical work and its performances) has been to privilege metaphysics to aesthetics and artistic practices, on the base of the principle: ‘no evaluation without identification’.14 Now, differently from paintings and statues that are produced by their makers, Platonists maintain that, being types, musical works cannot be created by composers, but only discovered by them. This idea is oddly enough against the common intuition that musical works are the outcomes of human creativity and their artistic properties importantly depend on their context of production.15

13 See Goehr, 1992; Bertinetto, 2016
14 I discuss the issue at length in Bertinetto, 2020.
15 See Predelli, 2001. In order to accommodate those considerations about the influence of historical contexts on the properties of the musical work, Jerrold Levinson (see for example Levinson, 2011) famously proposed a modification of Platonism, defending that musical works are ‘indicated’ types: types generated by the act of composition in a particular cultural context. This solution is, however, problematic, because if the type is unchangeable and eternal, how can it be created? I cannot enter the debate here (but see Bertinetto, 2016a, pp. 12-46). However, as I will suggest, the idea (generally accepted by all the ontologies of art that trace artworks’ ontological identities back to artists’ intentions and/or
Thus, an important theoretical possibility has been ignored. It is a possibility already available at least in nuce in some classical texts of music phenomenology and today developed in much more refined ways in the studies of social ontology: the idea, in fact, that a musical work-for-performance is not a metaphysical entity, but, indeed, a social object (or, as I prefer, a social process), obviously produced by their makers, but whose status and identity depends precisely on changing social and cultural practices: practices of production and reproduction, recording, reception, evaluation, dissemination; interpretive, critical, philological practices, etc. In other words, this, as I think, plausible view sees musical works as works of art existing in virtue not only of the artist’s performance, but also of evaluative and interpretive practices through which they are continuously (trans)formed. This practice-dependence implies that works of art, and, in particular, musical works, are identified through the contexts of socially normative practices of production and attribution of values and meanings, so that they are modifiable precisely by virtue of these identifications that are continuously changing. Consequently, therefore – and here I step beyond the standard social ontology of Searle and Ferraris as well as beyond Ingarden’s phenomenology –, the social objects emerging from human practices are, as I anticipated, much more similar to processes than to objects. In this sense, they are, I venture (resorting to the similitude I have already suggested) a bit like persons: their identities develop through time.

3. The pasticcio’s ‘readymade’ ontology

The discussion carried out so far should lay the foundations for articulating some thoughts concerning the ontology of the specific musical object, or rather of the specific musical practice, which is the thematic focus of this book: the pasticcio.

My (first) thesis is that Platonist ontology is particularly ineffective in accounting for this practice. In fact, this practice seems very resistant to the idea of the uniqueness of a repeatable musical work without transformations of identity. The pasticcio seems instead to be able to become a particularly paradigmatic case for the type of ontological solution that, as I think, is appropriate to propose for music as an artistic practice.

My own thesis is actually not my own thesis, but a re-elaboration of a proposal made more than 40 years ago by Joseph Margolis, who, as I think, actually takes up the idea from Hegel. The point is that works of art, including musical works, are objects, or better: processes, that are physically embodied and culturally emerging. In short, they are material things that acquire cultural meanings. As cultural, emerging objects of an performances) that artists (like composers) create unchangeable entities ‘out of the blue’ is also misguided: in fact, artworks are generated putting together already available forms and materials; moreover, since artworks are cultural objects, their ontological identity changes historically (see Bertinetto, 2019).

17 See Margolis, 1974.
aesthetic kind, their value and significance depend, on the one hand, on the formal and material arrangement of their elements (sounds, colors, gestures, etc.) as well as on the aesthetic properties that in turn are dependent on this arrangement and, on the other hand, on cultural meaning and value attributions that are continuously going on and continuously reshape the meaning and values of the artworks, thereby impacting on their ontological identity.\(^{18}\)

Omitting complications and technicalities I go straight to the point: Artworks are objects and processes that exist in the world and have a bodily existence;\(^{19}\) yet their identity also depends on practices of attribution of meaning and value: they are therefore cultural objects and processes.

What does the pasticcio have to do with all this? Or rather, what is the contribution of the pasticcio to the elaboration of a musical ontology that takes into account the idea of artworks as entities that are physically embodied and culturally emergent? In order to answer this question, we must dwell a bit on the notion of pasticcio. In a nutshell, we may say that in the musical practice of the pasticcio, already prepared musical materials are appropriated and used (or, if you prefer, abused) as building materials to generate other musical works.

The *Hutchinson Concise Dictionary of Music\(^{20}\)* translates the word pasticcio as “pie” or “pasty” and defines it as “stage entertainment with music drawn from existing works by one or more composers and words written to fit the music. It was particularly popular in the 18\(^{th}\) century”.

The definition provided by the *Oxford Dictionary of Music* is more articulated:

> “Pasticcio (It.). Pie, pasty. (1) A dramatic entertainment with songs, ensembles, dances, and other items assembled from the works of several composers, thus giving the audience a medley of their favourite tunes. Popular in 18\(^{th}\) cent., e.g. Thomyris (1707). (2) An opera in which each act is by a different composer, e.g. Muzio Scevola (1721) by Amadei, Bononcini, and Handel. (3) Instr. comp. containing different sections or items by different composers, e.g. Diabelli’s Väterlandischer Künstlerverein (1823-4), containing variations by 50 composers; the Hexaméron (1837), and L’Éventail de Jeanne (1927).”

Moreover, the pasticcio is sometimes distinguished from the “pastiche”:

> “Pastiche (Fr.). Imitation. Not the same as pasticcio, being a work deliberately written in the style of another period or manner, e.g. Prokofiev’s Classical Symphony,

18 I elaborate on this view in Bertinetto, 2019.
19 The case of conceptual art can give rise to some problems, which, in my opinion, are not unsolvable and, anyway, are not relevant here.
20 Jones, 2014, p. 482.
21 Kennedy/Kennedy, 2013, p. 638.
Strauss’s Ariadne auf Naxos, and Stravinsky’s Pulcinella. Although pastiche has a meaning as ‘medley’, it is invariably applied musically in the sense outlined above.”

The definition of pasticcio provided by the venerable Dictionary of Musical Terms is simpler: it identifies pasticcio and pastiche and defines the former in this way:

“Pasticcio (It.) Lit. a pie, or pasty. Pastiche (Fr.), Pastete (Ger.) An opera, cantata, or other work, the separate numbers of which are gleaned from the compositions of various authors, or from several disconnected works of one author. Pastiche (Fr.) [Pasticcio.]”

Moreover, it is symptomatic that in the entry “Opera” John Gay’s The Beggars’ Opera, is qualified as “a mere pasticcio of old tunes, popular for that reason, but valueless as a representative of English opera”. From these definitions we can get some interesting information.

1. A pasticcio, in a musical sense, is a collaborative musical work, the outcome of a kind of “distributed creativity”, as Georgina Born would have it, in virtue of which different existent pieces are put together, resulting in a new composition.
2. But, as resulting from the work of different composers, a pasticcio is less valuable than the musical work allegedly resulting from the work of one and the same composer.
3. The term “disconnected” is also telling. The pieces that are then put together in a “Pasticcio” are considered as disconnected. Which seems a bit of a banality. Before being connected how should those pieces be if not disconnected?

To sum up, a pasticcio is a composition resulting from disconnected pieces that composers have at their disposal for their creative works. These materials are appropriated for generating different or new compositions. They are, so to speak, extracted from an object, recombined together and re-contextualized within other constructions. Some musical works are symbolically disassembled and their pieces are used to give life to other musical works. And, I venture, it is for this reason that a pasticcio is not considered as a valuable artwork, but as a ‘mere’ pasticcio: the result of a recycling activity, rather than of authentic creativity. Pasticcios are not created ex nihilo after all.

22 Ibid.
26 One may deny that the musical works the elements of which are taken and then recombined for producing new musical works (the pasticcios) are really transformed through this operation. The ‘original’ musical work, one may think, does not change at all, if some of its parts are reused as elements of other works. However, once a new (or different) mu-
However, precisely in this sense I think that – and this is my second thesis – the pasticcio, both the culinary and the musical one, is like the ‘readymade’ in avant-garde art. In readymade art, everyday objects like bottle-holders, urinals, bicycle wheels and handlebars, but also famous works of art (you can think about Duchamp’s famous *Gioconda* with moustaches),\(^{27}\) are appropriated, decontextualized and defunctionalized, assembled together and recycled as something else.\(^{28}\)

But the concept of the readymade also plays an important role in performing arts and in particular in different musical practices. In jazz, for example, pre-packaged materials (phrases, themes, and harmonic structures) are continuously reused to generate tunes and improvisations.\(^{29}\) In the field of rock and pop music, the practice of ‘mash-up’, very accurately and intelligently studied by Frédéric Döhl also in relation to the juridical field,\(^{30}\) is nothing but the application of the guiding principle of the readymade to the construction of new musical pieces. And even the pasticcio in the culinary sense may be understood as a kind of readymade. The leftovers of the dishes of the day before, but also the best ingredients the chef has at her disposal, are decontextualized and reassembled in order to create a new delicious dish.

Therefore, the creative approach of readymade practices is a performative criticism against the idea of *a creatio ex nihilo*. Readymades show that the new may derive from a reuse or a misuse of the old, from the reassembly of the *disjecta membra* of an old artifact into a new composition. In doing so, readymades practically and performatively articulate the critique of ontologies of art based on the ideas of the discovery of eternal entities as well as of the creation of immutable items, while exemplifying the emergence of artworks’ meaning and identity out of cultural practices. A careful examination of what happens in readymade art should make us understand that, in a sense, artworks are all generated as readymades, since they all are, in the end, the result of the assemblage of pre-existing (physical and cultural) materials, which is also the original meaning of the musical work is produced by means of the re-combining of parts of previous compositions, listeners may interpret and evaluate the old compositions differently, for example because they now have discovered possible artistic developments of the musical ideas presented by the old compositions. Since evaluative interpretations impact on the cultural identity of its object, the fact that new musical works result from disassembling and differently and variously reassembling old musical works may strongly transform the ontological identity of the old works (I mean, this impact seems to be possibly stronger, intense and radical than the impact that every interpretation of musical works ordinarily has on the works' ontological identity). This seems to contrast decidedly with the Platonist assumption of the immutability of the musical work.

\(^{27}\) *L.H.O.O.Q.*, 1919.

\(^{28}\) See Evnine, 2013, for a general philosophical account of the readymade’s aesthetics and ontology.

\(^{29}\) I discussed aspects of the issue in Bertinetto, 2016a, pp. 221-262; Bertinetto, 2016b; Bertinetto, 2017a.

\(^{30}\) Döhl, 2016.
word ‘com-position’: putting together already extant elements. Hence, the new issues from the old. Creativity is never \textit{ex nihilo} and, implicitly or explicitly, is distributed, among items and agents of different kinds.

Moreover, works of art are not immutable. Their meaning, which impacts on their ontological-social identity, changes through the cultural interactions they are engaged in. Artworks, in this sense, live through continuous cultural mutations and appropriations and they are used and abused as readymade items for generating new cultural identities.\footnote{Hallam/Ingold, 2007 rightly extends this idea to all cultural process. See my Bertinetto, 2018.}

There are countless examples, even beyond the practice of pasticcio properly speaking. Let’s take one from jazz. Brad Mehldau’s version of The Beatles’ song \textit{Blackbird} (from the Album \textit{The Beatles}, 1968)\footnote{Brad Mehldau, \textit{The Art of the Trio}, vol. 1, 1997.} is at least the result of combining, if we so desire, The Beatles’ creative work and his own. Yet, the composition is actually a variation on the \textit{Bourrée in E Minor} by Johann Sebastian Bach (BWV 996; BC L166), originally written for lute. So, Bach contributed to the production of \textit{Blackbird}, in a way, which is not surprising given Mehldau’s well-known passion for Bach (cf. his 2018 album \textit{After Bach}). Is this the reason, perhaps unconscious, of his introduction of that piece in his performing repertoire? Be as it may, the important point is rather that all music, and all art, may be conceived of as a kind of pasticcio made of readymade elements that artists use and abuse for generating something different.

If we want more examples, we are spoiled for choice. A very interesting case is this. New Orleans Jazz (hence: jazz), is imbued with Italian Opera. And it is also a big pasticcio, a very big medley in a way. For instance, in one of his renditions of Gershwin’s \textit{Summertime} (from \textit{Porgy and Bess}, 1935; \textit{Blue Note} 78, June 1939) Sidney Bechet quotes the \textit{Miserere} from Giuseppe Verdi’s \textit{Trovatore}, announcing the hanging of Leonora’s lover. As jazz historian Francesco Martinelli has shown,\footnote{Martinelli, 2009.} the quotation is an intentional \textit{signifyin’} on Gershwin’s piece having socio-political significance\footnote{In the literature about Afro-American culture the \textit{signifyin’} is the practice of appropriation in virtue of which musicians ‘converse’ with an inherited musical material that is recapitulated, in a mixed attitude of complicity and distancing, through reverential quotations or, conversely, by irreverent gestures of irony, parody, sarcasm, or open criticism (see Monson, 1996).} and impacting on the cultural identities of both artistic items involved in this operation: Gershwin’s and Verdi’s operas. One might wonder whether Bechet’s operation is a quotation or an interpolation. I think it is both things all together: it is indeed a sort of pasticcio. It is not a quotation as part of a solo that leaves the harmonic structure of the piece unaltered, but the insertion of a readymade part, which is an originally foreign body (Verdi’s aria), into another already extant item (the structure of the Gershwin piece), which changes the artistic-musical object, while producing another readymade. Therefore, also
in this case readymade artworks or artwork pieces are recycled for producing something else, which in this way is also brought back to new life.

So, the practice of ‘mere’ pasticcio is not an ontological rarity, but rather it would seem to offer the paradigmatic model for answering the ontological question about what the entities are which we encounter in our artistic practices, and how they are made. Works of art are not like Platonic ideas, but are rather physically embodied and culturally changing objects (and processes), whose identity is continually modifiable in relation to the ways in which they are used or abused and recycled as readymade materials for generating other cultural constructs.\(^\text{35}\) To recapitulate: the pasticcio is a paradigmatic practice for musical and in general artistic creativity as a whole, since it shows that music (and, more generally speaking, art) is the result of a distributed creativity, not a mysterious creativity allegedly \textit{ex nihilo}, and that artworks are cultural constructs that result from appropriating, de-structuring, re-combining, and re-functionalizing (or recycling) elements of other artworks.

4. Conclusion: possible objections and replies

Two possible objections could be raised towards the idea that I am suggesting.

\(\text{a) }\) The first objection focuses on the derogatory evaluation or connotation of the pasticcio, somehow also implicit in the Italian meaning of the word. The pie or the pastry, just as a dish deriving from the combination of leftovers, can succeed or not. And if it fails it’s just a mess, a great culinary confusion, devoid of taste. Pasticcio, in Italian, means both: a Pasticcio 1, as a meal, can be a disaster, thereby becoming a Pasticcio 2, which means: a failure, a mess, a chaos. Both meanings may be conveyed by the musical notion of pasticcio. The combination of reused or abused readymade pieces to build something else may fail, and then it’s a mere mess, a mere pasticcio. Hence, one may object that the pasticcio cannot be paradigmatic for the ontology of art, since it seems odd that the result of such a minor and fallible form of creativity is paradigmatic of art.

However, the objection is not irresistible. The pasticcio, in the culinary sense, can be very good and tasty. So, if we want the analogy between music and culinary practices to be workable, let’s make it work all the way. On the one hand, the pasticcio, as a food, can be the result of the fine art of knowing how to creatively reuse the leftovers, combining them with each other and with new ingredients (the basic one being, as the name suggest, paste or dough), in order to prepare a delicious dish: culinary success is achieved, by means of acting within the constraints of the materials one has available and adapting the old to a new situation.\(^\text{36}\) Yet, the main point is actually that the pasticcio is not (not

\(^{35}\) I have argued similarly about musical meaning in my \textit{Bertinetto}, 2017b.

\(^{36}\) See \textit{Bertinetto}, 2018.
always at least) a mere mess. The view (nowadays implicit in the connotation of the Italian word *pasticcio*) of pasticcio as mess is precisely the outcome of the contemptuous and wrong idea that genuine creativity is first-hand and that therefore the components of a work of art must be invented from scratch, created from nothing. Which is odd, to say the least. In fact, on the other hand, the culinary pasticcio is not just a ‘mere’ art of recycling. As is clear from the history of cooking and banquets, it is also a delicious dish not made of leftovers, but of first quality ingredients.\(^37\) Thus, the practice of the musical pasticcio took its *raison d’être* from both the meanings of the notion: (a) on the one hand, it is a recycling practice, because composers (ab)used music already existing and coming from other contexts for producing other works; (b) on the other hand, it is an ingenious blend of different compositions and styles, a combination of the singers’ bests, an exquisite choice of arias with which the singers could shine and fascinate the audience.\(^38\) In this complex sense – (a) + (b), the pasticcio is really paradigmatic for the ontology of music (and, as I have already suggested, for art in general).

b) The second objection is, at first sight, a little more difficult to reject. And it seems to undermine the basis of my discourse on the ontology of music. What I said about the
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37 Cf. for example the recipes collected in the fundamental book of Antonio Latini, *Lo scalco alla moderna, overo L’arte di ben disporre li conviti, con le regole più scelte di scalcheria*, Napoli, Domenico Antonio Parrino e Michele Luigi Muzio, 1692-1694. I thank very much Berthold Over for pushing me on this point, providing me invaluable information at this regard. For a definition of pasticcio, as a dish, see Guarnaschelli Gotti, 2007, p. 1237: “È il nome tradizionale di varie preparazioni fatte con ingredienti diversi, di solito racchiusi in un involucro di pasta e poi cotto al forno: queste due caratteristiche dovrebbero essere gli elementi qualificanti di un pasticcio […]. La parola ‘pasticcio’ deriva dal latino *pasticium*, una preparazione già presente nel *De re cuoquinaria* di Apicio. Nei ricettari dei secoli XIV e XV, il pasticcio compare in molte delle sue varietà, a base di carni, selvaggina, pesci, crostacei, frutta, con integrazioni di ingredienti adatti a quello di base, il tutto di solito incassato in pasta. Altri sviluppi e libere interpretazioni e invenzioni il pasticcio ebbe nei secoli successivi […], mantenendo sempre un carattere di vivanda di prestigio, preparata per conviti principeschi e pranzi signorili […].” – “It is the traditional name of various preparations made with different ingredients, usually enclosed in a wrapper of pasta and then baked: these two characteristics should be the qualifying elements of a pasty […]. The word ‘pasticcio’ (pasty) comes from the Latin *pasticium*, a preparation already present in the *De re cuoquinaria* of Apicius. In the recipe books of the 14\(^{th}\) and 15\(^{th}\) centuries, the pasticcio appears in many of its varieties, based on meat, game, fish, crustaceans, fruit, with additions of ingredients suitable for the basic one, all usually embedded in pasta. The pasty had further developments and free interpretations and inventions in following centuries […], always maintaining a character of prestige food, prepared for princely feasts and stately banquets”.

38 I thank Berthold Over and Gianluca Stefani for their invaluable information regarding the practice of musical pasticcio.
typical assumption of Platonist ontologies, that is, the immutability of the musical work through its repetitions in the different performances, seems to be completely independent from the question of the appropriative combinatorial origin of the pasticcio and, as a consequence for someone, for the spurious, hybrid and bastard nature of the pasticcio, which therefore cannot be an artwork. The point in this case would be another. Not the immutability of the works through the performances, but precisely the originality of the great work of art, which is the pure result of the creative genius. A pasticcio, actually, once produced, can be performed as it is, without being transformed by its performances. Therefore, even wanting to argue that the practice of the pasticcio is paradigmatic of the distributive and appropriative creativity that, as I want to support, constitutes artistic creativity as a human practice, this does not invalidate the hard Platonist thesis of the immutability of the musical work through its performances. These are two independent questions, and wanting to mix them is another mess, an ontological mess that shows only the confusion of my bizarre and messy thoughts. To put it bluntly; the issue of the ‘immutability’ of the musical work must not be confused with the different issue of the ‘originality’ of the musical work. Being derivative and not original, as resulting from different readymade pieces, does not prevent the resulting work from being an immutable pasticcio, which is repeatable without loss of identity.

I cannot but admit that immutability and originality are two different issues. However, I challenge anyone to deny that they are not strictly related in the culture of the Werktreue. The Werktreue, the fidelity to an immutable text, implies also the fidelity to a creative genius to whom obedience and submission are due, because he (normally he, not she) is the author of that text and has authority on that text. It is precisely as an original product of a creative genius that the musical work is, or rather, must remain immutable. Thus, who makes a mess, pardon: who produces a pasticcio is thereby indeed modifying the original work, transforming what is supposed to have an immutable metaphysical consistency. S/he is committing a kind of sacrilege: whence also all the legal consequences related to copyright. Conversely, but actually in the very same way, a musical work’s performance that does not limit itself to portray the musical work, presenting it without alteration, but modifies it, is abusing the work, using it as a means and not as an end. The work becomes a component, a readymade piece, an ingredient or worse a leftover which the performer appropriates for a messy performance, for a mere performing pasticcio.

In this sense, understanding the paradigmatic character of the pasticcio as an artistic practice that highlights the emergence of the meaning and of the cultural identity of the musical work out of the collaboration of different productive activities, and also (an aspect I have not focused on explicitly here) out of the interpretative and evaluative activities of the listeners, which means: out of continuous transformations, thereby clarifying the distributive and collective character of artistic creativity, allows us to remove
— of course, without any conceptual repentance — the dogmatic assumption made by mainstream ontology of music: the unrepeatability of the work without loss of identity.\textsuperscript{39}

At this point, hearing these words, probably also the defenders of the pasticcio as high interesting creative practice will rebel and raise a third objection. If we no longer have the criterion of fidelity to the unchangeable work, how do we now know if a performance, even a performance of a pasticcio, is right or not? How may we evaluate music? Or, for that matter, how may we evaluate gastronomic art?

Well, I have to admit that this is definitely a big mess, but it’s the human, very human and maybe all too human situation, we find ourselves in and we have to deal with. I certainly cannot offer a comprehensive answer here. So, I will conclude with a simple invitation to reflection. Whoever believes that once the criterion of fidelity to the work and its ontological bulwark, the principle of unrepeatability of the work, has been eliminated, we can no longer evaluate the success of a performance, should try to answer this question. How do we evaluate improvisations? Improvisers,\textit{per definitionem}, improvise: they do not obey composers’ instructions provided by scores: they are not true to musical works. But we certainly evaluate improvisations as successful or not. Thus, so my argument goes on, the fact that we can evaluate improvisations, although, in order to do this, we cannot rely on the criterion of perfect identity between the performance and the musical work, shows that the criterion of fidelity to the work is not necessary for evaluating musical performances. Luckily, therefore, the fact that improvised performances may not be faithful to musical works (although they of course follow aesthetic standards of some kind) is not a problem for our aesthetic experience and judgment of musical performances and of musical works. We can appreciate the success of the performance regardless of a supposed criterion of fidelity. Similarly, and this is my point regarding the pasticcio, we can appreciate the success of a musical work even if it results from the misappropriation of pieces of other works, being therefore unfaithful to the aura of originality claimed by the ideologues of the absolute\textit{ creatio ex nihilo} or of the discovery of Platonic metaphysical structures.\textit{De facto}, as a practice of the readymade, the pasticcio can be understood as a practice of improvisation, in the sense that the materials artists (ab)use may be the ones they find available in their specific situations and/or in the sense that artists, while using the best ingredients at their disposal, invent their performances while making them, while performing. Moreover, in the musical theater the pasticcio has been indeed practiced as an improvisation in the ordinary and everyday sense of the word: pasticcios were quick and, sometimes, efficient, solutions to the problems of replacing failed musical works and of quickly solving technical or empirical problems (the absence of a concrete singer, for instance) by means of using existing materials and variously adapting them to a concrete (often unexpected) situation. It certainly is a case of making virtue of necessity: but is this not a key aspect of human creativity?

Finally, and with this remark I really conclude my ‘messy’ reflections on the pasticcio ontology, in an interesting way we can say that human beings in everyday life

\textsuperscript{39} See also above, n. 14.
improvises in their practices and in their evaluations, constantly calibrating the evaluation criteria of their actions and the results thereof with respect to the concrete specific situation of their performances. The moral of this is that the pasticcio – as a practice of readymade and improvisational creativity – exemplifies that the ontology of music is at the service of musical aesthetics if, leaving the ‘hyperuranion’ world of immutable ideas, goes down into the creative mess of concrete human practices.
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Musical terms hold a great attraction for literary discourses as they seem to provide modes of description for something ‘beyond’ the textual meaning. But, sadly, the closer the terms are examined the more their magic tends to disintegrate, like the musty musty rooms of Chandos.\(^1\) Probably the most prominent example is the term “counterpoint”, which was, and still is, applied to the writings of various authors from E.T.A. Hoffmann to Ingeborg Bachmann to describe parallel structures in their texts. As I have mentioned before,\(^2\) counterpoint can only be applied to text in a metaphorical sense, as it is, in essence, a means of organizing the sound of two or more simultaneous voices. Since the invention of polyphony one of the main characteristics of the European musical tradition is the simultaneous presence of two or more voices. But a text is in essence a linear phenomenon. It is simply impossible to read two lines of text at the same time. And it is impossible to listen to two different lines of spoken text at the same time. ‘Real’ counterpoint in literature is therefore only an option for performance, and one which comes at the price of sacrificing the meaning of the text for the sake of sound, as can be perceived in the audiobook version of Arno Schmidt’s *Zettels Traum* read by Joachim Kersten, Bernd Rauschenbach and Jan Philipp Reemtsma.\(^3\) Ingeborg Bachmann describes the libretto (although without using the term itself) as the only possible literary genre for counterpoint,\(^4\) even if the effect is rather confusing and clearly the opposite of
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1 Hugo von Hofmannsthall’s *Ein Brief* (also: *Brief des Lord Chandos an Francis Bacon* or *Chandos-Brief*) was published 18 and 19 October 1902 in two parts in the Berlin newspaper *Der Tag*.
2 Hartmann, 2013, p. 47.
3 Schmidt, 2008.
4 “What is fascinating to me and most difficult about writing for opera is the overlapping of texts, the similarity of contradictory or identical passages. That characters often talk not past each other, but together, against each other, in parallel is special to opera and exciting to the writer. An abstrusity and artificial at first glance, but in fact is the source of the superiority of the lyrical theater. Because in everyday life, as on the theater stage,
the harmony caused by musical counterpoint. So, there are good reasons for a critical examination of the musical term “pasticcio” in its musical sense as a tool for textual analysis. My article will therefore focus on the question of whether the musico-literary ‘technique’ of the dual-medium (music and text) opera pasticcio can serve as a blueprint for the mono-medium of literary texts and, if so, what could be described as the characteristics of the pasticcio en littérature?

**What is a pasticcio?**

A general understanding of the term pasticcio in opera and music of the 18th century is that of a practice rather than that of a genre. It may use contemporary or older parts (mainly arias) by other composers, or older compositions by the same composer, and integrate them into a new arrangement containing newly composed material to different extents. Aria texts can be kept (as quotes) or altered (in parody technique) as long as they fit into a clear narration. The line I would like to draw is that between a ‘concert pasticcio’ with arias threaded into a rather loose line without original material, and a dramaturgically reworked piece. The quality of an opera should therefore not be judged by the general use of pasticcio technique, but by the way pasticcio technique contributes to the quality of the work.

Regarding the relationship between word and music, the latter tends to be the more stable element in the opera pasticcio, which can be broadly described as a parody technique or contrafacture, when a new text is fitted to pre-existing music. It is therefore hard to find a direct equivalent in literature. The clearest case for a literary parody technique which puts the text into the more stable position might be religious song texts such as the
Latin *Stabat Mater*, the Latin Mass, and certain poems by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe such as Gretchen’s songs, *Das Veilchen* and *Erlkönig*, or the *Chansons* by Paul Verlaine that have been and continue to be set by various composers. New settings of pre-existing librettos such as the various settings of the libretto by Pietro Metastasio differ in so far as the text tends to be cut and adapted to new settings and theatrical contexts.

Apart from that, in literary studies, the term pastiche is used more often than the term pasticcio. “The term pastiche appeared in France at the end of the eighteenth century in the terminology of painting. It was a transfer of the Italian word pasticcio; the term literally meant ‘paste’ and designated first a mixture of diverse imitations, then a particular imitation.” Contrary to Gérard Genette’s definition of the pastiche, the opera pasticcio is not so much of an imitation, but more of a quote. But Genette’s shift from direct to (mainly textually) adapted quotation is significant for the use of pastiche in written literature, as it is mainly associated with the sphere of parody and travesty. The easy and clear cases are the comic pastiche, where the repetition of style points out or overstretches the main characteristics to poke fun, even taking into account, as every comedian knows, that one has to take parody very seriously to make it funny. A case of special interest along those lines are the Heinrich Heine imitations by the poet Peter Rühmkorf, which – as Theodor Verweyen has shown – instead of pointing critically to Heine, address the German attitude of Heine’s reception.

One of the most interesting cases of pastiche are writings by one author which imitate the style of a certain period like, for example, Thomas Mann in *Der Erwählte*, or that of one author, or several distinct author(s), like Marcel Proust writing on *l'affaire Lemoine* in the style of nine different authors (including Honoré de Balzac, Gustave Flaubert, Henri de Régnier und Ernest Renan). Proust stressed pastiche technique as a mode of an artist’s development, altering between the deliberate pastiche – as is nowadays also used in creative writing courses – and the ‘involuntary pastiche’.

The establishment of a clear frame is highly important for any form of pastiche or pasticcio to separate it from plagiarism. Taking into account the idea of Genieästhetik – dominant at least since 1800 – this seems to be highly plausible: any form of repetition, reuse or gluing of existing pieces into a new piece of literature becomes suspect when both texts are available to a broader public at the same time. Here lies one of the principal differences between the opera and any textual pasticcio, leaving aside the many cases in which the larger part of the audience will not know or recognize the reused parts of an opera as, for example, in the case of Christoph Willibald Gluck’s or George Frideric Handel’s recycling of their best arias, or on the other hand Claudio Monteverdi’s highlighting of a distinct quote in “Pur ti miro” in *L’incoronazione di Poppea*. This
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5 Genette, 1997, p. 89.
8 See Karrer, p. 47.
9 Proust, 1937, pp. 11-87.
is even true for the famous London pasticcio of *Artaserse* for Farinelli (Carlo Broschi) containing arias by various composers, some of which members of the audience might have heard before – but most of them will have not! More likely they may have known that the arias were famous. Previous to the technique of sound and video recording the reproduction of an aria or larger musical part needed the contextual frame of the theater or performance. In music and opera, pasticcio and original therefore share the situation of performance as a vital part of the work of art which forms a different piece at any repetition. Direct comparison of two different performance frames was limited to those few individuals able to travel widely, and even then, it was a matter of comparing not the performance but the memory of a performance. But for any intended broader public it was more or less impossible to compare different performances. As a result, there are always good reasons to reproduce a good aria again on stage. Spoken drama\(^\text{11}\) developed a different strategy, as Bernhard Jahn closely examines (see pp. 103-116). Even Goethe and Schiller never called into question the need for stage adaptations of their plays. But it caused them to develop a dual strategy by fixing their version in a canonical sense in ‘last hand’ (*Fassungen letzter Hand*) editions, which had often been reworked years after the first publication and were distinctively designed as versions for reading, but which also opened the possibility for even more radical stage adaptations. Our double standard for spoken drama and opera is rooted in this tradition, as no one would criticize, for example, the fact that Goethe’s *Faust* is reduced to a performance time of two hours – unthinkable for Richard Wagner’s *Parsifal*.

The situation for printed texts is quite contrary to that of the opera pasticcio performance: there have to be very good reasons to reproduce a printed reading text in another printed reading text as not only can they be easily accessed and placed next to each other, but can also be fully reproduced by any reader – just by reading.

Additionally, at all times the very process of canonization derived from the delicate relationship between the imitation of canonized works – soon classified as genre –\(^\text{12}\) and their subtle transformation into new, original works, which subsequently develop into a future canon. As literary repetition needs careful contextualization, framing becomes the heart of literary pasticcio technique.

**From pastiche to pasticcio**

While pastiche, parody, travesty and palimpsest are clearly defined types, the term pasticcio is rare in literary scholarship. Apart from his contribution to this volume on pa-
Pasticcio technique in spoken theater of 18th-century Germany, in 2008 Bernhard Jahn had already transferred the term from the main notion of imitation (of a certain style) to that of recombination. His study *Der Bauer als Pasticcio* examines recombination and shifts in the characterization of peasants and lower-class people in 16th- and 17th-century German comedy. Certain characteristics of the category “peasant”, developed to legitimate the maintenance of their position as the lowest rank in society, such as dullness, drunkenness, egoism and quarrelsomeness, can also partially shift to figures of other rank, such as the monk and even the courtier, leaving space for the emergence of positive characteristics such as sophistication and modesty.13 Jahn’s definition recalls techniques of the 18th-century aria whose catalogue of affects shaped the opera characters in the sense of a mosaic, in which every aria adds another shade of emotional color. Cuts and additions therefore change the character, but do not destroy its coherence, as it would if applied to the later 18th- and 19th-century characters modelled on later ideas of psychology and linear processual character development.

**Pasticcio and music**

In his analysis of Ingeborg Bachmann’s late poems as “pasticcio and »utopia of language«” (“Pasticcio und »Utopia der Sprache«”)14 Sebastian Kiefer starts off with Bachmann calling her poem *Enigma a “Collage”* and using and transforming a whole set of distinctively musical quotes. *Enigma*, dedicated to the composer Hans Werner Henze, quotes lyrics from Gustav Mahler’s Symphony No. 3: “Du sollst ja nicht weinen, / sagt eine Musik.”15 and Alban Berg’s op. 4: “Nichts wird kommen für meine Seele”16 shortening the latter to “Nichts wird mehr kommen”,17 and leaving the term “soul” – a word unspeakable for 1960s poetry – to the music remembered in and echoed by the words.18 Thus, by the way, 18th-century music theory’s dictum of music as ‘the language of the soul’ is recalled. The music or rather libretto quotes make clear that the way from words to music – Joseph von Eichendorff’s idea of the “magic word” (“Zauberwort”) that will cause the world to sound (“Und die Welt hebt an zu singen”) –19 is blocked by modernity.20 One has to add: a modernity that has seen the Holocaust. Bachmann’s inclination to “ventriloquize stylistically”21 therefore derives from her quest for a new

15 See Bachmann, 1993, p. 171. In his study Kiefer mixes up Symphonies No. 3 and 5. See Kiefer, 2004, p. 69.
16 See Kiefer, 2004, p. 73.
17 See Bachmann, 1993, p. 171.
18 See Kiefer, 2004, p. 73.
20 See Kiefer, 2004, p. 75.
21 “Bachmanns Trieb zum stilistischen Bauchreden…” See ibid., p. 86.
pathos and a new utopia which literature cannot achieve anymore and which in essence is bound to the figure of a negative utopia, as in Paul Celan’s poetry and Theodor W. Adorno’s writing. Similar to her use of voice in the context of gender in Malina, the libretto quotations in Enigma do not evoke music directly, but they bring with them the remembrance, the longing, dialectically tied to the notion that they fall silent, as soon as they are cast in literature.

Both Jahn and Kiefer use the term pasticcio in a rather symbolical way and more in terms of headlines without a closer examination whether, and to what extent, the term can provide an analytical tool for scholarly literary analysis. But in comparison with the term pastiche their focus on quotation and recombination can serve as a starting point.

**Quotation vs. originality**

Pasticcio works have long been neglected because of their supposed lack of originality. It is amusing that this romantic perception of an ‘original’ clearly deriving from the idea of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and later Ludwig van Beethoven (through Wagner) as being the ‘Originalgenie’, was applied even to Baroque opera. One of the many treasures still more or less buried under this paradigm is the opera Die getreue Alceste by Georg Caspar Schürmann and his librettist Ulrich von König, given in Brunswick and Hamburg in 1719. As most of his supposedly 108 operas including 50 pasticcios performed at Brunswick and Hamburg between 1700 and 1736 are lost, Schürmann is unknown even to experts of 18th-century opera. Apart from being the most important composer of the Hamburg Gänsemarkt theater between Reinhard Keiser and Georg Philipp Telemann, Schürmann was nothing less than Johann Adolf Hasse’s first and, as George J. Buelow points out convincingly, very influential teacher. Furthermore he was amongst the many German composers who were opera singers themselves, like, again, Hasse and Carl Heinrich Graun (another famous Schürmann pupil), who performed as tenors together with Schürmann at Brunswick. As Schürmann used to write the primo uomo in his operas for his own voice, at least Die getreue Alceste gives a clear testimony of the vocal abilities of what was long said to be non-existent: a Baroque opera countertenor, who easily reached the skills of his friend, the Italian castrato Campioli who took over Schürmann’s part for the Hamburg performances. Why was Die getreue Alceste, of which the Brunswick version is lost, but the Hamburg manuscript kept at the Preußische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin never performed until 2017 when the Hamburg University

23 Schmidt, 1933.
24 See Buelow, 1980, p. 821.
25 Antonio Gualandi, himself nothing less than the singing teacher for the Dresden castratos.
26 For a full discussion of the opera, its transformation and special dramaturgy see: Hartmann, 2017, pp. 217-279.
27 D-B, Mus.ms.20360.
Library hosted a heavily cut student’s performance\textsuperscript{28} The question is solved by a glance into *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart (MGG)*,\textsuperscript{29} which lists the surviving manuscript score as a pasticcio. In fact, the Hamburg version contains 14 Italian arias of which five can be identified.\textsuperscript{30} But as Schürmann adapted Italian operas for the Brunswick stage regularly, it is not unlikely that music and even words of some of the Italian arias might have come from his own hand. Even as both von König and Schürmann did not appreciate the specific Hamburg habit of mingling German opera with Italian arias, in comparison to the Brunswick libretto the Hamburg version displays a clear shift of dramaturgy, turning King Admetus from the royal and stoic ideal of Philippe Quinault’s version towards a more bourgeois and sentimental ideal. It reduces the choir parts and tableaux, introduces careful reedits and shortens the recitatives, and uses the Italian aria as a mode of intimacy between the bridal couple in a way the Brunswick version had not known. Appreciated or not, the Italian aria appears as a stepping stone towards a new and, compared to the Brunswick version, far more modern approach to German opera, which turns this pasticcio from a supposedly mediocre work into a milestone in German opera development. In the way it carefully and even poetologically adapts the inserted material to a musico-literary process, *Die getreue Alceste* displays a common rather than exceptional pasticcio practice. But is it possible to transfer this technique to purely literary production?

I will try to offer one example from the literary period most unlikely to appreciate the aesthetics of secondary use, a period which would value originality above all else – the German romantic period. Nevertheless, an inclination to quote is obvious, at least for Jean Paul and E.T.A. Hoffmann. Whereas Jean Paul’s strategy of literary adaptation as a means to mark literary worlds as clearly made of words and paper – in a straight line of descent from Laurence Sterne – seemed always clear and satisfactory, Hoffmann’s manner of quotation caused trouble to many scholars over the centuries.

The text in which the issue is most evident has the rather Baroque title *Lebens-Ansichten des Katers Murr nebst fragmentarischer Biographie des Kapellmeisters Johannes Kreisler in zufälligen Makulaturblättern* (*The Life and Opinions of the Tomcat Murr Together with a Fragmentary Biography of Kapellmeister Johannes Kreisler on Random Sheets of Waste Paper*).

Tomcat Murr is not only of the same pack as Hoffmann’s other animals from Dog Berganza to Master Flea and a close relative of Ludwig Tieck’s *Der Gestiefelte Kater*, but clearly also a twin to Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*.\textsuperscript{31} But Sterne’s strategy of writing a whole novel in digressions and turning the principle of narration upside down by making the main line of narration become completely random results in the emergence of a narration in fragments. In the novel, the Tomcat Murr gets the printed biography


\textsuperscript{29} CROLL/WACZKAT, 2006, col. 350.

\textsuperscript{30} See HARTMANN, 2017, pp. 235-238.

\textsuperscript{31} *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. 
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of Johannes Kreisler, the romantic musician and alter ego of the young Hoffmann, into his paws, as he (the cat!) is about to write his own autobiography. The cat tears out pages from the printed book and ‘ab-’uses them as blotting paper. By accident the pages remain in the manuscript and both biographies get printed and bound into the same volume. Early scholarship highly valued the romantic Kreisler fragments. But it often read the cat’s biography as it’s counterpoint in the sense that it furnishes an easily dispensable frame of parody on the typical bourgeois philistine, quoting Shakespeare, Goethe, Schiller and many others purely in the sense of a collection of superficial idioms for cozy living.  

In 1967 Hermann Meyer analyzed these quotes in detail to see how many of them appear in both the Kreisler and the Tomcat part. But to him, this quite remarkable bridging of the gap only shows that: “The letter kills. For a mind like Murr’s, literature is a poisoned gift, a curse rather than a blessing. […] Conversely, Murr represents a type spoiled by literature. His example shows how the poet gets terribly banalized.” Meyer still belongs to the line of German scholarship which regards Hoffmann as the ‘Gespensterhoffmann’ (‘ghost-story Hoffmann’), an author of occasional genius with a fatal inclination towards the trivial, writing in his spare time under the influence of strong liquids with a light and sometimes fleeting feather. It needed the French school of Jacques Derrida and especially Sarah Kofman’s brilliant study Autobiogriffure: Du Chat Murr d’Hoffmann to prove the perfect contrast, and to show how Hoffmann’s Tomcat Murr (next to his late play Prinzessin Brambilla) develops intertextuality (avant la lettre) as a mode of writing, and to draw attention to the brilliant lawyer, Hoffmann’s stunning precision of writing, aligning him with Franz Kafka. As I have shown some time ago, to follow that line of deconstruction leads to the rather stunning conclusion that with Kreisler and Murr two incarnations of the author’s self are tied together by the rather physical thread of a book’s binding, and that it is only the cat itself which, thanks to its animal instincts, can tie the romantic artist to the world.

34 Kofman, 1984.
35 See Hartmann, 2013, pp. 42-54.
36 In fact, Hoffmann owned a tomcat called “Murr” while he wrote the novel. The cat died as he was about to finish the second part and Hoffmann not only inserted the obituary notice he sent to friends, without the real cat he was not able to finish the last part of the novel, which remained a fragment.
As, in my understanding, the opera pasticcio technique is closer to the literary quotation than to matters of pastiche and parody, I wonder if it might open the way to a better understanding of Hoffmann’s ways of double quotation and self-quotation in Tomcat Murr. It could be understood as a technique which connects the dual parts (Cat and Composer) rather than one to contrast them as opposites, as Murr and Kreisler not only share quotes, but also frequently use the same words.37

One of the most interesting quotations is the small one-part aria from Goethe’s libretto Claudine von Villa Bella in the second version of 1788. Murr uses it as upbeat to his own lengthy poem, a “Sonett”, which is usually regarded as the most sophisticated genre of poetry. Murr uses the even more difficult type of the “Glosse”. In the original the heroine Claudine reflects on her love to Rugantino – a shadowy figure who in the end turns out to be a kind of Robin Hood:

Lieber schwärmt auf allen Wegen;
Treu wohnt für sich allein.
Lieber kommt euch rasch entgegen;
Aufgesucht will Treue sein.38

As Murr addresses the poem to the poodle Ponto39 he makes some alterations, substituting faith (“Treue”) with friendship (“Freundschaft”).

Lieber schwärmt auf allen Wegen,
Freundschaft bleibt für sich allein,
Lieber kommt uns rasch entgegen,
Aufgesucht will Freundschaft sein.40

There are two main interpretations of the passage. One regards it as a straightforward parody, showing that even Goethe wrote bad verse. Comparing the two versions, Meyer takes a different approach: he assumed that Hoffmann would not deliberately poke fun at the poem but that he just quoted the passage from his unreliable memory.41 Both readings turn out to be extremely unlikely. Contrary to the prominent quote from Goethe’s Egmont by Murr right on the first page,42 Claudine von Villa Bella was rather a text to be known by insiders and opera lovers. It was composed by Johann Friedrich Reichardt in 1789 as a Singspiel (with spoken dialogue) contrary to its structure as an opera buffa with sung recitatives. Hoffmann did not appreciate the Reichardt version (nor did

37 See in detail MEYER, 1967, pp. 115f.
38 GOETHE, 1988, vol. 5, p. 675. “Love flatters on every path / Truthfulness stays by its own. / Love will fly to you / Truthfulness needs to be searched for.” (English transl. TH).
39 By the way a reminiscence to Jean Paul who owned a dog of that name.
40 HOFFMANN, 1992, p. 91.
41 See MEYER, 1967, pp. 126f.
42 HOFFMANN, 1992, p. 18.
Goethe) and set off in 1795 to create his own version, being his first attempt to compose an opera. To his friend Theodor Gottfried von Hippel he writes: “You will not believe how the furies of composition in music and novel writing etc. grab hold of me.” Interestingly enough, music and novel become connected even at this early stage, when Hoffmann still regarded himself mainly as a composer. As for him, for Murr the passage marks an early stage of his artistic development. Even though the composition was never completed (but Hoffmann was later to compose another Goethe libretto: Scherz, List und Rache, which is lost), in his review of Egmont Hoffmann described Claudine as a libretto “rightly worked into any composers hand”.

The pasticcio mode here uses words of the aria. It is therefore not an adaptation of a certain style of writing like the pastiche or parody, but merely a quote. But like in Bachmann’s poems, it does not quote the whole text. This technique is dominant throughout Hoffmann’s novel, as one of modified quotes which get adapted to the context by subtly but significantly shifting their meaning towards a new expression. As Murr applies the love aria to a song of friendship, his altering “wohnt…” into “bleibt für sich allein” is not at all “shallow”, as Meyer complains, but necessary to transform the singular mode of a heroine dwelling on her own (in her chamber) into the dual mode of two friends, separating from the crowd (under the oven).

Another passage in the pasticcio mode is a longer prose section adapting the chapter “A fragment” from Sterne’s A Sentimental Journey where the narrator reads a newspaper fragment used as wrapping paper. But in Tomcat Murr, unexpectedly, the passage is not a quote but a close paraphrase in quotation marks and, as the first inserted Kreisler fragment, it functions as an upbeat to the principle of fragmentary narration. Again, shifts are significant and appear on the level of minute changes: Sterne’s soldiers collaborate in their robbery with a boatman who down on the water catches the items that the soldiers had thrown into the river Seine. Their cries “Tis an ill wind” are directly quoted by Hoffmann’s soldiers “Es weht ein großer Wind” but get clearly rhetorical as they run off with the notary’s wig, hat and coat, only ascribing their robbery to nature’s powers. This turn of the screw is worthy of the lawyer Hoffmann, as here Master Abraham quotes Sterne’s soldiers to shield himself from his sovereign’s (Fürst Irenäus/Knight Madman) blame for spoiling a royal feast by accusing nature’s thunderstorm.

---

47 Sterne, 1995, p. 81.
which he, in fact, is likely to have roused deliberately. Abraham is not only another Hoffmann *alter ego* in the novel and as teacher to Kreisler as well as to Murr, he is a magician, *magnétiseur*, a Baroque master of machines and one who is likely to govern the elements at least sometimes. He is, in short, the power of fragmentary narration.

**Conclusion**

In literature, the pasticcio turns from a technique into a mode. Fragment, quote and pasticcio form a line which is completely different from the mode of pastiche, parody and *travestie*. The basis of the literary pasticcio is not the adaptation of a full style, but a (re-)contextualization and an integration of meaning. Aesthetic judgement is fundamental to the mode of pastiche, which is in essence a mode of parody. But for the pasticcio mode the *void* of aesthetic judgement – or at least a sense of aesthetic ambivalence – is just as fundamental. It frees the quote or textual material from its context. With this tendency it might even help to bridge the gap between the rather pessimistic notion of modernity struggling for any form of originality – a struggle clearly inherited from the early romantic period – and postmodern celebration of intertextuality. My non-representative selection of authors with a strong musical background indicates a third direction, as their use of the pasticcio mode brings with it musico-theoretical discourses with notions of sound. In a quite utopian manner, it may set textual parts free, regardless of or even especially through their status as a transformed quote or material. Further examination of the pasticcio mode in literature has to prove whether it can help to understand further distinct questions like, for example, the technique of montage or modes of self-quotation. Topics could be the reappearance of characters in works by Balzac or in works by the passionate Jazz lover and former Jazz musician Günter Grass, or the music quotes in the genre of Pop literature of the 1980s.
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49 To spoil an intrigue by which – supposedly – Kreisler’s beloved Julia was supposed to be married to the mad prince.
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On the New Significance of the Pastiche in Copyright Law

Frédéric Döhl*

The concept of the pastiche is not only a concept found in the arts, with its long and varied history in the fields of aesthetics, criticism and artistic practice. It is also a concept in law. In this latter context it is to be found in statutes, judgments, official notices and academic publications.

The pastiche, however, is not just any legal concept. It is about to become ‘the next big thing’, specifically to German copyright law – with its key legal framework being the German Act on Copyright and Related Rights (UrhG – Gesetz über Urheberrecht und verwandte Schutzrechte) – to which the concept of pastiche was unknown until recently. In music, the new legal development regarding the concept of pastiche explored here impinges directly on the rights of composers, lyricists, performers and producers of phonograms. But this development will eventually affect all the arts, as well as other holders of ancillary intellectual property rights, such as film makers and broadcasting corporations, which are comparatively seldom participants in litigation pertaining to exclusively music-related legal disputes. It is expected that in the near future the pastiche will experience not only a marked boom in legal disputes, but also in jurisprudential literature and dissertations, as observed in German-speaking countries over the past years in relation to the areas of sound sampling, the ubiquitous questions around the remix culture or the legal requirements for license-free use of artistic products by third parties.

The reason for this new significance of the concept of the pastiche for music in German copyright law (and beyond in Europe) is a judgment handed down by the European Court of Justice on 29 July 2019 under case number C-476/17. This musical dispute, better known under the abbreviated name of Metall auf Metall (English: “metal

* Frédéric Döhl is a musicologist and lawyer specialized in music and copyright law. He currently works at the German National Library and teaches at Free University Berlin. This article summarizes research published in more detailed form elsewhere, especially in Döhl, 2016b, 2017a, 2019c, 2020a and 2020b.

1 Hoesterey, 2001; Dyer, 2007.
“Metall auf Metall”) reverberated through the courts for 20 years. The dispute turns around two seconds of music which were originally composed and performed, produced and recorded in 1977 by the German band Kraftwerk as part of a track called *Metall auf Metall*. In 1997 a team around producer Moses Pelham used these two seconds as a digital extract (sample) from the Kraftwerk recording. They were used in a continuous loop to provide the rhythm underlay in a song titled *Nur mir* by German rapper, Sabrina Setlur, without Pelham & Co. having sought permission from the copyright holder to do so. The legally entitled members of the band Kraftwerk thereupon instituted legal proceedings, among other things for a claim to compensation and for a cease-and-desist order. The unparalleled legal odyssey thus began. In the legal proceedings Kraftwerk was both the author on the one hand as well as the performer and producer of the phonogram on the other – a unique constellation.

*Metall auf Metall* is a dispute unusually rich in jurisprudential collocations, which I have been scrutinizing and commenting on from a musicological perspective for some time.\(^2\) In this essay, I deal with the last of these developments, namely those relating to the concept of the pastiche itself.

*Metall auf Metall* is the single most fascinating and fundamental litigation concerning itself with the subject matter “music” to be conducted in Germany in the new millennium. It is an absolute rarity for legal proceedings concerning music to be brought before the highest courts. In addition, it is unprecedented for legal proceedings relating to music to receive the attention of all the courts which could be occupied with such a legal matter – the Federal Court of Justice, the Federal Constitutional Court and the European Court of Justice. The judgment which has now been handed down by the European Court of Justice is already the eighth court decision to be handed down in this matter.\(^3\) After it, it was heard again by the Federal Court of Justice and currently continues on a regional level. In decisions on referral such as the present one, the European Court of Justice only adjudicates on questions of the interpretation of the relevant European law and not on the merits of the matter itself. It refers the matter together with the issues for determination back to the submitting national court. This is exactly what happened on 29 July 2019. Adjudications on interpretation of the relevant European law affects not only the matter which gave rise to the interpretation but also beyond that until such time as the law itself is changed or the court’s interpretation thereof. Experience has shown that we can assume that the decision will stand for a considerable time and that it will have a sustained and marked effect on cultural practice in the sphere of adaptation across all the arts for the time being.

The reasons for these lengthy, complex and drawn out legal proceedings, which cannot be dealt with here in detail, are simple.\(^4\) On the one hand, the parties are arguing

---


\(^4\) Cf. n. 2.
with the obstinacy of a dispute between neighbors which has long since become a matter of principle, and most especially a matter of winning. Without such perseverance, it would not have been possible to take this dispute so far. On the other hand, digital editing hard- and software, as utilized in sound sampling, have become part of everyday culture since the mid-1980s when they became easily affordable and accessible. Today it is possible to edit musical passages with any smartphone. To boot, sound sampling is only one example of the many digital remix techniques available, from photo memes to video mashups. At the same time, the adaptation rights aspects of copyright and related rights law still have their origins in the pre-digital age. In Germany, in essence, they have been in operation since the 1960s. De facto the Metall auf Metall litigation has thus become a test case for an entire sphere of life, with a reach far beyond music alone. Over and above the subject matter in dispute, the cardinal question being posed is whether the legal framework needs to be readjusted to the changed realities of modern life. This explains not only the extreme duration of the proceedings but also the many legal permutations and the great interest in this debate from outside of the jurisprudential fraternity and the music industry. In so doing, the harmonization of conflicting interests in a manner that is appropriate to the digital present as well as the subjects of artistic freedom and a law that is true-to-life and responds to the changed methods of interaction and communication in the modern media, are being debated in the public forum. The modern media especially are diametrically opposed to the protection of aesthetic and financial investments, resulting in a conflict of interests which is difficult to resolve. So, in short, we have two well-known professionals in the music world who may be litigating over a special music problem, but after the proceedings have run their course, the final decision will have a profound impact that will reach far into everyday cultural life, far beyond the realm of music. This is also the case with the concept of the pastiche as a doctrine in law, which the proceedings in the European Court of Justice have now drawn into focus.

However, the consequences which are relevant for this discussion have been kept comparatively vague in the text of the judgment. The term pastiche itself does not occur at all. The full import of the entire matter is not yet evident. For legal practitioners, however, they are expressed unambiguously in the third sentence of the operative part of the judgment, which states: “Member States may not provide in their national law for an exclusion or limitation with regard to the phonogram producer’s right under Article 2 (c) of Directive 2001/29, which is not envisaged in Article 5 of that directive.”

We can render the content of this paragraph, its background and most especially its consequences, in simple language: everything about the German right of adaptation of artistic works will change and specifically for all non-primary adaptations of the protected creative works of third parties which are not primarily intended as humoristic critiques (known in legal parlance as ‘anti-thematic’ adaptations). The judgment therefore is particularly tangential to musical appropriations which are neither parody nor caricature and thus the vast majority of typical cases of “musical borrowing”.

5 ECJ, 2019, ruling No. 3.
6 Burkholder, 2018; Burkholder, 2019.
So, what has happened? There is a fundamental need in copyright and ancillary property rights law to balance the interests on the one hand of the monopoly rights granted by it which are mainly economic and moral/personality rights to musical works, performances and audio recordings on the one hand, and on the other hand the need to make usage freely available in the service of cultural diversity and productivity, so as to secure the fundamental right of freedom of artistic pursuit and take into account the fact that new art is regularly created through active engagement with already existing art, even the most original and innovative contributions: “composition as editing” as the norm in music history. The traditional German system of guaranteeing these equally essential but difficult to balance interests had solved the task since the promulgation of section 13 of the Law on Copyright in Works of Literature and Musical Art (LUG – Gesetz betreffend das Urheberrecht an Werken der Literatur und Tonkunst) in 1902, with generally applicable clauses providing for adaptations based on protected portions of works by third parties to be permitted, without consent in the event of the adaptation itself having aesthetically independent qualities. The applicable version of the current German copyright law uses the term “independent” in section 24 par. 1 Act on Copyright and Related Rights (UrhG). “Free use” is the name given to this harmonization of interests. In practice the point of contention in individual cases always remains the point from when this “independence” can be deemed to have been achieved. But the lever for the harmonization of interests is clearly intended to be fundamentally arts-orientated. And this is precisely the requirement of the Federal Constitutional Court in Germany in balancing the fundamental rights of freedom of art and ownership.

This traditional German system of harmonizing interests has now been declared to be in contravention of the law of the European Union by the European Court of Justice. This decision was reached quite correctly, and hardly surprisingly, in the judgment of 29 July 2019. The decision did not only emerge subsequent to the vote of the Attorney General at the European Court of Justice in the same matter, which explicitly focused on this. Free use as envisaged in the current sec. 24 par. 1 of the German Act on Copyright and Related Rights (UrhG) simply cannot be equated with what has become EU copyright and related rights law since 2001 by way of EU directive no. 2001/29/EC. And it is precisely this EU copyright and related rights law that the European Court of Justice refers back to in the quoted section of the operative provisions of its judgment in Metall auf Metall. It is in fact this Directive 2001/29/EC which contains the concept of pastiche.

---

9 Döhl, 2016b, pp. 314-344.
10 Ibid.
13 Döhl, 2017a; Ohly, 2017, p. 969.
14 Szpunar, 2018, para 59.
It is via this judgment of the European Court of Justice that Directive 2001/29/EC with its reference to the pastiche now comes into play in Germany. In the German copyright discourse, this has not been the case before, despite the fact that Directive 2001/29/EC has already been in force since 2001 (the implementation period ended December 2002). Until now this has been jurisprudentialterra incognitato a large extent because the idea of pastiche as a legal concept does not stem from German legal tradition, and German courts as well as jurisprudence have until now not been forced by legal disputes and litigation to take issue with the concept of pastiche. It was taken cognizance of, but otherwise ignored. First tentative and increasing familiarization with the concept of pastiche has only recently started taking place.\textsuperscript{15} This will now change; it will have to change.

Whilst a unified, overarching EU copyright and related rights law is not yet in existence, parts have in fact become standardized. Following a series of first steps in regard to cross-border questions in areas such as trade in goods, broadcasting rights and protective periods, the aforementioned Directive 2001/29/EC, which in turn partially implemented international treaties (WIPO copyright treaty, WCT, and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, WPPT), was in the year 2001 the first substantial legislative measure at EU level in copyright and related rights law.\textsuperscript{16} And it has remained the authoritative statutory source for the sphere of artistic adaptation until today. In particular, Directive 2001/29/EC defines “reproduction right” (Art. 2), “right of communication to the public of works and right of making available to the public other subject-matter” (Art. 3) and “distribution right” (Art. 4). As we will see, the concept of pastiche comes into play in adaptation cases with regard to Art. 2. The juristic operation of Art. 2 sets out the right of reproduction clearly and its immediately apparent applicability to music and adaptation of music:

“Member States shall provide for the exclusive right to authorise or prohibit direct or indirect, temporary or permanent reproduction by any means and in any form, in whole or in part: (a) for authors, of their works; (b) for performers, of fixations of their performances; (c) for phonogram producers, of their phonograms; (d) for the producers of the first fixations of films, in respect of the original and copies of their films; (e) for broadcasting organisations, of fixations of their broadcasts, whether those broadcasts are transmitted by wire or over the air, including by cable or satellite.”

Directive 2001/29/EC, to the extent that it contains provisions regulating for instance the reproduction right, is fully harmonized EU law.\textsuperscript{17} This means that it is European law which, to the extent that it regulates copyright and related rights law, is binding on all


\textsuperscript{16} Döhl, 2019, pp. 535f.

\textsuperscript{17} Grünberger, 2015, pp. 276, 284.
EU member states and leaves no leeway for country-specific deviations unless they have been provided for in the directive itself, or by acknowledgement of their existence in the course of the interpretation of the directive by the European Court of Justice, being the relevant judicial instance.

The quoted section of the reasons for the judgment of the European Court of Justice is thus binding on the German courts. And it will now, after a delay of almost two decades, force a fundamental re-examination of the German right of adaptation of artistic works, incorporating the harmonization of interests outlined, which has been in existence for over 100 years without referring to the concept of the pastiche. That has changed with immediate effect. Most likely, the concept of pastiche will instead have a pivotal role from now on within the German copyright regime when it comes to adaptations.

It is not all about pastiche now: there are other special exemptions from the all-encompassing rights guaranteed in Directive 2001/29/EC in Art. 2 to Art. 4, notably from the right to reproduce. First of all, this is the case for minimal reproductions. If sections taken from works or performances of third parties are below the so-called threshold of originality, they neither fall under the scope of protection of Directive 2001/29/EC, nor do they fall under that of the German Act on Copyright and Related Rights (UrhG). This activity is freely permissible. Minimal reproduction refers to everything that can be called the musician’s tools of the trade. If it is done digitally (sound sampling), the European Court of Justice now also requires that the copied material be rendered unrecognizable by further adaptation or processing. But what is clear is that trivialities are sifted out. The new aspect is that this is now solidified and clarified as the state of the law with regard to the reproduction right of the phonogram producer in cases of acts of minimal digital adaptation of music (‘microsampling’) – a question that has been widely disputed throughout the *Metall auf Metall* litigation.

In all other cases where material is taken over, however, Directive 2001/29/EC takes full effect and is binding. Member states may only make provision for exceptions within the framework of the options set out in Article 5 of this directive. For musical appropriations only two provisions are relevant, as the European Court of Justice has emphasized in its recent judgment. However, experience shows that the fundamentally dubious qualification of a reproduction as a quotation (Art. 5 par. 3 (d) in Directive 2001/29/EC), i.e.

> “the use, by a user other than the copyright holder, of a work or, more generally, of an extract from a work for the purposes of illustrating an assertion, of defending an opinion or of allowing an intellectual comparison between that work and the assertions of that user, since the user of a protected work wishing to rely on the quotation exception must therefore have the intention of entering into ‘dialogue’ with that work”,

18 ECJ, 2019, para 71.
rarely applies to music in practice. In most cases there remains only one of the provisions that could actually come into consideration: Article 5 par. 3 (k). If this exception also does not apply, the permission of the relevant rightsholder is required for the appropriation. The rightsholder is of course under no obligation to give permission and is able to set any price for the granting of such permission. In practice, licensing is often simply not an attainable option, as the German Federal Constitutional Court has emphasized.\(^\text{19}\)

For this reason alone the provisions relating to free use in creative practice have great importance.

Now, Article 5 par. 3 (k) of the directive is the section in the European copyright and related rights law in which the concept of the pastiche appears. Article 5 par. 3 (k) states: “Member States may provide for exceptions or limitations to the rights provided for in Articles 2 and 3 in the following cases: […] (k) use for the purpose of caricature, parody or pastiche.” Pastiche will thus be a pivotal exit option to attain the privilege of deeming an unauthorized appropriation as free use, and in future the qualification as a pastiche will consequently be a key concept in the law of adaptation, in determining the borderline between illegality and legality in the described harmonization of interests.\(^\text{20}\) It is not necessary to be a legal expert for it to become immediately clear that this is a change of system. Pastiche is a classifiable, subsumable category. To subsume an adaptation to this category or not is something categorically different compared to the determination of the aesthetic relationship between two artistic entities in individual cases and to measure the degree of aesthetic independence of the younger work from the older. The modalities of the harmonization of interests in the law pertaining to adaptation are therefore undergoing fundamental change in Germany right now, and the concept of pastiche will have a central role to play from now on (becoming e.g. para 50a UrhG as of June 2021).

Far-reaching change brings with it systemic challenges; in this case they concern the fundamental question of how the balancing out of the described and necessary harmonization, can be carried out; this aspect has been dealt with in detail by me in other publications.\(^\text{21}\) It does, however, already present a problem at a very basic level, which I would like to highlight here. Whilst the concept of the pastiche occupies a central position in European copyright law with regard to adaptations, it is nevertheless not yet clear what the legal content of the term pastiche, i.e. what it means, will be. Directive 2001/29/EC does not provide a legal definition. There has not been any case law emanating from the European let alone the German courts to date which has defined or even described the concept of pastiche passably coherently. To the contrary, intensive research has shown that there are many differing perceptions of the meaning of the word pastiche circulating in the European copyright discourse, as I have described at length elsewhere, providing exhaustive documentary evidence.\(^\text{22}\) For example, it is already in dispute whether there are any material differences between the categories of caricature,

\(^{19}\) BVerfG, 2016, para 98.

\(^{20}\) See in detail Döhl, 2020b.

\(^{21}\) Döhl, 2016b.

\(^{22}\) Döhl, 2020b.
parody and pastiche at all, and whether these terms do not ultimately designate the same phenomenon occurring in different art forms. It is debatable, for instance, whether a humoristic-critical intent is a prerequisite for a pastiche in the legal context, as it is for parody and caricature. Furthermore, it is also debatable whether a pastiche in the legal sense is a ‘mere’ imitation of the style of another, or whether the taking over of material components from the original artwork is actually permissible. These points of dispute serve to demonstrate that the law has not yet considered those practices which go beyond this, but still fall under the generic term of pastiche. One only has to consider the practice forming the central theme of this publication, namely the practice of the pasticio, the disparagingly named patchwork operas of the 18th century, or, in the context of modern music, of the internet culture of the mashup.

Here, therefore, a field is opening up for the arts-related humanities to enter the discourse on copyright law. A dialogue of this nature is imperative. Only a scientifically informed administration of justice which is alive to the meaning of pastiche in the individual artistic forms and practices at a given time and in a specific context can allow the European Court of Justice to interpret Directive 2001/29/EC in a manner that is appropriate to the arts and has the tools to hand down judgments that are art-oriented and differentiated in individual cases. And it is precisely this that the German Federal Constitutional Court is demanding, for instance, when it prescribes that in order for the aforementioned harmonization of interests to be achieved the relevant special characteristics of a respective genre affected by a case are to be taken into account, i.e. the legal term of pastiche shall not be interpreted in a generalized manner but with “genre-specific” sensibility and flexibility. So far the interest of the courts and jurisprudence has been limited to sporadic and anecdotal literature emanating from research in the arts-related humanities. The bibliographies of the numerous dissertations and footnotes to the many essays surrounding the Metall auf Metall proceedings, and the references in the eight court judgments which have already been handed down in this matter to date are a sad confirmation of this general status quo. It is up to the arts-related humanities to make the challenge that this is not sufficient. At the same time, it is up to them to extend the invitation to dialogue and offer knowledge about the concept of the pastiche to the law to enable the courts to pass judgements that are at least based on a full understanding of the relevant artistic practices and its aesthetic specifics. In this regard, the ongoing Metall auf Metall proceedings are an opportunity for both sides, arts-related humanities and law, to strengthen and expand their dialogue to foster mutual understanding.

Translation: Dierdre Scheibert
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3. Traveling Musicians – Traveling Music?
Throughout opera history singers have had a decisive impact on the circulation of music, a fact which is particularly evident if we think about the most prominent phenomenon of 18th-century opera, the *aria di baule*. It is also a well-known fact that composers often ‘tailored’ their music around the individual strengths and needs of their performers.¹ This fact is by no means new to musicological research on singers, as there are numerous cases of (mostly) castratos and female sopranos who imposed a distinctive vocal style on ‘their’ composers.² As many of those singers traveled frequently – only a few of them were lucky enough to stay in just one court for their whole lives – this music inevitably traveled with them, a subject that is considered by other contributors to the present volume.

For the most part, research on baroque singers has always pictured them in a quite active and decisive role, a perspective often based on anecdotes about the affectations of the most famous singers.³ They were the force that compelled composers to write in a certain way, to avoid certain notes or technicalities and to assign distinctive role types in order to accommodate the performers. This article will also underline the significance of the singer for the creation of operas, but from a slightly different perspective. Through

---

¹ A concept recapped by the title of Thomas Seedorf and Daniel Brandenburg’s volume “*Per ben vestir la viruosa*: Die Oper im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert im Spannungsfeld zwischen Komponisten und Sängern” (Brandenburg/Seedorf, 2011).
³ On the subject of the various ‘special requests’ of 18th-century singers, see e.g. Bucciarelli, 2015. The author sheds light on the case of the castrato Senesino, whose negotiations with the Royal Academy ultimately secured him important roles, not only on the operatic stage but also in London’s cultural circles. The struggle for artistic influence was common also for other singers, especially castratos.
an examination of the vocal profile of the tenor Francesco Borosini (c. 1690-1755), developed from my study of the characteristic arias written for him in Vienna and London, I would like to illustrate how his collaboration with George Frideric Handel for the Royal Academy resulted in the creation of special roles which introduced a new way of utilizing Borosini’s voice for dramatic purposes. In contrast to his Viennese parts, the singer was assigned far less excessively virtuoso elements in his arias, a fact that corresponds perfectly with the exceptional roles of Bajazet in Tamerlano (1724) and Grimoaldo in Rodelinda, regina de’ Longobardi (1725). Those two characters will be key roles for the present article and will be discussed in detail. Apart from these broad modifications to Borosini’s profile in general, a closer examination reveals that the ambitus of his London arias were changed in an odd manner. As I will illustrate, his parts written for the London stage stand out in comparison with the majority of music written for the tenor in the years before and after his appearance there.

There are two elements of Handel’s arias for Borosini which triggered my interest in this particular aspect of the latter’s career. Firstly, there are clear modifications to his parts subsequent to his arrival in London in 1724. Those are of a more ‘technical’ nature and mainly concern the transposition of high notes to facilitate Borosini’s baritonal vocal range from $A$ to $e’$. Secondly and more importantly, the role types and vocal style he assumed at the Academy emphasize a completely different side of the singer, which other composers in other operatic centers never chose to highlight. With respect to the issue of ‘local tastes’, I would like to address the following questions: are there any determinable changes in musical writing for Borosini that exceed the obvious motives for modification, such as different tuning? If so, could those modifications be linked to the ‘local tastes’ of composers or audiences, or could we explain them in other ways?

As already mentioned, the key figure of my research is the Modenese tenor Francesco Borosini (c. 1690-after 1756). Following his father Antonio Borosini, also a successful tenor who most probably paved the way for Francesco’s employment, he became a permanent member of the Viennese Hofkapelle of Emperor Charles VI in 1712. Between 1712 and 1731 the Hofkapelle secured him financial stability and a considerable career, which stands out from most of his tenor colleagues of the early 18th century. Borosini rose to fame, having obtained major roles in operas by the court Kapellmeister Johann Joseph Fux, Antonio Caldara, Francesco Bartolomeo Conti, and other composers active at that time.

Information regarding his origins and his exact whereabouts outside Vienna remain uncertain. Nevertheless, I was able to provide an updated list of documented perfor-

4 For more information regarding the genesis of Tamerlano see Knapp, 1970.
5 More on the subject of tuning will be discussed below.
6 His biography has been examined closely, see Michels, 2012. Michels conducted detailed archival research on his activity in Vienna, including the time after his official retirement from the Hofkapelle in 1731. Borosini was also object of my master’s thesis Francesco Borosini: vita e carriera di un tenore nel Settecento (Università degli studi di Pavia 2017), in which I focussed my attention on his vocal profile.
7 He became the highest paid tenor of the Hofkapelle, see Michels, 2012, p. 115.
mances – both in and outside Vienna – in which he certainly appeared. Said catalogue consists of roughly 70 works, including several different operatic genres, like *drammi per musica*, *tragicommedie*, serenatas and oratorios. My research did not focus on archival investigation of his biography, though, but rather on the study of Borosini’s vocal profile, that is, the kinds of roles he normally assumed, or was associated with and the recurring technical elements. My aim is to profile most of the ‘parameters’ of his voice which we can derive from the analysis of the arias he sang, including ambitus, tessitura and various other technical elements. If observed chronologically and geographically, all those elements can help us to highlight certain changes over time.

As for Borosini, I could narrow down his appearances to three macro-areas within Europe: the Habsburg lands (including Vienna, Prague and Graz), Northern Italy (different operatic centers, such as Parma, Reggio Emilia and Venice) and, of course, the Royal Academy in London. In order to illustrate the differences between the latter area and the main corpus of Viennese operas, I will first proceed to highlight some of the Viennese features.

A closer look at the Viennese operas reveals a clear recurrence of certain role-types. Especially during his youth, the tenor was often assigned the roles of villain or antagonist which were portrayed musically through virtuoso rage arias. Those arias included a wide range of technical elements, which Borosini apparently excelled at, including for example coloratura passages and wide leaps. His ability to reach exceptionally low notes – at least comparing to our modern conception of the tenor as a high voice – was often used by composers as a musical illustration of inner turmoil or explosiveness of the character, as I will demonstrate. One of his earliest roles in Vienna was the satyr Damone in Francesco Conti’s *I Satiri in Arcadia* (1714). The following table illustrates the distribution of the arias and ensemble numbers of all seven characters. Young Francesco Borosini – being at the very beginning of his career – had only three arias, but those arias already anticipate his vocal peculiarities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mirtilla</td>
<td>9, 1 duet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirsi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elpina</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurindo</td>
<td>4, 1 duet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergasto</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigella</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


9 Score: A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17190.
This role encapsulates a lot of his peculiar vocal elements. The opera was performed in Vienna in August 1714 in honor of the birthday of Empress Elisabeth Christine. The designation *favola pastorale* indicates that this piece does not reflect the strict Metastasian features of a *dramma per musica*: it includes comic situations and characters in disguise, as, for example, the shepherd Tirsi, who pretends to be the nymph Nicea. He fears that once Damone discovers his real identity, the satyr will vindicate his previous banishment from the lands of Arcadia.

Borosini was assigned three arias, the first two being typical rage arias which one could expect from a villain. The first aria highlights that, besides his ruthlessness, the character shows an incessant interest in all females, regardless of his marriage to Nigella. His new love interest, the *prima donna* Mirtilla, pretends to be mad to escape his unseemly offers. Damone suspects her lie and engages in a rage aria: he threatens to destroy Arcadia if he finds out Mirtilla was making a fool of him.

The aria “Con un guardo mio sdegnato” depicts Borosini’s best qualities and certainly served as a showpiece for the newly arrived singer. The incipit displays his ability for quick changes in register:

*Example 1: Damone, “Con un guardo mio sdegnato”, bars 5-9.*

The vocal line moves from the low, almost ‘baritonal’ register up to high $f'$ and includes a succession of leaps. They alternate with coloraturas that underline the satyr’s anger and uncontrollable temper. The vocal line thus gives us a sense of interruption and irritation, perfectly in line with the character. Interestingly, the entire aria is notated in bass clef in the manuscript preserved in the *Musiksammlung* of the Austrian National Library, a recurring fact in a few of Borosini’s earliest Viennese operas. For the purpose of this paper, I carried out a faithful transcription of all the notational features of the manuscripts I consulted. However, the notation does not in any way reflect the ambitus or the tessitura of the pieces.  

10 In fact, taking a look at Damone’s arias reveals that writing them in the bass clef does not make any sense from a graphical point of view: the mostly tenor-like tessitura ($b$ flat-$f'$) results in the use of ledger lines not particularly comfortable to read or to write. In addition to that, the ledger lines compromise the legibility of the text, squeezed between the singer’s line and the one of the viola. It could be a simple notational feature applied by the copyist, though an interesting one (for a detailed examination of the Viennese copyists of the 18th century, see Eybl, 1996). However, I would not dismiss the supposition that there was more to it than just an individual notational preference: in the broader context of the
Damone’s second aria, “Io m’abbrucio”, exceeds the level of difficulty of the first one, even though in the beginning it seems to be simpler. The characteristic descending semiquaver-motive is alternated with octave leaps, again probably taking advantage of Borosini’s vocal flexibility. In the B section, however, the vocal line descends to a low F on the word “lampo” (flash), clearly evocating a lightning strike. Although the concept of the tenor voice in the 18th century differs vastly from our modern image, a note this low can rarely be found in baroque tenor parts. The execution of those notes, however, became something of a Francesco Borosini specialty. At bar 32, the tenor even carried out a descending two-octave-leap, reaching the same note. The fact that it recurs various times within one aria makes me suppose that the singer was comfortable with the lower register.


Many other composers active at the Viennese court other than Francesco Bartolomeo Conti – like Antonio Caldara, Johann Georg Reinhardt and Johann Joseph Fux – began to notice Borosini’s capacities and took advantage of them. The operatic genre had little to no influence on the vocal style written for him, as we can also find it in oratorios and serenatas. For example, Johann Georg Reinhardt’s serenata *La più bella,* first performed in Vienna in 1715, contains a role of similar difficulty. Although the dramaturgical context is completely different from that of a favola pastorale, Borosini’s role of Marte, the God of war, displays traits quite similar to Damone. Being that he is the god who does not recognize the true virtues of the female protagonist Venere, but
typologies of the operatic genre, the notation could reflect the fact that the role contains some features associated with that of a bass rather than a tenor role (as, for example, a buffo part). As for Damone, his third and final aria (III,7) clearly reflects the comic dimension of his character: it is completely different than the first two virtuoso rage arias and presents an almost syllabic, buffo-like vocal style.

11 Score: A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17969.
who merely adores her physical attributes, he can be classified as an antagonist. His two arias are technically demanding as they incorporate similar alternations between wide leaps and coloraturas. The vocal line is so scattered across, that it is actually difficult to determine the tessitura, and requires a quick adaptation to changes in register to reflect Marte’s main affect.

As one can imagine, the features described in the aforementioned works do recur in Borosini’s parts, especially between the years 1713 and 1719. Furthermore, from 1716 onwards, he became a shoe-in for the main parts of Conti’s *tragicommedia per musica*.\(^\text{12}\) There, his roles displayed comic traits perhaps already anticipated in the role of Damone. Conti, being the composer who knew best how to draw attention to the singer’s acting and vocal qualities, clearly recognized the potential of the young Borosini. In his most famous carnival opera, *Don Chisciotte in Sierra Morena*,\(^\text{13}\) he incorporates the comic anti-hero, who turns mad recalling scenes from Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso* during his journey through the Sierra Morena. His musical parts display elements already seen in prior operas, as illustrated in the following example from his first aria “Corro incontro a le squadre de’ Mori”.\(^\text{14}\)

*Example 4: Don Chisciotte, “Corro incontro a le squadre de’ Mori”, bars 12-15.*

---

12 For more information on the topic of Viennese carnival opera, see Michels, 2019. She dedicates considerable attention to Borosini’s important role in the creation of the main characters, see ibid., pp. 106-112.

13 Score: A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17207. It is the only *tragicommedia* by Conti performed and recorded in 2005. The first modern performance was directed by René Jacobs at the *Innsbrucker Festwochen der Alten Musik* with the baritone Nicolas Reveq in the protagonist role of Don Chisciotte.

14 In Don Chisciotte’s other arias we find a lot of poetic textual elements that suggest a certain kind of musical realization. The second aria “Sono un fulmine di guerra” (“I am a lightning bolt of war”) revokes the reference to the lightning and is connected to a melismatic passage. Conti also does not hesitate to underline textual references to “descending”, which he could use to display Borosini’s low register.
The excerpts I provided can only allow a glimpse of the vast amount of material preserved in Vienna today. Of course, not all of the arias ever written for Borosini correspond to the aforementioned criteria, as some of his roles are more traditional and less virtuosic than those examples. Nevertheless, even when not in an antagonist role, the arias provided for him often feature the characteristic leaps and the steep descent into his low register. However, a mere comparison of numbers shows that the antagonist and paternal roles are the most numerous category of his career. Because the musical style of an aria is closely connected to the specific role type, I assume composers and librettists ‘typecast’ him in very similar roles.

As pointed out in the introduction, there was one specific period of Borosini’s career which broke the aforementioned tendencies. In 1724, after a few years of negotiations, he arrived in London in early autumn. There, he appeared in the following operas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operas</th>
<th>Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamerlano (1724, Handel/Haym)</td>
<td>Bajazet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaserse (1724, Ariosti/Haym)</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulio Cesare (1725, Handel/Haym) [revival]</td>
<td>Sesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodelinda, regina de’ Longobardi (1725, Handel/Haym)</td>
<td>Grimoaldo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il Dario (1725, Ariosti/Silvani)</td>
<td>Siderme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Elpidia, ovvero Li rivali generosi (1725, Handel – Vinci – Orlandini/Zeno)</td>
<td>Vitige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I will focus on what might seem to be a small excerpt of his career – the season of 1724/25, for which Borosini was invited to the Royal Academy – this excerpt will prove to be rather significant. Borosini appeared in Handel’s Tamerlano and Rodelinda, the two operas that make him most known to posterity. As opposed to the Viennese repertoire, both operas are nowadays part of standard repertoire of Italian Baroque opera and have been investigated from different points of view.\(^{15}\)

In particular, the origins of Tamerlano and Borosini’s role of Bajazet have been discussed multiple times by musicologists.\(^{16}\) It is known that the singer assumed the role of Bajazet twice during his career: the first in 1719, performing in Reggio Emilia in a homonymous setting by Francesco Gasparini.\(^{17}\) Borosini then almost certainly brought

\(^{15}\) Dean/Knapp, 1995, pp. 577-587.

\(^{16}\) Jones, 2008.

\(^{17}\) The role of Bajazet was performed by another exceptional tenor, Marc’Antonio Mareschi. He was chosen to participate in Antonio Vivaldi’s setting of this topic, after he had sung the part of Clistene in Vivaldi’s L’Olimpiade one year earlier. The pasticcio Tamerlano
a copy of Gasparini’s work to London in 1724 and notably contributed to the creation of the same role for the Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{18} This is an often cited and exemplary case of a singer’s involvement in dramaturgical and musical aspects of the opera, as Handel was compelled to rewrite the entire finale of his \textit{Tamerlano} after Borosini’s arrival. Thus, one of the most peculiar roles of 18\textsuperscript{th}-century opera was created. Many scholars define it as one of the first protagonist tenor roles, anticipating the complete inversion of the hierarchy of voice categories towards the end of the \textit{Settecento}.\textsuperscript{19}

With a total of ten numbers – including his three \textit{accompagnato} recitatives and the trio with Asteria and Tamerlano at the end of the second act – Bajazet is the absolute protagonist of the opera, numerically ‘outshining’ the \textit{primo uomo} role of Andronico. Being the proud and belligerent character that he is, one could immediately find parallels with the Viennese antagonist roles of the sultan.\textsuperscript{20} However, the musical realization is quite unrelated to it. Many of his arias actually accentuate his struggle to save his beloved daughter, which ultimately results in his suicide. One key moment is his second act aria “A suoi piedi”,\textsuperscript{21} which is, instead of a rage aria, a true revelation of Bajazet’s inner turmoil and sadness after finding out about the presumed betrayal by his daughter Asteria. The slow 3/8 tempo, the minor mode and the recurrent pauses of the basses and the vocal line indicating the sighs of the character, evoke mourning rather than rage, as we can see in Example 5. The mere technical challenges are reduced to a minimum in order to accentuate the dramaturgical intensity.\textsuperscript{22} Apart from the obvious stylistic choic-

\textsuperscript{18} Strohm, 1981.
\textsuperscript{19} John Potter (among others) claims Bajazet to be the first actual protagonist role for a tenor: “[Bajazet] is considered to be the first substantial true tenor role to exploit the potential of the voice.” Potter, 2009, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{20} In fact, his first aria “Forte e lieto a morte andrei”, a solemn C-major, march-like \textit{andamento}, underlines exactly those qualities. The semi-syllabic vocal style is partially interrupted by melismatic passages, which insist on his middle register \textit{e-d’}. However, they are far from the fast coloraturas and leaps of Damone’s arias.
\textsuperscript{21} This aria substitutes „Dalla fronte orgogliosa” in Gasparini’s \textit{Bajazet}. It goes without saying that Handel and his librettist Nicola Haym aimed to underline a completely different facet of the role, while Gasparini reverted to Borosini’s ‘typical’ set of skills.
\textsuperscript{22} Winton Dean and J. Merrill Knapp see this aria as a clear contrast to Handel’s style and a clear underlining of Bajazet’s inner conflict: “The news that Asteria has capitulated to Tamerlano wrings from Bajazet the most anguished of his arias, ‘A suoi piedi’. This astonishing piece sounds more like Bach than Handel; indeed its content and technique so strongly anticipate the bass aria ‘Gerne will ich mich bequemen’ in the St. Matthew Passion as to suggest the unlikely (but not inconceivable) possibility that Bach had come across it.
es present in Bajazet’s death scene at the end of the third act, this particular aria presents other curiosities, such as the striking modification of the written ambitus. All of the high notes exceeding $g'$ and sometimes $f'$ were altered once Handel had a chance to hear Borosini’s baritonal voice. Already at bar 29, the first quarter note was transposed down an octave, in order to avoid high $a'$. This procedure was repeated several times in the course of this aria, often compromising the descending direction of the vocal line. The adaptation to Borosini’s voice must have been an absolute necessity, considering that even lower notes were transposed down: the cadence at bar 37 was supposed to end on $b$ for the singer and was modified to $e$. The ‘modified’ version of “A suoi piedi” has an ambitus of $A-f'$, which results rather restricted, for Borosini’s standards.


On the other hand, there is the supposed villain Grimoaldo in Rodelinda, regina de’ Longobardi, first performed in February 1725. The distribution of the arias does not come close to the one in Tamerlano, yet Borosini still obtained six arias and one accompaniato-recitative. Besides the bass role Garibaldo, the real antagonist who operates without remorse, Grimoaldo is quarrelling with his feeling of guilt regarding his actions. He is, by any account, a “wolf in a sheep’s clothing” and as the plot goes on, his arias get more and more focused on his interior conflict. Similar to the case of Bajazet, Handel underlined his character with emotionally rich arias. The culmination is without a doubt the siciliano “Pastorello d’un povero armento”, his final aria, in which he somewhat admits his complete loss of control over the situation.

The resemblance, striking throughout but almost literal towards the end of the A section, extends far beyond the 3/8 rhythm with occasional syncopation and the linear three-part texture.”, Dean/Knapp, 1995, p. 539.

23 Ibid., p. 577.
Apart from this very unusual aria for an antagonist, the part of Grimoaldo does highlight some of Borosini’s specialties. His final second act aria “Tuo drudo è mio rivale”, a jealous reaction to Rodelinda reuniting with her former husband Bertarido. Grimoaldo’s part displays coloratura passages.

*Example 6: Grimoaldo, “Tuo drudo è mio rivale”, bars 13-16.*

Within the same piece, there is also a short section of *canto di sbalzo*, a succession of leaps, that illustrates the restlessness of the character. Such techniques are to be found throughout Borosini’s career. One can note, however, that the tenor’s low register is avoided completely.

*Example 7: Grimoaldo, “Tuo drudo è mio rivale”, bars 26-28.*

It is evident from comparing the roles of Bajazet in *Tamerlano* and of Grimoaldo in *Rodelinda* to other roles of Borosini that there is a huge difference in the handling of his voice. Although the role categories to which Bajazet and Grimoaldo adhere could promote quite virtuosic musical writing, Handel chose not to overload Borosini’s char-
acters. Having briefly illustrated the Viennese ‘style’, the emphasis on the emotional expressiveness of both roles is mirrored in the musical writing and stands in sharp contrast to the roles of Conti, Caldara, and others. It was not predominantly his technical ability, that Handel wanted to underline, but more his seemingly great expressive qualities. This resulted in a clear reduction of virtuoso elements like excessive coloratura and canto di sbalzo. Although both roles display technically challenging arias within both works, comparing them to Borosini’s parts at the Hofkapelle makes it clear that they were geared towards another direction. The extent of said contrast does not stop at vocality, however.

The presence of critical editions for both Tamerlano and Rodelinda allowed me to enter into detail about the specific adaptations the composer undertook to make Borosini comfortable. As I already mentioned, the alterations to the arias mainly concerned Borosini’s top notes. On many occasions, notes that exceeded top g’ were transposed. Within the aforementioned London operas there is only one piece that contains a written a’, which is Bajazet’s aria “Empio per farti guerra”. As for the role of Grimoaldo, Handel avoided the high a’ completely. This fact is interesting if we consider that once he returned to Vienna in 1725, this note started to reappear in several scores, as it is evident in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Ambitus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spartaco (1726, Porsile/Pasquini)</td>
<td>Spartaco</td>
<td>A-a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La corona d’Arianna (1726, Fux/Pariati)</td>
<td>Asterio</td>
<td>c-a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Disingannati (1729, Caldara/Pasquini)</td>
<td>Alceste</td>
<td>c-a’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, Handel decided not to make use of the tenor’s abilities to descend into his low, almost ‘bass-like’ register, as many of the Viennese composers before and after him did. None of the arias written by Handel descends lower than A, which – considering the fact that low F appeared quite often in the Viennese scores – had to be an intentional decision by the composer.

24 At this point it is rather interesting to compare Gasparini’s and Handel’s conception of the role of Bajazet. As I already mentioned, there is a quite remarkable difference in the portrayal of this role and therefore of the vocal style for Borosini.

25 It would defeat the purpose of this paper to illustrate the quantity of so-called “rage arias” written for the tenor in Vienna. Even when not in an antagonist or villain role, as is the case with Damone, many composers chose the vocal style illustrated above. Examples would be the role of Ruggiero in Fux’ Angelica vincitrice di Alcina, Orazio in Fux’s Costanza e fortezza, Leone in Antonio Lotti’s Costantino and many others. Even in oratorios, his parts tended to be exceptionally loaded with vocal challenges, as his role of Saul in Conti’s David shows.

26 Naturally, when speaking about ambitus in this particular context, one can never make absolute assumptions. Many elements of the performance were (purposely) not written down
A possible explanation for the ‘restriction’ of Borosini’s ambitus, especially regarding the transposed top notes, could be the performing pitch. Assuming that at the London opera, the instruments played at a slightly higher pitch, an intervention to accommodate the singer could seem justifiable. One of the most extensive researches regarding performance pitch was conducted by Bruce Haynes.\(^{27}\) He states that in the 1720’s the London opera orchestra indeed played at approximately 423 Hz, but during the last decades of the century the pitch increasingly rose. The author supposes that this phenomenon had to do with more and more singers coming from Venice to London, where performing pitch was notably higher than in the rest of Europe.\(^{28}\) However, the Habsburg lands were also strongly influenced by musicians from Northern Italy, who brought their instruments with them. Regarding Vienna, however, Haynes does not provide a clear date as to when the pitch moved up to the Venetian standard. It might be reasonable to think that in the 1720s – when Borosini came to London – there would have been a perceivable difference in tuning. While this could explain why higher notes were less comfortable for the singer, it does not, however, justify the absence of low notes. This shows that the reasons for the modifications to the written ambitus of the arias went far beyond the question of accommodation for technical reasons: the omission of the low notes and impressive leaps reflects a clear stylistic dissociation (be it deliberate or unintentional). Reducing these obvious changes to tuning would be short-sighted.

Having observed Borosini’s career as a whole and in the different geographical areas he worked, at least those known to me up to this point, I can conclude that the London operas depict him in rather ‘atypical roles’. During his long-lasting career in Imperial Vienna, Borosini’s special talents – musical and acting abilities – had made sure that he was assigned recurring roles. Although they did not all belong to a single ‘category’ (as far as such a classification exists), most of them had one thing in common: they were prone to explosiveness, be it in a good or in a bad way. His most impressive characters all gave reason to depict inner turmoil through highly virtuosic, technically challenging arias. Most of those roles featured very similar singing styles and technical elements, such as canto di sbalzo, the engagement of his complete ambitus, and virtuoso coloraturas.

The recurrence of such virtuoso elements seems to be present in Borosini’s whole career, regardless of the geographical location or the composer. For instance, his part in Geminiano Giacomelli’s Lucio Papirio Dittatore, performed in Parma in 1729, displays a musical style very similar to the Viennese operas. The characteristics of musical writing for Borosini therefore also applies to regions other than Vienna.\(^{29}\) His collaboration with Handel at the Royal Academy seems to be the only exception.

\(^{27}\) Haynes, 2002.
\(^{28}\) See ibid., 2002, pp. 149-155.
\(^{29}\) Unfortunately, it is not possible to conduct extensive research about Borosini’s performances outside Vienna and London as most of the music is lost. The only two exceptions are Gasparini’s Bajazet and Giacomelli’s Lucio Papirio.
The roles of Bajazet and of Grimoaldo do not display the abilities he was most known for. Considering that in 1724 he was already a well-established singer who had performed in several European operatic centers, it would have made sense to showcase those abilities which set him apart from his colleagues. His introduction to the London audience, however, aimed at something different: Borosini obtained antagonist roles with exceptional dramaturgical depth, far away from the more superficial, raging villains he so often impersonated at the Vienna court theater. Those two roles accentuate his seemingly great acting abilities, rather than his vocal capacities. How much of this contrast between London and the other areas is due to external conditions such as tuning, cannot be determined. Nevertheless, I suppose that this element played only a secondary role in the modification of Borosini’s part. Having illustrated two examples of Viennese court opera with a quite distinctive comic connotation, one could ask if the stylistic differences could be due to the distinction of *tragicommedia* and *opera seria*. While this aspect cannot be denied, I would like to underline that the Viennese roles of Borosini also included more conventional *seria* roles. Many of those characters displayed exactly the same vocal elements as those of Damone and Don Chisciotte, and therefore those elements are not specifically linked to the comic genre.

Regarding the adaptation of the musical style to the psychological depth of the role, it is beyond doubt that Borosini himself exerted influence over the musical realization. After all, it was the singer himself who compelled Handel to alter the ending of *Tamerlano*. He certainly had a special instinct for theater, as is evident from his post-London biography: shortly before applying for his retirement as court musician, he became the impresario for Vienna’s Kärntertortheater.

We could suppose that at the height of his career, the tenor – conscious about his abilities – wanted to create something special for the London audience, revealing not only the ‘fireworks’ of his voice, but its beauty and its drama as well. In contrast with numerous other cases of traveling music, be it *arie di baule* or other practices, Borosini did something quite different once with Handel. He took advantage of the presence of one of the most gifted dramatic composers of his time and elaborated one of the most dramaturgically intense characters of Baroque opera.

The open question is whether other singers of the same period present similar cases once at the Royal Academy, and if this could actually be linked to ‘local tastes’. Surely, there were cases of singers who had major influence on the creation of single operas, yet how many of them actually portrayed themselves in a less technically challenging

---

30 See n. 18.
31 See Michels, 2012, pp. 123-125. He was also in permanent contact with Viennese and Bohemian aristocracy, for which he served as procurator of librettos (see on that behalf Perutková, 2015).
32 A similar case to that of Bajazet emerges in the contribution of Brandt, 2008. The author cites the cases of two castratos, Giovanni Carestini and Nicola Grimaldi, who collaborated with Handel and Porpora respectively. They both played a major role in inserting whole scenes which showcased their acting and singing abilities.
way when exposed to one of the most prestigious audiences of Europe? If there are, the case of Borosini could be seen as an emblem for his time rather than as an isolated event. However, this case ultimately reflects something far more important, namely that opera production as a whole – regardless of the designation *dramma per musica* or *pasticcio* – was a combined effort, to which singers could contribute in a very enriching way. To which extent they had the ability (or the possibility) to do so surely depends on the individual case. Even Francesco Borosini, being a tenor and therefore lower on the hierarchy to his castrato colleagues, managed to have influence on the genesis of several different genres. Within the series of Baroque tenors who managed to have a career comparable to celebrated singers and female sopranos, he, by all accounts, stands out.
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Debts and Destiny
New Findings on Antonio Maria Peruzzi
and the Origin of His Opera Touring Business

Berthold Over

The title Debts and Destiny, which sounds like a Jane Austen novel such as Pride and Prejudice or Sense and Sensibility, alludes to the seemingly fictitious story of the first great impresario of touring opera troupes in the 18th century, Antonio Maria Peruzzi. But whereas Jane Austen’s stories deal with the vicissitudes of love his story is, in contrast, one of the vices of crime.

Until now, not much has been known about Peruzzi. He was a native Venetian and appears in Leipzig in 1722, virtually from nowhere. There, he signed a contract of tenancy with Ernst Gottlob Siegfried, owner of the plot of land on which the opera house was built. But, he did not give any operas in Leipzig.1 He must have had contacts to the Dresden court, as he claims to be in the king’s, resp. elector’s service and to have written poetry or music for the royal, resp. electoral princess Maria Josepha of Habsburg.2 In 1922

2 “It should be known to all who need to know it: that this day (see below at the end) between Signor [blank] Peruzzi, maestro di [blank] in the service of his Royal Majesty of Poland and Electoral Highness of Saxony [...].” (“Gia noto à ciaschuno che importa di saperlo: Che questo giorno sottoscritto qui sùl fine, trà’l Sgr: [blank] Peruzzi, Maestro di [blank] nel servizio di Sua Maestà Reale di Polonia ed Altezza Elettorale di Sassonia [...].”) D-LEsa, Tit. XXIV A Nr. 7a, fol. 103r (contract between Ernst Gottlob Siegfried and Peruzzi from May 1722; see also Maul, 2009, Textband, pp. 317-320). At this time August II (“the Strong”) was Elector of Saxony (since 1694) and King of Poland (since 1697).
3 “He wrote a small Italian composition [poetry or music?] during the fair here for which she gave him sixty ongari” (“Er hätte Ihnen diese Meße allhier eine kleine Italiänische Composition verfertiget; wofür Sie ihm gegeben: Sessanta ongheri; [...]”). Letter by Ernst Gottlob Siegfried to the King/Elector from 10 September 1722, D-LEsa, Tit. XXIV A Nr. 7a, fol. 101r. However, a payment to Peruzzi is not recorded in the ledgers of the princess’s
Fritz Reuter claimed, without citing any sources, that he was a prompter at the Dresden opera house. These were uncovered by Alina Żórawska-Witkowska who pointed to documents in the Dresden State Archives for the first time in 1991. In 1724 Peruzzi was in Prague where he obtained the permission to perform operas. In collaboration with Antonio Denzio whose task it was to form an opera troupe in Venice and his father Giovanni Maria Peruzzi he staged operas until 1725. The contract between Denzio and the two Peruzzis shows that he was still planning to perform operas in Saxony since the contract was concluded with the objective of staging some operas in Prague, Dresden and Leipzig ("per far rappresentare nella città di Praga, Dresden, e Lipsia alcune opere in musica"). After some financial troubles Denzio worked on his own and initiated a fruitful operatic life in the Prague theater of count Sporck. Peruzzi went to Wrocław/Breslau (1725) and later to Cologne (1726), Frankfurt (1726, 1731), Brussels (1727), Munich (1733, as he claimed himself), Augsburg (1733, 1735, the family remained until 1741), Verona (1744) and maybe other places where he produced operas too. Apparently, Peruzzi and Denzio were related: Peruzzi’s father was almost certainly the brother of Denzio’s mother, Teresa Peruzzi.

New documents show that Peruzzi came to Dresden already in 1717 as part of the project to establish Italian opera for the wedding festivities of the Saxon royal, resp. electoral prince Friedrich August and archduchess Maria Josepha of Habsburg that took place in 1719. The musical implications of this event are well known; among the musicians employed at this time the most prominent were Antonio Lotti, his wife Santa Stella, the castratos Senesino (Francesco Bernardi), Matteo Berselli and Gaetano Berenstadt, the bass singer Giuseppe Maria Boschi, the librettist Antonio Maria Luchini and the violinist Francesco Maria Veracini.

household (ledgers 1721 and 1722: D-Dla, 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 364/3 and Loc. 364/4), but this could also have been made from her private funds.

6 Freeman, 1992, p. 281.
7 Studies often contradict each other on his wedding festivities, see Bärwald, 2016, vol. 1, p. 15; Borcherd, 1910, p. 27; Freeman, 1995; Freeman, 1992, pp. 23-40; Liebrecht, 1923, pp. 151-158; Maul, 2009, p. 320; Nagel, 1911, p. 71 (Peruzzi’s request to perform in Frankfurt in 1728 was denied); Pega, 2011; Schenk, 1928, pp. 170-176 (he probably also had permission for Vienna); Selfridge-Field, 2018; Strohm, 1988, pp. 164f. (English version: Strohm, 1997, pp. 93f).
Here the crime comes in: These new documents are records of a lawsuit as Peruzzi was the subject of a criminal case in 1719. He had debts with a certain merchant Contessa and Peruzzi was put under house arrest. As was typical for debtors of his time, he planned to flee, and intoxicated his two wardens with opium. The plan worked and Peruzzi made off for Prague. But, unfortunately, one of the wardens died, Peruzzi was captured and put on trial a day after his flight. This was on 21 August 1719.

The documents are preserved in the Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden, collection “Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv)” and consist of four volumes. Some of the documents have been published, often in an abridged form and sometimes with names and places redacted as a kind of early data privacy, as early as 1734 in a medical-forensic book: Johann Christian Fritsch’s Seltsame jedoch wahrhaftige theologische, juristische, medicinische und physicalische Geschichte, printed in Leipzig. Since vol. 2 of the three most important manuscript volumes in the Hauptstaatsarchiv containing the records of the process is lost today, this publication is the only source for part of the documents used for this study.

The case itself is not as interesting as the information we can extract from the documents on Peruzzi’s life. They give a remarkable insight into the socio-economic circumstances of a musician and impresario, his origins, migration history and social standing. Moreover, they give a clue to the reasons for the establishment of Peruzzi’s opera touring business that initiated a most influential development for the dissemination of Italian opera all over Europe: the constitution and wanderings of itinerant opera troupes.

Peruzzi was, as already known, born and brought up in Venice being 25 years old in the year of the trial, so his year of birth must be c. 1694. His father Giovanni Maria was active in the opera houses in the lagoon city; his precise profession is not known, but

---

10 D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, Loc. 11400/9, Loc. 11400/10, Loc. 9717/28. For the titles of the volumes see the “Trial records” in the Sources at the end of this article.
11 Fritsch, 1734, pp. 673-752. Fritsch held the position of „Fürstl. Sächß. Weimarischen Leib= und Hof=Medici“.
12 Information on Peruzzi’s life is found in D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 187v-189v; 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 907/3.
13 “His father’s name was Joan Maria Peruzzi; he made his living in Venice from the music at the operas. His birth mother died, but his stepmother Catarina Peruzzi still lived in Venice as well.” (“Sein Vater heiße Joan Maria [cancelled: Antonio] Peruzzi, und lebe in Venedig von der Music bey denen Opern. Seine leibl. Mutter sey verstorben, seine Stiefmutter Catarina Peruzzi aber lebe ebenfalls noch in Venedig.”), D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 188r. However, Giovanni Maria Peruzzi married Cattarina Gambaroni already on 9 March 1692 (cf. Jonášová, 2008, p. 84), but may have married another Catarina some years later.
14 Pegah, 2011, claims on p. 67 that Antonio Maria was the son of a copyist in Venice referring to Jonášová, 2008. But Jonášová does not mention Giovanni Maria’s profession; in-
he sometimes acted as impresario on the Venetian terraferma. There, Giovanni Maria must have known Antonio Lotti whom Peruzzi names as an acquaintance of his father. In fact, Giovanni Maria staged Lotti’s Teuzzone while being impresario in Verona in 1713. In Venice, Antonio Maria went to school, learnt writing and some music. After having finished school he studied music more intensively and tried to earn his living as a musician “here and there”. But obviously his efforts were not so fruitful since he went to “Morea” (i.e. Greece) on a warship as a scribe for three years together with his cousin, a captain of the Venetian army and later “Grand-Admiral” in the Arsenal. Thereafter, he went to Bologna for five or six months, the birthplace of his father, and the living place of his uncle – and probably Anna Maria and Vittoria Peruzzi “di Bologna”, singers active from 1728 to 1756, were relatives of this brother, maybe his daughters or nieces. He then proceeded to Rome where he remained a week and Naples where he practiced as a musician for two years. After that, he went to Turin for about 20 months and continued to Avignon. There he fell ill after 40 days and returned to Venice. At some time after carnival he went to Innsbruck for about five months working for the court as a musician. This must have been in 1716/17 because there he met “the Kapellmeister here, stead, Pietro Antonio Denzio, father of the impresario Antonio Denzio, was a copyist (pp. 59 [testimony by Francesco Zane: “we both copy music”?”tutti due scrivemo di Musica”], 68f., 106).

15 Freeman, 1992, p. 24 (no. 35). According to SARTORI, 1990-94, he staged Armida abbandonata (Ferrara 1710/11), Astarto (Verona 1712/13), Teuzzone (Verona 1713), Camilla regina de Volsci and Il più fedel tra I vassalli o sia L’innocenza trionfante (Udine 1715).

16 D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 193v.

17 Cf. Freeman, 1992, p. 24 (no. 35). He signed the libretto, see: Teuzzone. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Verona il Carnovale 1713. Consacrato all’Illustissimi Direttori della Conversazione de Nobili di Verona, Verona 1713, p. 4. However, the composer is classified as “Anonimo” in Corago. Repertorio e archivio di libretti del melodramma italiano dal 1600 al 1900, http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0042325.

18 “In his youth he was exhorted to go to school where he learnt writing and some music. (“Er seÿ in seiner Jugend zur Schule gehalten worden und habe das Schreiben auch etwas von der Music erlernet.”) D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 188r.

19 “After having grown up and left school he was diligent in learning music and tried to earn his bread with it here and there. He succeeded in doing so.” (“Nachdem er heran gewachsen und aus der Schule geblieben, habe er in der Musique Fleiß angewendet, und damit sein Brod hier und da zu verdienen gesucht, sich auch also davon hingebracht.”) Ibid., fol. 188v.

20 On their careers see SARTORI, 1990-1994, “Indice dei cantanti”.

21 He is not recorded in SENN, 1954.
Mr Hennig”, that is the Dresden Kapellmeister Johann David Heinichen, who, after having worked in Italy for six years, was on his way back to the Saxon court (Figure 1).22

22 “At the beginning, from Venice he went as a ship scribe to Morea (Greece) with his cousin who was a captain on a war ship and, after three years, returned with him, and who nowadays is grand admiral of the arsenal in Venice. Then he went to Bologna to his father’s brother where he stayed for five to six months. From there he went to Rome where he stayed only seven days and then to Naples where he stayed permanently for two years practicing the profession of music. From there he hastened his return journey and went to Turin where he was for c. 20 months. After that he went to Avignon and after 40 days fell ill from a fiery fever. Then he returned to Venice and stayed all carnival long. From there he made a journey to Innsbruck where he served the court as music [musician or singer?] for c. five months. This can be testified by the Kapellmeister here, Herr Hennig [Heinichen] who gave him the opportunity to come to Dresden. Therefore, he left service there and entered service here as a prompter and music copyist.” (“Anfängl[ich] sey er von Venedig [insertion:] mit seinem leibl[iche]n Vettern, welcher ein Schiffs-Capitain gewesen auf einem Kriegs-Schiffe, als Schiff-Schreiber mit nach Morea gegangen, und nach 3. Jahren mit demselben, welcher vorietzo Grand-Admiral von dem Arsenal zu Venedig sey, wieder zurück geko[m]men, hernach sey er [end insertion] nach Bolonien [Bologna] zu seines Vaters Bruder geko[m]men, allwo er sich in die 5. bis 6. Monathe aufgehalten. Von dar sey er nacher Rom gegangen, daselbst doch nur 7. Tage geblieben und sodann nach Neapolis, allwo er 2. Jahr beständig verblieben und von der Musique Profession gemachet, [cancelled: nach diesem] gegangen, vondar er seine Rückreyse beschleuniget, und nacher Turin sich begeben, woselbst er in die 20. Monathe ungefähr gewesen, nach diesem sey er nach Avignon gegangen, daselbst nach 40. Tagen an einem hitzigen Fieber kranck gewesen, und darauf wieder nacher Venedig zurück gegangen, allda auch den Carneval über verblieben, und von danhenn nacher Inspruck gereyset, an welchem Orthe er ungefähr 5. Monathe an dasigem Hofe, als Musico, gediennet, wie solches der hiesig Kapellmeister, Hr Hennig [Heinichen], wißen würde, als welcher ihn soda[n] Gelegenheit gegeben, anhero, nacher Dreßden, zu ko[m]men, gestalt er den aus alldortigen diensten anhero, und allhier als Souffleur und Notenschreiber in dienste geko[m]men.”) D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 188v-189v. On Heinichen: Horn, 1987, pp. 40-48; also Over, 2019, pp. 57f.
Figure 1: D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 188r: Peruzzi’s life, fol. 189r: Peruzzi and Heinichen in Innsbruck.
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In Innsbruck Heinichen’s oratorio *La pace di Kamberga*, which he had offered the royal/electoral prince Friedrich August in Venice between February and July 1716, was arranged and performed in Holy Week (21-27 March 1717), most probably in the composer’s presence as we now know from the Peruzzi documents. From Innsbruck Heinichen took Peruzzi to Dresden. There, Peruzzi was engaged only shortly after the Italian operatic ensemble received its contracts in July 1717 in Venice and reached Dresden on 5 October. On 30 November 1717 he was officially employed as first prompter of the Italian opera and worked also as a copyist, as the documents reveal. According to his wife he also was in Bayreuth, the birthplace of the Polish queen and Saxon electress Christiane Eberhardine, for some time. This visit may have taken place during his journey to Dresden.

Following a typical migration pattern, once he became formally employed after a life with occasional jobs, Peruzzi settled down. Thus, in 1718 he married Anne Henriette or Ariette La France, a daughter of the Dresden court musician Robert du Houlondel called La France who was, together with his son Jean-Baptiste, employed in the *Hofkapelle* as a cellist (the father since 1707, the son since 1709). At this time La France was...

---


25 D-Dla, 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 907/3, p. 45r.

26 “[...] she did not know where he may have taken his way, she learned from him that he will probably go to Bayreuth because he had already been in this place and did know the Kapellmeister there. Furthermore, he took some music on this occasion with him.” (“Im übrigen wüßte sie nicht, wohin er seinen Weg genommen haben möge, sie habe aber von ihm so viel vermercket, daß er sich wohl nacher baßreuth begeben werde, weil er daselbst schon ehemahls gewesen, und mit alldortigem Capellmeister bekandt seiy, wie er de[n]n auch einige Musicalia annoch mit sich davon geno[m]men habe.” D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 21v-22r. It is not known who was Kapellmeister in Bayreuth around 1717 when the visit may have taken place. Hans-Joachim Bauer mentions a certain “Capellmeister Rugier” in 1712, see Bauer, 1982, p. 181.

27 The importance of this aspect is strengthened by Peruzzi’s fear during the trial not to lose his job and to misinterpret his flight as a desire to quit his service. On permanent employment as the final destination of an itinerant musician see zur Nieden, 2016. An opposite concept obviously pursued Jonas Friederich Boenicke, a musician who had a family, but apparently never a long-term employment, cf. Pegah, 2016.

28 Information on both La France are found in the *Hofbücher*, D-Dla, 10006 Hofmarschallamt, K 2, Nr. 4 (fols. 260v-261r), 5 (88v-89r), 6 (3v-4r, 75v-76r); they are also mentioned in Ágústsson/Stockigt, 2014.
50 years old\textsuperscript{29} and had been born in Caen in Normandy.\textsuperscript{30} Before coming to Dresden he had worked in several places, including Brussels. His son was born there, and since the latter was 29 years old in 1721, he must have been born around 1692.\textsuperscript{31} In 1719, Ariette was 22, so she might have been born in 1696/97, in Mons as she said.\textsuperscript{32} As Ariette claims, the marriage was a love marriage, and was initially not supported by her father, but he was persuaded to agree to it by her confessor and by friends. By the time of the trial Antonio Maria and his wife had had a child and Ariette was pregnant again. The couple lived in Kleine Brüdergasse in immediate proximity of Dresden castle and just behind Taschenberg Palais/Türkisches Palais, residence of the princely couple Friedrich August and Maria Josepha.\textsuperscript{33}

Although Peruzzi was employed at court, and had additional earnings through copying music and working in other capacities at the opera,\textsuperscript{34} he had serious financial prob-

29 D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 136v. However, in the Hofbücher are found different age statements.

30 See the Hofbücher.

31 On his age and birth place see the Hofbücher. Apparently, a musician du Houlondel or La France is not recorded in the Brussels household of Max Emanuel of Bavaria (governor of the Spanish Netherlands from 1691 to 1706) or in other musical establishments in the city. Over, 2016; Hörner/Werr 2012 (index).

32 “She was born in Flanders in Mons and not grown up constantly at a single place since her parents moved from time to time because of their profession. At the age of eleven she came with them to Dresden.” “It is c. eleven or twelve years that she has been here with her parents.” (“Sie seÿ in Flandern zu Mons gebohren, und an keinem beständigen Orthe erzogen worden, weil ihre Eltern hin und wieder ihrer Profession nach gereÿset, im 11. Jahre ihres Alters aber mit anhero nacher Dreßden geko[m]men.” “Es werde nun bald 11. oder 12. Jahr seÿn, daß sie mit ihren Eltern sich alhier befinde.”) D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 261v-262r.

33 “in his apartment in the Gutkäse house in Kleine Brüdergasse here” (“in seinem Logis im Gutkäsischen Hauß auf der Kleinen Brüdergaße alhier”). Ibid., fol. 1r.

34 In 1718 he “invented” an Italian ballet together with “Mauro” (the stage designer Alessandro or the carpenter Gasparo?), i.e. he probably was responsible for the concept or choreography of a ballet that, obviously, opposed Italian dancing to the usual French, and received 12 thalers. Several documents in D-Dla, 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 907/3, fols. 50r-54r, one is dated 31 March 1718. The ballet in question may have been inserted in Lotti’s Gl’odi delusi dal sangue. The opera was performed during carnival which lasted until 1 March that year. However, in the libretto, the invention of the ballets is attributed to “Monsieur Caret” (in the French translation: “Coret”): “The ballets – the first Roman, the second heroic, the third of geniuses – are invented by Monsieur Caret, second choreographer of His Royal Majesty of Poland and Elector of Saxony.” (“Gli Balli: Primo Romano, / Secondo Eroico, / Terzo de Genii. / Sono invenzioni di Monsieur Caret, Secondo Com-positore di S.M.R. di Polonia & Elettore di Sassonia.”) It could also have been a ballet for another occasion.
lems. These were caused by his low salary, delays of payment and a rather ostentatious life style. If the list provided by his creditor, the merchant Contessa, is right (many entries are marked “non è vero” – “that is not true” by another hand), he bought rather luxurious things like tea, coffee, French wine, silver tobacco tins, cut glass or a clock. Also his wife had a maidservant and he accrued debts through offering rather opulent meals on occasion of his marriage. These were provided by Charles La Place, the French cook of the Count of Saxony, i.e. Moritz Graf von Sachsen, the later famous Maréchal de Saxe who was the illegitimate child of August “the Strong” and his mistress Maria Aurora von Königsmarck. La Place helped Peruzzi during his flight. Peruzzi discussed the delayed payments with Baron Johann Siegmund von Mordaxt, the director of the musical establishment, and asked him for an increase of his salary. For this latter purpose he also made a trip to Vienna where he wanted to present his case to the royal/electoral prince Friedrich August with the aim of being granted a higher remuneration.

35 D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 9717/28, no pagination.
36 She is mentioned several times in the documents.
37 On his biography see Treffer.
38 On Mordaxt see FÜRSTENAU, 1979, vol. 2, pp. 44-47.
39 “In the first two months he lived from his own money and after that Herr Baron von Mordaxt promised him 200 thalers as an annual salary. After having presented his objection that he would not be able to live from this money, Mordaxt made him hopes that he, like the others, would have free lodging and firewood, also pleasure money. But this dragged on so that he did not receive any further money until he obtained some writing jobs. But he did not earn a lot because he had not much work. When afterwards he heard that His Royal Highness the Prince came to Vienna, he also undertook a journey there to recommend himself to him. Since he was even unable to live from the stipulated 200 thalers annually he therefore needed to spend money for it and make some debts that he had paid back little by little for the most part. He added that Herr Baron von Mordaxt had given him some hope that he might be awarded 100 thalers as a present being a grant for his better living, but he did not receive them as well although he supplicated His Royal Majesty in person.” (“Als er aber anfängl. 2. Monathe alhier vor sein Geld gezehret gehabt, und ihm nachhero durch den Hn Baron von Mordax jährl. 200. [Taler] pro salario versprochen worden, So habe derselbe, auf seine Vorstellung, daß er davor nicht leben könne, ihm noch Hoffnung gemachet, daß er, [insertion] gleich denen anderen, [end insertion] freye Wohnung haben, und Holtz, auch Lust-Geld bekomen solle; Es habe sich aber damit in die Länge verzogen, daß er weiter nichts erhalten, bis er noch etwas zu Schreiben darzu bekomen, jedoch habe er sich auch damit nicht viel verdient, weil er damit nicht viel zu thun bekommen, und nachgehends gehörct, daß Ihr des Königl. Printzens Hoheit nacher Wien gekommen, daheo auch eine Reyse dahin angetreten, um beý dero selben sich zu reco[mendiren, da er dann, und weil er von denen ihm ausgemachten 200. [Taler] jährl. nicht malh ausko[m]men können, freýl. Geld aufgewandt und einige Schulden machen müßen, er habe aber auch diese meistentheils nach und nach wieder bezahlt. Wórbey er annoch hinzu gefügct, daß von dem Hn Baron von Mordax ihm auch [insertion] einige Hoffnung, daß er [end insertion] 100. [Taler] als
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Friedrich August stayed in the imperial city during the marriage negotiations from October 1717 until March 1719. The prince was the leading figure behind the establishment of Italian opera in Dresden, so Peruzzi obviously hoped to have more success in achieving his aims with him than with his father August. On the day the fatal event took place Peruzzi still copied music and his wife tried to obtain outstanding remunerations for work he had done for Oberkapellmeister Johann Christoph Schmidt, Kapellmeister Heinichen and Francesco Maria Veracini. Her efforts were not successful.

During the trial, Peruzzi made use of his musical network. As advocates he called Girolamo (Personelli/Personè?), a friend of his father, who, however, was friendly to him at first but later became his enemy, the second prompter Felizetto (Felicetti, i.e. Giovanni Felice Maria Picinetti), Antonio Lotti whom his father knew as well, his wife Santa Stella, and the castratos Matteo Berselli and Senesino. The judge summoned Lotti and his wife. But in the end Berselli showed up together with Johann Friedrich Lotti.

40 Staszewski, 1996, pp. 87-94.
41 “He wrote music on Friday afternoon and he wrote on the same Friday and Saturday so much that he could claim 12 thalers, for every sheet 12 groschen.” (“Es habe derselbe Freýtags Nachmittage Musicalia geschrieben wie er denn sothanen Freýtags und des So[n]abends bis zum Abend so viel geschrieben, daß er 12. [Taler] dafür zu fordern beko[m]men , vor ie-den bogen 12 [Groschen].”) D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 194v-195v.
42 “She went to Herr Kapellmeister Schmidt, as well as to Herr Kapellmeister Heinichen and to Monsieur [Francesco Maria] Veracini and tried to get money for [outstanding] payments for her husband.” (“Sie seÿ beÿm Hn Capellmeister Schmieden ingl[seichen] beÿm Hn Capellmeister Hennigen und beÿ Ms. Varazzini gewesen und habe sich noch um Geld vor ihren Mann zur Zahlung bemühet.”) D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 294v.
43 Some other Italians spoke ill of Peruzzi too: the Italian painter in the opera, Gasparo Mau-ro (in other documents he is called a carpenter), the “Opern=Aufwärther” Giovanni Antonio Bon (according to another document he substituted Felicetti as second prompter in 1718, see D-Dla, 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 907/3, fol. 50r ff.) and the singer of the Hofkapelle Natale or Natalin Pelotti. D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 174r-180r.
45 D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 193r-194v, 338v-344v; 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 907/3, fols. 45r-46r.
The latter, a violinist active at the Dresden court since 1709, was Antonio’s brother and born in Hanover where his father Mattio Lotti (or Trento) was employed as an organist from 1667 to 1679.46 Previously in the trial, he had appeared as translator.47

Peruzzi’s flight from house arrest took place at night. Horses were provided by La Place and his scullion Johann Baptist Blasius or Gauer, a colored person (“Mohr”) whose peripatetic life brought him from London probably as far as the Crimea.48 Both accompanied him for a while on the way to his destination, Prague, where he wanted to stay until his affairs were put in order. His father-in-law provided him with a letter of introduction to one of his acquaintances, dance master Dilange,49 with whom Peruzzi could stay. But on his way Peruzzi lost time by going to several inns, he fled through Pirna, “Closter Graupen” in Bohemia, i.e. Kloster Mariaschein in today’s Krupka (Czech Republic), and finally was captured in “Zschochau”, i.e. Groß Tschochau or Řehlovice (Czech Republic).

As has been said, the trial deals mostly with the question of whether Peruzzi had used a poison in addition to opium; as one of the wardens had died, he could be culpable of murder, punishable by death. This could not be proved and in the end Peruzzi was sentenced to public flagellation and expulsion from the Saxon territory in November 1719.50 He did not accept this verdict and appealed several times.51 Even the latest document from 27 April 1722, in which he and his wife officially accepted the punishment (reduced to lifelong expulsion), was immediately questioned by him,52 for shortly thereafter we find him in Leipzig together with another Italian (maybe Denzio or his

47 Fritsch, 1734, pp. 691, 694, 712-714 (supposed “Mons. Lotti” and “Mons. Johann Fried- rich” being the same person); D-Dla, 10006 Hofmarschallamt, K 2, Nr. 4 (fols. 259v-260r), 5 (87v-88r), 6 (1v-2r, 74v-75r); he is also mentioned in Ágústsson/Stockigt, 2014.
48 The documents refer to the Tartars who named him “Gauer”, meaning in their language Christian. D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fols. 81r-81v.
49 “Because he, the inquired, for the rest did not know anyone in Prague. Therefore, his father-in-law gave him the letter to dance master Dilange that can be found in the records.” (“Gestalt de[n]n er, inquisit, sonst in Praag Niemanden gekannt, sein Schwiegervater aber ihn deshalber den von ihm ad Acta gegebenen Brief an den Tantzmeister Dilangen annoch mit gegeben.”) D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/8, fol. 199v. Dilange could not be identified; he is not mentioned in Salmen, 1997; the letter is found on fols. 64r-65v.
50 Fritsch, 1734, pp. 702-710.
51 Ibid., pp. 714f., 717-735 (a lengthy pleading [“Defension-Schriß”]), 736f. (sentence 8 Oc- tober 1731 [sic, probably 1721]); 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 9717/28, no pagination (pleading [“Defension”] from 4 April 1720, letter from the king/elector re- ducing the punishment to lifelong expulsion from 27 September 1721); 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/10, no pagination (Ariette leaves the office without permission to hand over a memorandum [“Memorial”] to the king/elector, without date).
52 D-Dla, 10024 Geheimer Rat (Geheimes Archiv), Loc. 11400/10, no pagination.
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father who both were involved in the opera business in Prague two years later) where he negotiated with Ernst Gottlob Siegfried about the opera house and concluded a contract in May on the use of the building for opera performances during all the Leipzig fairs in the three years to come. But, for the time being Peruzzi obviously was indeed leaving the Saxon territory, since he wanted to speak to Siegfried in a hurry before traveling to Venice.

Peruzzi never produced an opera in Leipzig. But the reason must not be sought in Michael Maul’s argument that the Leipzig officials waited for the employment of the opera expert Georg Philipp Telemann whom they hoped to engage as Thomaskantor after the death of Johann Kuhnau in 1722, but in Peruzzi’s expulsion. Siegfried sent his letter to the king/elector exposing Peruzzi’s project and surely the latter forbade opera staging under Peruzzi because he himself had commanded his expulsion (although documents are not extant to prove this assumption). The Prague contract of 1724, where he planned to perform not only operas in the Bohemian capital but in the Saxon territory (i.e. in Leipzig and Dresden) as well, shows that Peruzzi still hoped to be rehabilitated.

Why is this story important for Peruzzi’s reputation of being the first great impresario of an itinerant opera business in the 18th century in our days? I presume that he engaged in this business because he had no other choice. He had no other option but to build up an independent musical business on his own. As he notes himself, he no longer had any credit amongst musicians after he was sentenced:

“since this kind of life [of a musician] is characterized by the fact that one person alone cannot practice this art and earn his living, but many partners are needed that

53 “2.) Siegfried concedes his place with the mentioned opera house to Signor Peruzzi for performing Italian operas there for three years during all the Leipzig fairs.” (“2.) Concede il Siffrido al Sigr: Peruzzo, la di lui piazza, colla soprastrutta [sic] Casa d’Opera per far rappresentare colà Opere Italiane, durante Trè Anni, tutte le Fiere di Lipsia; […]” D-LEsa, Tit. XXIV A Nr. 7a, fol. 103r.

54 “Shortly after the last Easter fair two Italians came to my house. They made many compliments I did not deserve: // They wanted to be acquainted with me; they had to talk with me the same day because they were to leave for Venice tomorrow.” (“Kurtz nach vergangener Oster Meße a.e. waren 2. Italiän er in mein Haus gekommen, hatten viel mier nicht gebührende Complimenten gemachet: // Sie wollten gern mit mier bekannt seyn; Sollten u. müßten selben Tages annoch, mit mier sprechen; Weil sie morgen nach Venedig gingen.”) Ibid., fol. 100v. Siegfried wrote his letter on 10 September and added a contract concluded in May. Leipzig Easter fair began officially on Sunday Jubilate and ended on Sunday Cantate, but was preceded and followed by exhibition times. In 1722, Jubilate fell on 26 April and Cantate on 3 May, so Peruzzi and the other Italian must have negotiated with Siegfried in early May. On Leipzig trade fairs see Hasse, 1885, pp. 17 and 211f.; Leipziger Handwörterbuch, vol. 1, cols. 1529f. I would like to thank Manuel Bärwald from the Bach-Archiv Leipzig for his valuable information on the fairs.

constitute an integral whole. Therefore, nobody would accept such a person hereafter or let him earn his living at his side if he had been in the hands of the headsman and would have suffered the punishment. This happens because amongst craftspeople and guilds such kind of unfortunate persons is not tolerated and the liberal arts possess such dignity that unworthy persons are not suffered.”

Although Peruzzi’s statement may be somewhat exaggerated, it nevertheless seems reasonable that for him regular employment in a musical establishment was rather unattainable. To pursue a musical career, he could only count on musicians who knew about his fate and accepted it. And he was forced to maintain a certain degree of mobility.

On the other hand, Peruzzi seems to have seen the demand and the business opportunities for opera production in cities where there was a public, but no supply. Since 1693 Leipzig almost regularly had opera performances during the trade fairs which also were attended by the Dresden court. Thus, the normal opera-going public – the nobility and wealthy merchants from all over Europe – was present in the city. The opera was closed in 1720, however. Dresden had experienced opera in the 17th and 18th centuries only occasionally, but during Peruzzi’s time the city was the residence of the important royal Polish/electoral Saxon court as well as of the opera loving prince Friedrich August. In Dresden too, the Italian opera had been closed at the beginning of 1720. The empty opera houses and the public were there, but opera was too expensive to be firmly established.

Following his father’s and uncle’s footsteps and considering Peruzzi’s personal situation and the wider regional situation, a touring business, presenting opera for a restricted time (and, thus, avoiding any developments of market saturation with the ensuing


57 Maul, 2009, Katalogband, pp. 858-864 (chronology). On the visitors of the Leipzig trade fair cf. Hofmann-Polster, 2014, pp. 74-88; on opera and spoken theater during the fairs ibid., pp. 177-198. That Peruzzi himself was an eyewitness to this situation in the first half of 1722 when he claims to have written poetry or music for Princess Maria Josepha “during the fair here” seems improbable (see above, n. 3). Maybe the wording “during the fair” is a simple adverb of time, but, anyway, it seems rather questionable that he had any contacts to the court at this time at all given his conflicts with the law.
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decrease of audience and income) and trooping together freelance musicians (being fine with Peruzzi), would have been an ideal solution. Peruzzi was not an expert in the opera business, but his father and his uncle Pietro Antonio, Antonio Denzio’s father, were. Together with Antonio and his father he staged the first season of opera in Prague, the capital of Bohemia and therefore in an important administrative center. In addition, Pietro Antonio Denzio had a similar career to Peruzzi: although he did not get in trouble with the law, he initially was a music copyist before becoming an impresario in northern Italy (Ferrara, Venice, Bergamo, Mantua, Verona) from at least 1711 until 1726. In this function he made rather a fortune, as is evident from his and his wife’s wills, a fortune that Peruzzi certainly hoped to make in northern Europe. The possibility to draw upon his father’s and uncle’s experiences, competences and skills may as well have favorably affected his decision to establish an opera troupe.

All in all, the mobile, itinerant opera business must be considered a derivative of the fixed, permanent one combined with the business model of theatrical companies. In itinerant and stable opera there is an impresario, often moving from opera house to opera house organizing the opera performance. In both, there are opera personnel (composer, singers, etc.) who do not come from the place. But the difference with the itinerant business is that it relies on a core group (impresario, his wife, some singers, some members of the orchestra, etc.) complemented by changing personnel (singers, instrumentalists) which performs opera in a place for a restricted time and then turns to another. As for Peruzzi we know that he was accompanied at least by his wife to Brussels and that he came to Augsburg with her and four other persons, whereas the situation of his parents and the Denzios was different: the wives remained in Venice.

59 A similar strategy can be observed with other touring companies. The Mingotti, for example, played in residence cities (Bonn, Dresden, Copenhagen), capitals (Bratislava/Pressburg, capital of Hungary; Prague, capital of Bohemia), cities with Estates (Brno/Brünn – Moravia; Klagenfurt – Carinthia; Graz – Styria; Linz – Austria “ob der Enns”; Ljubljana/Laibach – Carniola), trade fair cities (Frankfurt, hosting also the imperial coronations; Leipzig) and important trade cities (Hamburg, Lübeck). Peruzzi first went to Prague with Denzio and then concentrated on residence cities (Brussels, Austrian Netherlands), two times connected to the Palatine dynasty (Wrocław, residence city of Bishop Franz Ludwig of Pfalz-Neuburg; Augsburg, residence city of Bishop Alexander Sigmund of Pfalz-Neuburg), but also played in Frankfurt. On the Mingotti see THEOBALD, 2015; MÜLLER VON ASOW, 1917; on Peruzzi see n. 7.

60 On the Denzios’ activities cf. JONÁŠOVÁ, 2008.

61 Actually, Peruzzi seems not to have been as successful as his uncle. He finished his seasons with debts in Brussels and Augsburg. Cf. LIEBRECHT, 1923, p. 152; SCHENK, 1928, pp. 172-175.

62 LIEBRECHT, 1923, pp. 151-158; SCHENK, 1928, p. 170. Liebrecht assumes erroneously that the singer Anna Maria Peruzzi was Antonio Maria’s wife.

255
when their husbands ran their opera business abroad. The core group of the Mingotti troupe consisted of Angelo and/or Pietro Mingotti, the latter’s wife Regina Valentini (for a short time), the singer-composer Giuseppe Nicola Alberti (by the way, active earlier in the Peruzzi troupe where he sang in Wroclaw in 1725), the violinist and translator of librettos Franz Joseph Carl Pirker and the composer/arranger/conductor (Paolo Scalabrini, Christoph Willibald Gluck, and others). Other singers may have joined the troupe over several seasons too. The advantage of itinerant opera troupes in comparison to a stable opera was an effective cash management. Through the performance of the same opera at different places resources were better utilized. Whereas the costs for musical manuscripts, arrangements, copies of parts and even scenes were paid once, income could be generated several times. Through the employment of young professionals (the most striking example being Regina Valentini soon to become Pietro Mingotti’s wife and to be employed at the Saxon court), second-rate singers (for example Anna Dotti who performed in Vivaldi’s and Handel’s operas or Anna Girò, Vivaldi’s protégée), fading divas with a certain renown (Francesca Cuzzoni, Giustina Turcotti) and normally only one castrato singer, the high male parts being sung by women, costs for singers could be diminished considerably. So, I think that Peruzzi’s precarious status after the trial and, hence, his failed career is responsible for the beginning of a development that took Italian opera, mostly in the form of pasticcios, to many major and minor centers in the north and that resulted in the Europe-wide dissemination of Italian music and style during the 18th century.

In this sense Peruzzi’s repertoire may be prototypical for the one later troupes brought to the north. As a first overview shows (Peruzzi’s repertoire is not much investigated), his repertoire consisted mainly of rather unchanged opera productions, opere impasticciate and pasticcios, coming from different operatic centers, mainly from Ven-

63 Jonášová, 2008, passim. Antonio Denzio’s wife joined him in Prague after having remained several years in Venice.
64 Mattheson, 1740, p. 374.
65 Also active in the Vienna Kärntnertortheater, see the article by Judit Zsovár in the present volume, pp. 425-446.
67 There are several options regarding stage designs: as so-called scene di dotazione they could have been the property of the theater (and adjusted for different performances in different opera seasons), they could have been made expressly for an opera production or they could have been the property of the impresario. On the first option see, for example, Diana Blichmann’s article in the present volume, p. 128; as a late testimony Reisinger/Wilson, 1923, p. 151; Brauneck 1996, pp. 912f.; Pigozzi; Mackeprang, 1949-52, pp. 3f.; Fabris, 1930, pp. 27-35 (Jacopo Fabris’s designs for the Mingotti opera troupe in Copenhagen); on the third D’Ovidio, 2017, p. 108 (numerous sceneries found in the estate of the deceased Roman impresario Giuseppe Polvini Faliconti in 1741). It is not known explicitly if opera troupes took their stage designs with them to different places, but this can definitely not be excluded.
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The overview shows that he relied at first on older repertoire that was sometimes updated by newly composed music, only a few operas were taken over shortly after their premiere. Operas were revived in different cities and exchanged between different troupes. Sometimes singers seem to have been responsible for their material transfer. Some examples may be presented here: Antonio Bioni’s *Orlando furioso* was first given in Prague in 1724 as the first production of the Peruzzi-Denzie business at the Sporck theater, Peruzzi signing the dedication of the libretto. A year later the opera was performed by the Peruzzi troupe in Wrocław implying that the impresario took a score of this opera with him or obtained it from his cousin. Another case seems to be Francesco Bartolomeo Conti’s *Alba Cornelia* which was first performed in Wrocław in 1726 by Ludwig Wussin (who took over Peruzzi’s *impresa* after the latter had left the city in late 1725 or early 1726) and his troupe. In 1728, the opera was given by Peruzzi in Brussels. Both impresarios based their operas on Conti’s version performed in Vienna in 1714 (and not on the one of the Milanese performance of 1704), maybe using the same score for their adaptations. A third case is *Siface* given in Frankfurt in 1732 that uses the version produced in Prague in 1729. The Prague *Siface* is distinguished by the added comic role of Mustafò who reappears in Frankfurt and receives an additional aria. In both versions the comic role was sung by the same singer, Sebastiano Zane. Some singers may have taken opera scores to the troupe, namely from opera houses where they performed earlier: Anna Maria Giusti and Paolo Vida sang in the Venetian premiere of Giovanni Porta’s *La costanza combattuta in amore* (1716), in a revival in Verona (1723) and later in Wrocław (1725). The same applies to Anna Dotti who performed in Domenico Sarro’s *Arsace* in the premiere in Naples (1718) and later in Brussels (1727). As for the musical shape of the operas the following examples may be given: *Orlando furioso* (Wrocław 1725) was based on a more than ten-year-old opera by Giovanni Alberto Ristori (second version with some new music by Antonio Vivaldi.

---

68 US-Wc, ML48 [S2203]; Mattheson, 1740, p. 375, who had all his information from the eye-witness Johann Georg Hoffmann, harpsichord player in the opera; Spáčilová, 2016.

69 Wussin cuts the role of Lentulo whereas Peruzzi shortens the text considerably. Peruzzi points to the Viennese origin in his dedication claiming that the opera had been given “on the stage of the Istro” (“ sopra le Scene dell’Istro”), i.e. the Danube. In *Corago*, the Milanese premiere is attributed to Conti as well, but his name is not mentioned in the libretto. This attribution, however, must be questioned because it seems rather unlikely that a composer employed at the imperial court may have written an opera dedicated to Philipp V of Bourbon, the opponent of the Habsburg emperor in the struggle over the Spanish crown during the War of the Spanish Succession.

70 I would like to thank Jana Spáčilová for sharing with me a copy of the Prague *Siface*. The Frankfurt *Siface* is preserved in D-F, Mus W 330.

71 The influence of singers on the choice of opera scores was not unusual as Senesino’s example shows, cf. Bucciarelli, 2017.
Venice 1714).\textsuperscript{72} Except for one aria (coming from the opera’s premiere, Venice 1713) there are no changes. One opera contains substitute arias from the troupe’s composer Giuseppe Antonio Paganelli (Giovanni Porta’s \textit{Amore e Fortuna}, Augsburg 1733, an opera from 1725 or 1727).\textsuperscript{73} Scores are continuously modified like Porta’s \textit{Apollo in Tempe}, performed in Darmstadt for the birthday of Landgrave Ernst Ludwig of Hesse-Darmstadt, most probably in 1731 when the troupe was in nearby Frankfurt, and different from a score preserved in Dresden.\textsuperscript{74} ‘Real’ pasticcios were part of the repertoire too like \textit{Argippo} (probably Frankfurt 1731, maybe based on Vivaldi’s opera, Prague 1730, and, hence, maybe coming from the Denzio troupe) or \textit{Il Siroe} (Verona 1744).\textsuperscript{75} Rather ‘new’ operas from current opera production are only rarely found such as Antonio Cortona’s \textit{Amor indovino} (Venice 1726 – Brussels 1727), Tomaso Albinoni’s \textit{L’incostanza schernita} (Venice 1727 – Frankfurt 1731) or (probably) Vivaldi’s \textit{Argippo} (Prague 1730 – Frankfurt 1731), already mentioned. Representative of the upcoming ‘Neapolitan style’ are barely present in Peruzzi’s repertoire (the mentioned Sarro opera). Thus, with his new business model Peruzzi not only gave the prelude for the wanderings of opera troupes in his aftermath, but set also the standard for the musical shape of the operas presented. This standard was, however, not different from common opera practice in Italy, a practice that cared for the current adaptation of the operatic repertoire to local tastes, singer’s abilities, modern styles, as well as specific musical conceptions and strategies.

\textsuperscript{72} On \textit{Orlando furioso} cf. Strohm, 2008b, vol. 1, pp. 122-141. Notwithstanding Vivaldi research the libretto is, however, not identical with the one Antonio Bioni set to music for Prague in 1724.

\textsuperscript{73} On Paganelli cf. SL (Folker Göthel), 2004; Talbot; Schenk, 1928 (pp. 17ff., on Peruzzi in Augsburg pp. 170-176). Similar cases are Conti’s \textit{Alba Cornelia} (Wrocław 1726) with substitute arias by Daniel Gottlob Treu (Fedele) (US-Wc, ML48 [S2203]) and Tomaso Albinoni’s \textit{Didone abbandonata} (Wrocław 1726) with substitute arias by Antonio Bioni (US-Wc, ML48 [S90]); for both cf. Mattheson, 1740, p. 373ff.; Spáčilová, 2016.

\textsuperscript{74} Pegah, 2011. Peruzzi made a first attempt to perform operas in Frankfurt during the trade fairs (Easter and autumn fair) between January and June 1728, but his request was denied. In 1731 and 1732 he had contact with the Frankfurt city council (Pegah, 2011; Nagel, 1911, p. 71; three letters to Johann Friedrich von Uffenbach are preserved in D-Gs). In 1731, \textit{L’incostanza schernita} and in 1732, \textit{Siface re di Numidia} were performed in Frankfurt linking Peruzzi to the Thurn and Taxis family through the dedications “all’Altezza Serenissima di Madame la Principessa della Tour e Tassis nata Lobkowiz” and “A. S. Alt. Serma. Il Prencipe della Torre & Tassis”. These offer an explanation for the existence of an aria collection from \textit{Argippo} – probably performed in the same year 1731 – in the family’s library (D-Rtt, Prota 4). The music is written by the scribe who also wrote the music in scores where Peruzzi added the text (see n. 41 and Pegah, 2011).

\textsuperscript{75} Another performance of \textit{Argippo} took place at the Vienna Kärntnerthortheater in a shortened version in the same year 1730. On \textit{Argippo} cf. Pegah, 2011; Strohm, 2008a. In the libretto of \textit{Il Siroe} we can read (p. 6): “La Musica è una scelta fatta da’ più Virtuosi Maestri.”
## Appendix

*First overview of the repertoire of the Peruzzi troupe*[^76]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Composer/Title</th>
<th>Premiere</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>A. Bioni, <em>Orlando furioso</em></td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>CZ-Pu, 52 G 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>[G. Porta], <em>La costanza combattuta in amore</em></td>
<td>Venice 1716</td>
<td>PL-Wn, BN.XVIII.2.6288/ S.2.3453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>D.G. Treu (Fedele) <em>Astarto</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mattheson, 1740, pp. 374ff.; Spáčilová, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>[G.A. Ristori/A. Vivaldi], <em>Orlando furioso</em></td>
<td>Venice 1714</td>
<td>D-F, Sg Mansk Mus II 180/921; D-MHrm, T 37; NL-DHk, KW 312 L 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>[G. Porta], <em>La costanza combattuta in amore</em></td>
<td>Venice 1716</td>
<td>B-Bc, 22252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^76]: Based on Corago; Sartori, 1990-1994; Mattheson, 1740, pp. 374ff.; Spáčilová, 2016; Pegah, 2011; Strohm, 2008a; Liebrecht, 1923, pp. 151-156, and own research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Composer/Title</th>
<th>Premiere</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>D. Sarro, <em>Arsace</em></td>
<td>Naples 1718</td>
<td>B-Bc, 22253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with some changes, cuts and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many substitute arias; Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dotti (Statira/Rosmiri) sang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also in the premiere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>[C.F. Pollarolo], <em>Faramondo</em></td>
<td>Venice 1698</td>
<td>B-Bc, 22254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peruzzi’s version seems to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>follow A. Zeno’s original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>libretto first set to music by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pollarolo rather closely with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>only few substituted arias and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changes; previous revivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Pratolino 1699, Verona 1704,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milan 1705, Messina 1709,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna 1710, Genoa 1712,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naples 1719, Rome 1720) are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>much heavier changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>F.B. Conti, <em>Alba Cornelia</em></td>
<td>Vienna 1714</td>
<td>B-Br, IV 16.603 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many text cuts and substituted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>arias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also performed in 1726 by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ludwig Wussin, Peruzzi’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>successor in Wrocław, with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lentulo’s role cut and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>substitute arias by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.G. Treu (Fedele)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maybe both impresarios used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the same score for their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adaptations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>schernita*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many arias exchanged in</td>
<td></td>
<td>D-MZp according</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comparison to the premiere;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the aria texts in the revival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna 1728 are sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identical; this and the revival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fano 1731 are certainly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>connected to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giovanna Gasparini singing in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice and Bologna and Paola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corvi (la Morotti) singing in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna and Fano, but it is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>known if one of these singers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was in the Peruzzi troupe later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Composer/Title</td>
<td>Premiere</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Frankfurt?</td>
<td>Argippo, pasticcio, probably based on A. Vivaldi’s opera</td>
<td>Prague 1730</td>
<td>score: D-Ds, aria collection: D-Rtt (see Sources); PEGAH, 2011; STROHM, 2008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Darmstadt?</td>
<td>G. Porta, Apollo in Tempe in comparison to the earlier version the score in D-Ds contains three substitute arias, a modified quartet and a slightly different end</td>
<td>Venice 1712</td>
<td>score: D-Ds, earlier version: D-DI (see Sources); PEGAH, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>G. Nelvi, Siface re di Numidia text almost identical to the version Prague 1729 (N. Porpora) which is distinguished by the addition of the comic role of Mustafo because of the rather identical Prague version ascribed to Porpora it is not clear which role the obscure Nelvi played, whether he composed the entire opera or only the new aria for Mustafo and some other arias</td>
<td>Prague 1729</td>
<td>D-F, Mus W 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732?</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>[G. Porta], La sorte nemica (= Amore e fortuna) produced by Peruzzi’s singers after he had left the troupe, probably because of financial troubles text almost identical with Augsburg production</td>
<td>Naples 1725</td>
<td>D-F, Mus W 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>G. Porta, Amore e fortuna with substitute arias by G.A. Paganelli and additional ones at the end of Act III recitative text almost identical with Frankfurt production, all but two arias changed, cut or added</td>
<td>Naples 1725</td>
<td>D-Mbs, 4 P.o.it.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Il Siroe pasticcio</td>
<td>I-Mb, Racc. dramm.4525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[Argippo]; score: D-Ds, Mus.ms.245, online: http://tudigit.ulb.tu-darmstadt.de/show/ Mus-Ms-245, 03.02.2020; aria collection: D-Rtt, Prota 4.
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Id., Alba Cornelia, Dramma per musica, da rappresentarsi nel Gran Teatro di Brusselle nel carnevale dell’anno 1728. Per commando di S.A.S. Maria Elisabetta Lucia, Arciduchessa d’Austria, Governatrice de’ Paesi-bassi Austriaci, Brussels [1728]; libretto: B-Br, IV 16.603 A.


Fabris, Jacopo, Instruction in der theatralischen Architectur und Mechanique, ed. by Torben Krogh, Copenhagen 1930.
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Hofbücher; D-Dla, 10006 Hofmarschallamt, K 2, Nr. 4, 5, 6.

Ledgers of princess Maria Josepha’s household (1721 and 1722); D-Dla, 10026 Geheimes Kabinett, Loc. 364/3 and Loc. 364/4.

Letter by Ernst Gottlob Siegfried to the King/Elector from 10 September 1722; contract with Peruzzi from May 1722; D-LEsa, Tit. XXIV A Nr. 7a, fols. 98r-105v.

Mattheson, Johann, Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte, woran der tüchtigsten Capellmeister, Componisten, Musikgelehrten, Tonkünstler etc. Leben, Werke, Verdienste etc. erscheinen sollen. Zum fernern Ausbau angegeben […], Hamburg 1740.


Orlando furioso, dramma per musica, da rappresentarsi nel Gran Teatro di Bruselles, il maggio dell’anno 1727. Consegroat a S. A. S. Maria Elisabetta Luccia, Arciduchessa d’Austria, Governatrice degli Paesi-bassi Austriaci, Brussels [1727]; libretto: D-F, Sg Mansk Mus II 180/921, online: http://publikationen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/front-door/index/index/docId/10613, 03.02.2020; D-MHrm, T 37; NL-DHk, KW 312 L 108, online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0031921, 03.02.2020.


[Id.], Faramondo, drama per musica, da rappresentarsi nel Gran Teatro di Brusselle, per la festa del glorioso nome di S. C. C. M. gli 4. novembre 1727. Per comando di S. A. S. Maria Elisabetta Luccia, Arciduchessa d’ Austria, Governatrice de’ Paesi-bassi Austriaci, Brussels [1727]; libretto: B-Be, 22254.


[Id.], Apollo in Tempe; score: D-Ds, Mus.ms.1174, online: http://tudigit.ulb.tu-darmstadt.de/show/Mus-Ms-1174, 03.02.2020; D-DI, Mus.2444-L-1, online: https://digital.slub-dresden.de/werkansicht/dlf/113128/1/0/, 03.02.2020.
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[Id.], La costanza combattuta in amore, dramma per musica, da rappresentarsi in occasione del felicissimo compleanus di Sua M. C. C. Imperatrice Regnante, nel giorno del 28. Agosto 1727. Per comando di Su[a] A. S. Maria Elisabetta Lucia, Arciduchessa d’Austria, Governatrice degli Paesi-bassi Austriaci, Brussels [1727]; libretto: B-Be, 22252.

[Id.], La sorte nemica drama, da rappresentarsi in musica nel Teatro di Francofort consacrata &c. all’ Nobilissimo Senato./Das widrige Schicksahl in einem Sing-spiele auf dem Franckfurtischen Schau=Platze/ mit unterthäniger Zuschrifft an ei- nen Hoch=Edlen, Hochweisen und Hochgebiethenden Rath daselbsten auffgeführt, [Frankfurt 1732?], D-F, Mus W 329.


RISTORI, GIOVANNI ALBERTO/BRACCIOLI, GRAZIO, Orlando furioso. Dramma per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di S. Angelo l’autunno del 1713. […] Conseguito all’Il-lustrißimo Signore il Sig. Marchese Scipione del Sale, Venice 1713; libretto: several copies, online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001282, 03.02.2020.

ID./ANTONIO VIVALDI/BRACCIOLI, GRAZIO, Orlando furioso. Dramma per musica da rappresentarsi la seconda volta nel Teatro di S. Angelo l’autunno del 1714. […] Conseguito alli Illustrissimi Sig. li Sig. Angelo ed’Annibale Marsiglj Rossi, Venice 1714; libretto: several copies, online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001299, 03.02.2020.
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Italian operisti, Repertoire and the *aria di baule*

Insights from the Pirker Correspondence

Daniel Brandenburg

Only relatively recently did scholarship begin to understand the variability of the musical content of 18th-century Italian opera, an understanding which emerged in opposition to inherited notions of a singular work set as fixed and final by the composer and distributed as such. This variability puts into perspective the term “pasticcio opera” already discussed in the 1970s, which, against the backdrop of the progress in research just alluded to, appears like a rather fuzzy term, hard to define with clarity. Engaged with the period’s singers and their creative influence on the processes of making and adapting operatic works has further contributed to a change in perspective. If the participatory aspect is no longer regarded as a form of rebellion against a composer’s supposed intention, but as a foundational element of practice, this relativizes categories such as those of a composer’s singular authorship, of an “original version” set in stone by the ‘premiere’ (in German, the *Uraufführung*). Furthermore, close engagement with the sources of frequently performed works from the period points to their modification from performance series to performance series, so that the commonly practiced principle of basing critical academic editions on the score of a first performance has come to seem problematic. The notion of there being an ‘Ur-Version’ created by the composer that then undergoes a ‘process of decay’ marked by interpolations and other interventions does not do justice to 18th-century thought. What was to be performed was determined by success, by its suitability for the singers, and by the level of the audience’s enjoyment. The composer’s intention was secondary.

In what follows, there will first be some observations about the dissemination paths and the related variability of Italian opera around the mid-18th century, and, subsequently, the focus will be placed on the phenomenon of the *aria di baule* from the perspective

2 Feder, 1987, p. 156.
of the exchange of letters between the operisti Franz and Marianne Pirker, which has been the subject of a research project conducted by the author of this article at Salzburg University.3

Due to the flexible day-to-day mechanisms and practices of the opera, it seems unlikely that it will ever be possible to analyze exhaustively the questions of who among those involved in opera (operisti), and under which institutional circumstances, affected the shape of an opera. Nevertheless, case studies can exemplify a range of possibilities. The fact that the singers’ mobility significantly impacted a work’s score and realization in performance is undisputed. For the burgeoning, innovative opera buffa of the late 1730s, the singers – carrying and disseminating scores and initiating performances – were of great importance. Singers such as Francesco Baglioni took operatic works that supplied them with successful parts from Rome to northern Italy, thus popularizing the genre.4 It was taken for granted that the text of a particular work would be adapted to accommodate both the performance location and the participants. Even traveling ensembles of a relatively stable make-up would still make adjustments, and would do so irrespective of whether the cast of singers changed or remained constant.5 By contrast, in the second half of the century (from c. 1760), we can observe in opera buffa an increased circulation of scores not directly tied to particular persons or casting constellations in spite of the interpreters’ continued mobility. A plausible pattern for this form of distribution might be the following: an opera buffa is to be performed in City A, so the impresario obtains a version of the work’s score that is then produced and performed in accord with the singers contracted as well as with the aesthetic expectations of the given city (which may have also involved, for example, legal considerations, censorship, and so on). In the performance version thus established, the work’s score subsequently travels on in order to be staged anew in City B with different artists and in an altered form.6

We can see in this model a network taking effect without which the opera business in this period would be unthinkable: that of the operisti. The singers in particular played an important role, their mobility giving the network an extensive reach. Its influence was heightened by contact with other networks such as diplomatic ones, as well as by the fact that it comprehended, across genres, the opera business for both opera seria and opera buffa. In spite of some uncertainties presented by the period’s communication and transport routes (it took days for mail to be delivered by coach or, possibly, boat), these channels functioned very well even across larger distances and assisted the distribution of information as well as of musical material and librettos across the whole of Europe. In their trunks (“bauli”), singers carried both arias and textbooks (one can hence also speak of ‘libretti di baule’) as these could serve as proof of their “meriti”, of their artistic merit, and were hence of great importance in building up renown – in turn determining one’s

3 *Italian Operisti as Cultural Network: Insights and Contexts of the Pirker Correspondence* (Universität Salzburg, 2015-2018).

4 Mackenzie, 1993, pp. 256-296.

5 Brandenburg, 2017, pp. 21-23.

6 Ibid., pp. 23-26.
remuneration. Complete opera scores were and did not normally form part of the singers’ ‘standard luggage’. In order to acquire a score, a singer had to have it copied, and the cost of copying was prohibitive. Nevertheless, it was customary – not only in opera buffa, but also in opera seria – for soloist singers to actively support a piece being adopted from one stage to another. For instance, documents show how the castrato Giovanni Carestini argued for bringing Christoph Willibald Gluck’s 1742/43 opera Demofoonte from Milan to Padua’s Teatro degli Obizzi, in this case, however, to no avail.

The wide dissemination of printed librettos that resulted from the communication routes sketched can especially assist us in following, at least by means of a comparative view from the outside, the changes a work underwent when staged anew. The broad-ranging study of the text and music used in different performance versions allows us to trace the trajectories of individual arias from one work to the next, from one performance to the next, and allows us to link them, where applicable, to particular singers. In this regard, however, we can only consider the result, as the processes – everyday working practices – usually remain hidden due to the lack of personal written statements on the part of those involved.

It is for this reason that the exchange of letters between the married musicians Franz and Marianne Pirker is so illuminating. Around the mid-18th century, both worked in Italian opera – Franz as violinist and arranger, Marianne as singer – and belonged for several opera seasons to the troupe of the Venetian impresario Pietro Mingotti. The exchange of letters stems from a temporary geographical separation of the couple due to a failed scrittura in London between 1746-1748. As the impresario Charles Sackville Earl of Middlesex continued to owe the Pirkers their fee, in August 1748 Marianne initially returned alone to Pietro Mingotti’s troupe, Franz remaining in London in the hope of still being able to collect the outstanding payment.

From the point of Marianne’s departure to Franz’s arrival at Mingotti’s in Copenhagen near the end of 1749, an exchange of letters developed between husband and wife that not only gives us interesting insights into the daily life and intellectual world of 18th-century opera artists, but also conveys details of the artistic processes found in the professional world. Criteria for the selection of arias and ways of acquisition are repeatedly addressed by the couple. They also discuss the possible influence of third parties and unwelcome competition from colleagues. Such exchange of thoughts is prompted by how the Mingotti troupe carried – not least in the years 1748-1749 – a stock of operas that aimed to continuously realize the concept of the “new”. In this regard, generally speaking, it was the performance place or geographical space in which the production occurred, and hence ultimately the audience, that determined which music or combination of arias was “new”. Exactly when the music as such had been composed, whether much earlier or only recently, however, was only of limited importance. The surviving sources of the troupe’s repertoire from the given period are all, to a varying degree,
committed to this idea. Operatic works from only ‘one’ textual poet and ‘one’ composer were viable only under particular institutional circumstances, as one-off productions.

The Pirkers’ exchange of letters provides excellent insight into the question of how such continuous ‘innovation’ was realized. The following will aim to shed light on some striking examples.

In a letter from 11 September 1748, Marianne writes to her husband from Hamburg, informing him of the troupe’s schedule and regretting that she had not got in touch earlier with Mingotti, as this meant that she would not yet be included in the pasticcio Arsace but only in the second opera programmed, Johann Adolph Hasse’s La clemenza di Tito. The latter, however, the artist continues, was specially chosen by the impresario as she was to be given a notably fine part in the role of Sesto. Initially, however, she is concerned with the musical realization of her part (that of Asteria) in Bajazet, the final opera scheduled for Hamburg, and it is in this context that she first provides a view of her artistic decisions: her husband is to obtain for her the aria “Cara sposa, amato bene” from Handel’s opera Radamisto (I,4) in the version from 1720, i.e. from roughly 28 years earlier.

Most likely she had encountered the piece during her stay in London, and for this reason wanted to present it, slightly adapted, as a novelty: indeed, the piece appears in the libretto of Bajazet (Hamburg 1748) under the title of “Caro sposo, amato bene” (that is, with a male figure addressed). Two days later, on 13 September 1748, she continues her account engaging more closely with Hasse’s La clemenza di Tito: “[…] the first aria I will sing is ‘parto ma tu ben mio’ from the original, I don’t think it would be possible to find a more beautiful one, and because of the oboe it is impossi-

---

9 MüLLER vON Asov, 1917, Anhang II, pp. XLIII-CLXVII. The Operas Arsace and Bajazet are to be considered pasticcios, La clemenza di Tito was basically performed with Johann Adolph Hasse’s music (libretto by Metastasio). In the case of Artaserse the libretto was basically by Metastasio. Part of the music was composed by the troupe’s composer and orchestra leader Paolo Scalabrini. However, it cannot be excluded that arias by other composers were also inserted into this opera over time. Il Temistocle was presented with music by Filippo Finazzi and a libretto mainly by Metastasio.

10 See e.g. Christoph Willibald Gluck’s Opera La contesa dei numi performed 1749 by Mingotti’s ensemble in Copenhagen on the occasion of the birth of the Danish heir to the throne.

11 Letter no. 16: “die erste opera ist arsaces la quale parte fa haagher, la seconda ove reciterò io sarà la clemenza di tito, ove farò la parte di sesto, e questa è molto bella[,] scelta a posta acciò ch’io avessi una buona parte, o dio s’io avessi risposta al principio subito, addesso sressimo fuori dei guaj, perché tutti hanno avuto molti regali. […]” All the letters are cited as in the forthcoming edition of the correspondence. Publication is scheduled for 2021.

12 Letter no. 16: “onde vi prego di farmi subito copiare l’aria cara sposa amato bene perché mi dovrà servire nel altra opera […].” The opera she alludes to was Bajazet.

13 MüLLER vON Asov was not able to identify the provenance of this aria, see MüLLER vON Asov, 1917, Anhang II, p. LXX.
ble, there are none here, and in Copenhagen it is even worse with wind instruments.”

Which “original” Marianne is referring to remains unclear as there are various versions of the opera by Hasse himself, although not all are extant. On 19 September 1748, her husband supports her judgement, describing the part of Sesto as “incomparable” and cautioning that the part’s arias could not be easily substituted. This may be read as advice against the wish to replace the arias and as a prompt for her to resist the possible exertion of influence from third parties: “Be resolute in the rehearsals, make your weight felt a little, make your thoughts known to Monsieur Gluck […], he is sure to bring the orchestra to reason after all.”

More generally, Kapellmeister Gluck, responsible for the troupe’s arrangements, seems to have interfered with musical concerns in manifold ways. On 11 October of the same year, Marianne reports that the “parts” for Bajazet – in the sense of the material sheets used by the singers to study their individual sections – were now being written down, with her as Asteria being the prima donna and Teresa Pompeati the seconda donna. Even though the opera had already featured as a set component of the Mingotti repertoire, it seems that the adaptations were so far-reaching that it was necessary to produce new scores. It also seems as if the run-up had been conflictual, as the following remark may suggest: “Gluck and Pompeati are mortal enemies due to the selection of arias […].”

That the selection of arias should lead to dispute is based on the fact that for the soloists they carried importance beyond the individual performance. The already mentioned “meriti” played a decisive role in the operisti’s artistic thought as they formed an important component of the individual singer’s “symbolic capital”. This defined a singer’s position in the ensemble hierarchy, in the role hierarchy on stage, and ultimately their payment. Conversely, the part’s rank, as well as the number and choice of arias, confirmed a status already achieved, a status in turn subjected to constant competition by

---


15 See Mellace, 2016, pp. 226-228.


colleagues. The communication networks of the diplomatic world also played a role: the former British ambassador to Hamburg, Sir Cyrill Wych, for instance, personally esteemed some of Marianne’s competitors and had excellent contacts in the Hanseatic city. For this reason, she entreats her husband not to pass on her artistic reflections to the diplomat: “Don’t talk too much about the arias with Wych: he is a fool, it’ll come back here in writing from him and he has a very bad reputation.” In particular, Marianne feared the intrigues of the “fat pig” Giustina Turcotti, who was envious of her role as Asteria (the prima donna in Bajazet). On 25 October 1748, she writes: “On Monday, the new opera, the Bajazet; God help me, for the devil will rage in the fat pig.”

Which arias Marianne herself chose for Bajazet we only learn in relation to the programming for Copenhagen in winter 1748/49. In this context, we can see the manifold points of origin the pieces could take. On 26 November 1748, she tells her husband that she would be singing the arias “Voi che sciolto il piede avete”, “La bella Irene”, “Leon cacciato in selva” and “Cara sposa amato bene”. The first of these is from Baldassare Galuppi’s Enrico (libretto by Francesco Vanneschi, London 1743), the second from Andrea Bernasconi’s Il Bajazet (libretto by Agostino Piovene, Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo, Venice 1742), the third from Galuppi’s Scipione in Cartagine (libretto by Vanneschi, London 1743) and the fourth from Handel’s Radamisto. In the case of the first two, she justifies her selection by pointing out that the pieces had already been interpreted by her colleague Domenica Casarini. In the case of the aria from Bajazet, however, Marianne emphasizes that she wanted to sing the version “dell’originale”, in this case from Bernasconi’s scoring, which hence may also have provided the framework of the version played by Mingotti’s company. Marianne explicitly asks her husband to send her the third aria, “Leon cacciato in selva”. None of these arias, then, corresponds to the

---

18 “Symbolic capital” is a term created by Pierre Bourdieu and recently used in this context by Michael Walter. See Walter, 2016, pp. 283-288.


20 Letter no. 53, 15 October 1748: “nun habe ich den part von der asteria in bajazet, und die dike sau bleibt auß, du kanst dir den lerm vorstell[en], mir ist gar nicht wohl dabey, gott wird mir aber helfen, [...].”

21 Letter no. 60: “montag ist die neue der bajazet gott helf mir, denn die dike sau wird des teufels.”

22 This opera seems to be a pasticcio with music by Baldassare Galuppi and others, performed in London in 1742. The aria “Leon cacciato in selva” concludes Act I of this opera and is sung by the character Arsinoe. A single manuscript of an aria with this textual incipit in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (https://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb41031018j, 03.02.2020) is attributed to Galuppi’s Adriano in Siria (Metastasio), even if this text originally is not included in Metastasio’s libretto.

23 Letter no. 77: “Die arien in bajazet sind. voi che sciolto il piede avete so die casarina gesung[en]; e piaceeva assai a hamburgo. 2: la bella Irene del original. 3. leon cacci[a]to in selva so die casarini gesung[en]. 4. cara sposa amato bene so du mir geschickt hast und
common cliché of the *aria di baule* (the “trunk aria”) in the sense of a successful piece tried and tested by the interpreter herself, to be freshly launched elsewhere. That said, the exchange of letters provides us with an example of this kind, too:

For Paolo Scalabrini’s opera *Artaserse*, scheduled for Copenhagen, Marianne planned to draw on at least one of her previous successes by replacing the aria “Per quel paterno ampiessio” with Domingo Terradella’s version, which she had previously performed in Venice in 1744. Her husband, however, recommended to her two other versions, by Hasse and Vinci, as Terradella’s version required two flutes and the situation with wind instruments in Copenhagen was difficult. Nevertheless, on 13 December 1748, he seems to have sent her a kind of *particell* or compressed score to be further prepared by the troupe’s copying department.

---

24 *Sartori, 1990, p. 315 (no. 2980).*

25 Letter no. 83, 10 December 1748: “Knowing that you are going to perform *Artaserse* I will send you the aria ‘Per quel paterno’ in portions and the first part with the next post. I suppose that you are asking for Terradella’s version, but I want to tell you that it does not have effect without the two flutes and that I like much more the versions of Sassone and Vinci. Nevertheless, you can rely on me and you will get it in time.” (“gleichwie ich dir die Aria *Per quel paterno* Stückweise, und also mit erster Post eines davon schicken werde, nachdem ich weiß, daß ihr den Artaserse machet. Ich Supponire, daß du die vom terradellas verlangest. Ich muß aber auch anbey melden, daß sie ohne 2 Flûte traversen nichts machet, und daß die von Sassone und Vinci mir besser gefallen. An mir solle es nicht mangeln, du solst sie a tempo haben.”).

26 Letter no. 84: “Now you are going to receive the aria and if it is possible, insert it, because in the meantime I have come to the conclusion that it will have a great effect. If you don’t have the flutes, even if you have to try hard to get them, let the part be played by two [solo] violins without *sordini*, the others playing with them. This solution may cause a great loss of effect but it will work. Please note particularly the last rest or fermata ‘Addio’. You can never take too long as you need to give enough time for removing the *sordini* and for the *lazzo* and action. This should be the best moment of the whole aria. In Italy we performed a transposed version, at the San Giovanni Grisostomo it was composed and sung in c minor. I don’t know in which tuning you are there and you may decide by yourself which register may be more comfortable to you, but this piece cannot be transposed to any other key because of the minor third. It [the manuscript] should be copied and I hope you may manage with the actual original. You absolutely have to copy it in seven parts and on the same number of staves: 1. Violino 1mo. 2. Violino 2do. 3. Flauto 1mo. 4. Flauto 2o. 5. Viola. 6. Voice. 7. Basso. The *Andante* may be written down on five staves, as usual, as the flutes don’t have to play anything in it. To save paper I patched the parts together, and where I patched the flutes together with the two violins you will easily understand me doing that in order to avoid two further staves, and where I wrote *tacet*, in the extended original there are to be signed the same number of bar rests on their staves. In the second part after the *Andante*
The musico-scenic effect thus formed an important criterion for the choice of arias, which had to have been tested either by the respective singer herself or by a successful colleague; further factors included an appropriate instrumental orchestration and, possibly, the composer’s reputation. For Hasse’s *La clemenza di Tito*, Marianne listened to her husband’s advice in taking on for Sesto’s part all arias as originally intended by the score Mingotti had to hand. This was possible as the impresario must doubtlessly have had at his disposal a kind of library of complete original scores that could provide him

32 bars are the same as at the beginning and therefore it was superfluous to write them down again, specially sending it by mail. I only wrote down the first bar passing over the remaining 31 up to the point where it continues in another way. In the new copy it should be written out. The *pianos* and *fortes* are indicated accurately and I recommend the same accuracy in copying them and in the performance. In case of any doubt Monsieur Gluck, to whom I send my greetings, will help you. But I hope it will not be necessary.” (“Nun schicke ich dir die Aria, und so du kannst, so giebe sie hinein, denn ich habe es seitdem selbst gefunden, daß sie einen grossen Effect thun müsse. Kanst du keine Flute traverse nicht haben, welches du dir ‘doch/ eüserst must angelegen seyn lassen, so lasse 2 Violin ohne Sordins, die übrigen alle mit Sordins davor spielen. Sie verliert freilich viel, allein sie wird gleichwohl thun. Ich recomandire den allerlezten pausen od[er] fermata Addio. Du kannst sie niemahls zu lang aushalt[en], sowohl der Zeit die Sordins wegzunemen, als des Lazzo und Action wegen. Dieses muß das beste in der ganzen Aria thun. Wir haben sie in Italien so transponiren lassen, componirt und producir[en] ist sie a S[an] Gio[vanni] Gris[o][s]to aus den C[mol]. Ich weis nicht wie ihr dort stehet, und was dir für ein thon comoder falle, das muß du zusehen, aber sonst kan mans in keinen andern thon transponiren[en] wegen der terz minor. Es muß wohl abecopirt werden, und ich hoffe du wirst aus gegenwärtigen Original kommen. Du muß sie absolutè a 7 Stimmen und so viel Linien copiren lassen nemlich. 1. Viol[i]no 1mo. 2. V[iolin]o 2o. 3. Flauto 1mo. 4. Fl[auto] 2o. 5. Viola. 6. Sing Stimme. 7. der Basso. Das Andante kann mit 5 Linien geschreiben werden, wie ordinair, weil die Flut traversiers nichts darin zu thun. Ich habe des Papiers wegen so geflikt, und gespary, und wo ich die Flauten zwischen den 2 Viol[i]nen hineingeflikt, wirst du leicht versteh[en], daß ich es die 2 Zeilen wegen zu ersparen so gemacht, und so oft ich tacet geschrieben, so macht man ihnen im grossen Original so viele pausen als tacte in ihren Linien. Im anderten Theil nach dem Andante sind 32 tacte accurat wie im Anfang, derowegen wäre es überflüssig gewest solche 2 mahl, in specie auf der Post, zu schreiben, derohalben habe ich nur den ersten tact gesetzt ‘die übrige 31 tacte ausgelassen/ und so dann wo es anfängt anders zu gehen. Im Original muß es ganz ausgeschrieben werden. Die Piano und forte habe ich accurat ausgesetz, diese recomandire ich gleichfalls im copiren, und in der Production. sollst du in etwas anstehen, so wird dir Monsieur Gluck, dem ich mich empfehle, schon helfen, ich hoffe aber, daß es nicht nöthig seyn solle.”

Two of the arias chosen had been successfully performed, as mentioned above, by Domenica Casarini.
with material for fresh arrangements and for the substitution of arias as well.\textsuperscript{28} It must have consisted of mostly hand-written materials as, due to the Italian practice of constant re-working, operas did not appear in print. Nevertheless, neither Mingotti nor Marianne could escape the gains of industrialisation creeping in, namely, the advantages of printed scores. Both Marianne’s personal store of arias, which she carried in her trunk, and the impresario’s library featured the aria collections published by London-based publisher Walsh.

In October 1748 Marianne had already urgently commissioned her husband with obtaining for Mingotti “five or six printed books of arias”,\textsuperscript{29} and in early June 1749, Franz comes back to the topic of musical prints, asking his wife which printed operas (“opere stampate”) she already owned. This was due to the occasion of the London-based publisher Walsh issuing five collected volumes under the title of \textit{Delizie dell’opere} (Figure 1), with – as Franz puts it – “beautiful arias by Galuppi and others”.\textsuperscript{30} A few weeks later, on the 19\textsuperscript{th} of the same month, the reader can catch a glimpse of Marianne’s collection, as she reports that she is in possession of printed aria collections of Terradella’s \textit{Mitridade}, Gluck’s \textit{Artamene}, Domenico Paradis’ \textit{Fetonte} and \textit{Bellerofonte}, and Handel’s \textit{Alessandro}.\textsuperscript{31} Franz subsequently obtains for her and Mingotti, respectively, the desired materials, posting them to Dresden for the impresario and to Stuttgart for Marianne, where she was trying to find employment at court. In a letter from 6 September 1749, Franz justifies his selection for Marianne as follows: “You will probably criticize me for the music selected, but take into consideration what you can make use of for the theater in Stuttgart. I have intentionally chosen the operas by Galuppi and others who are not widespread in Italy and who are hence, in a certain way, exclusive rarities.”\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} Reinhard Strohm supposes that there should have existed such a library of the troupe, see \textsc{Strohm}, 2005, p. 40; \textsc{Strohm}, 2004.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Letter no. 60, 25 October 1748: “Signor Mingotti läst dich schönstens bitt[en] du möchtest ihm 5: oder 6: gedruckte Bücher von Arien schick[en], komst du so bringe sie gleich mit, wo nicht so schicke sie unverzüglich hieher \textit{an Hamburg} […].”
\item \textsuperscript{30} Letter no. 151, 6 June 1749: “Scrivetemi ancora, che opere Stampate che tenite? perché qui il Walsh [h]a stampato 5 Volumi, ciascheduno per un guiné le chiama delicie dell’Ope pp e ci sono arie bellissime del Galuppi ed altri, che pochi [h]anno, e si puol avere a parte senza dover prendere tutti i volumi. Io ne porterò qualcheuno.”
\item \textsuperscript{31} Letter no. 169: “Le opere stamp[ate] che tengo sono due esemplare del Midridate di Terra-d[ellas] l’artamene di Kluk. il phaeton, e bellerephonte e l’allessandro del hendel, ma giusto l’aria il cor mio non v’è perché ho due esemplari con l’istesse arie, […].”
\item \textsuperscript{32} Letter no. 217: “Mi rimprovarete forse la Musica ma considerate un poco quanto avete bisogno per il Teatro e per Stoutgart, ed io ho scelto apposta le opere di Galuppi ed altri, che l’Arie non sono divulgate in Italia, e così in una certa maniera rare.”
\end{itemize}
Figure 1: Delizie dell’opere, vol. 5, London c. 1748, title page and index.
### LE DELIZIE DELL' OPERE

**VOL. V.**

**A Table of the Songs contain'd in this Book.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Opera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ah! mi dividano...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amo soffrìo e peno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amor per me non senti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tuo placere Yagnella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ah! feamante...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caius animans gemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con lorchi folle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con volo il mio mar...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi puo trevar...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi Vogere non fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi macque alle pene...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cara trai dolci ampefulli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Che ghivello che l'ipne...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi non fa che fis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D'un genio che maccerenda...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dico che fida fei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Di fedelta de ameni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D'un genio che maccerenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E la mater istud...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facce ardeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facce portem Cristi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figlio sfolta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freggi dagli occhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felici belpo che in liberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Inflammatiss et accensus...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No sperar che cani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nd, etul che prova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non fo fe fugnano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Oh quan tristis...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oh dei qualumi sorprendi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ombra cara...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Propeccosi fue gentis...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per quel paterno...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perdona amato bene...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per mai più non amat...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per quell istesso...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paffi di belle...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Que me rebat...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quas ett homo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quando corpus morisist...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quando ti acquisto...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quel core all arci...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Kallembro un pazzaggiere...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Stabat mater...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanea mater istud...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se mira qual volto...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se d'un amor tiranno...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentio si dire dal cero...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se vi lascio o luci...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se reto fullido...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se spuntan veze...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se piangote o luci...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se perde l'uggiando...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spera il pistor...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se spunta il giglio...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tu vuo chio viva...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talor se il vento...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torna innocente...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trofe vittime...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vidi furor dulcem...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voi non la pese quanto...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vorei spigar Tafano...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vorei spigar l'uffanno...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volgi a me gli affetti...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vorei da lacci...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un solo amante...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the examples drawn from the exchange of letters discussed, the form of the modification or adaptation of an operatic score depended on a variety of parameters: the novelty of the music to be performed, personal vocal skills, aesthetic preferences and artistic ambitions of the singers planning their career in a context of hard competition, the wishes and ambitions of impresarios and composers, the parameters of production, such as the musical instruments available in the orchestra, etc. The selection and acquisition of arias was subject to manifold institutional circumstances which – as we can surmise from the exchange of letters – far exceeded the practice of the *aria di baule*, of the solo number carried in the trunk from place to place. While this makes research into the phenomenon difficult, it can also serve as proof of the liveliness of the operatic world of the period, its capacity for continuously offering fresh materials to audiences, of stirring interest and hence of realizing a successful formula making Italian opera, in terms of the cultural world, the glue binding Europe together.
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Dido Abandoned?
Shifts of Focus and Artistic Choices
in *Didone* Pasticcios of the Mingotti Opera Troupe

**Berthold Over**

In late 1747 the Mingotti opera troupe arrived for the first time at Copenhagen, a court that would remain at the center of its activity for several years.\(^1\) Coming from Hamburg, where the troupe had performed operas during November, the repertoire the Mingottis put on stage was mostly well known by the troupe, almost no novelty was presented:

*Farnace, re di Ponto*
Previous performances: Hamburg (Nov. 1747), Leipzig (Michaelmas fair 1747), Graz (spring 1737)

*Didone*
Previous performances: Hamburg (Nov. 1747), Leipzig (Michaelmas fair 1747), Dresden (June 1747), Hamburg (Oct. 1746), Hamburg (Aug. 1744), Ljubljana/Laibach (carnival 1742), Graz (carnival 1737), Brno/Brünn (Dec. 1734), Linz (1731-1734)?

*Venceslao*
Previous performances: Leipzig (Michaelmas fair 1747), Hamburg (Aug. 1744), Hamburg (autumn 1743), Linz (summer 1743), Graz (spring 1737)

*La furba e lo sciocco*
Previous performances: Hamburg (carnival 1747)

---


Il Tabarano
Previous performances: Dresden (summer 1747), Dresden (summer 1746), Hamburg (Jan. 1745), Graz (carnival 1738), Ljubljana (carnival 1733)\(^2\)

To these performances must also be added Merope, given in February 1748. The staging of Merope is not documented by librettos, but is reported in the Hamburg newspaper Hamburger Relations-Courier.\(^3\)

Merope
Previous performances: Dresden (summer 1747), Leipzig (spring 1747), Hamburg (carnival 1747)

The only relatively new pieces with few performances before the Copenhagen productions were the intermezzi La furba e lo sciocco which had been performed once, Merope, a new production from the previous year 1747, and, maybe, Farnace which was revived in Leipzig after a ten-year break, probably in a new musical version.

---

\(^2\) Dates and performance places after Theobald, 2015. His study is not only based on existing librettos but also on secondary literature. He does not mention the Linz performance of Didone in 1731-1734.

\(^3\) Copenhagen, 13 February 1748: “Yesterday, Her Royal Majesty the queen, together with Princess Louise, Royal Highness, attended the opera Merope in highest person.” (“Gestern haben Ihro Königl. Maj. die Königin benebst der Prinzessin Louise Königl. Hoheit der Opera Merope in höchster Person mit beygewohnet.”) Hamburger Relations-Courier, no. 28, 19 February 1748. Also, in Hamburger unpartheyischer Correspondent (no. 202, 23 December 1747) there may be a reference to Merope: Copenhagen, 19 December 1747: “Yesterday, the high birthday of Her Majesty the reigning queen was celebrated at court with much splendor. […] At five o’clock in the evening Their Majesties the king and the queen as well as Princess Louise, Royal Highnesses, betook to Charlottenburg and saw the opera Nero be performed with much pleasure and applause. The royal household servants up to the gentlemen Judicial Counsellors included were permitted to see it.” (“Gestern wurde der hohe Geburtstag Ihro Majestät der regierenden Königin mit vieler Pracht bey Hofe gefeiert. […] Des Abends um 5 Uhr begaben sich Ihro Majestäten der König und die Königin, imgleichen der Prinzessin Louise Königl. Hoheiten nach Charlottenburg, und sahen die Opera Nero mit vielem Vergnügen und Beyfall aufführen. Die Königl. Hofbediente bis auf die Herren Justizräthe, mit eingeschlossen, haben die Erlaubniß gehabt, selbige mit anzusehen.”) Nero could be a mis-spelling for Merope since an opera with this title is not known from the Mingotti repertoire. But it is documented that Farnace has been performed at the queen’s birthday, cf. Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. 79f.; Mackeprang, 1949-52, pp. 6-8. Maybe Merope was originally planned for performance as birthday opera or shortly thereafter and titles have been confused. The Copenhagen performance of Merope is not mentioned in Theobald, 2015, and Müller von Asow, 1917.
Dido Abandoned?

*Didone* has a most impressive performance history and it must have been a backbone of the troupe’s repertoire. First performed in Brno in 1734 by Mingotti, it was originally in the repertoire of Antonio Denzio’s opera troupe in Prague where it had been given in 1731. Another performance took place in Linz between these two years, but it remains unclear whether it was staged by Denzio or by Mingotti. The libretto bears similarities to both the 1731 and 1734 productions. Since the networking of the troupes and the exchange of scores seem to have been very common, as Jana Spáčilová has already recognized, it is probable, however, that Denzio’s *Didone* version may have been derived from the one given in late 1726 in Wrocław/Breslau. This production was given by the troupe Antonio Maria Peruzzi had brought to the city which, at this time, was led by Ludwig Wussin. The ties between Denzio and Peruzzi were relatively close because they were related – Peruzzi’s father Giovanni Maria was almost certainly the brother of Denzio’s mother Teresa Peruzzi – and they had collaborated in Prague. After some financial troubles they were still on good terms. Also, the Mingottis were part of this network; in 1732 six singers from the Denzio troupe joined their business in Brno, maybe taking over some musical material.

The aim of the present study is to have a closer look at the different *Didone* versions the Mingotti troupe performed over the years with regard to the recitatives and the arias. The focus will be on the modifications which may uncover the daily ‘routine’ of opera troupes, their strategies, aesthetics, the influence of the agents involved or the transfer of musical material. The basic questions are: Were different operas performed or just one that was modified constantly? How were successful operas created? How were choices made for substitute arias and which aesthetical concept is behind them? Particular attention will be given to the productions done around the existing score in Hamburg in 1744 and 1746, as well as in Copenhagen in 1748.

**Recitative structure and authorship**

For most of the performances the music is not extant. But, because sometimes a composer is named in the textbooks and because in some librettos, we can find handwritten composer names besides the aria texts, a partial reconstruction is possible. Moreover, there is a score of the Hamburg 1744 production of *Didone* that is preserved in Modena and has been de-

---

4 According to *Bibliographia dramatica* (pp. 67-69) this performance took place “c. 1732”.
5 Spáčilová, 2018, pp. 228, 244.
6 Mattheson, 1740, p. 375.
7 After a rupture due to unfulfilled financial obligations in 1725, Giovanni Maria functioned as godfather for Antonio Denzio’s child Giustiniana Vittoria in 1730, lent money some years later and stayed with the Denzios in 1735 when he died. On Peruzzi and the relationship with the Denzios see Jonášová, 2008, pp. 83-88; Freeman, 1992a, p. 66; also the article by the author in the present volume, pp. 241-269.
scribed in detail for the first time by Reinhard Strohm. What we can say is that Peruzzi’s version from 1726 derived from Tomaso Albinoni’s score that was premiered in Venice at the Teatro San Cassian in 1725. In the Wrocław libretto that is rather close to Albinoni’s version the composer is mentioned (“The music is by Signore Tomaso Albinoni”; “La Musica è del Signore Tomaso Albinoni”) as well as substitution arias by Antonio Bioni. Albinoni is also the composer of the opera according to the librettos for Prague and Linz. In Brno the music is ascribed to Domenico Sarro who was the first to set Metastasio’s libretto to music for Naples in 1724 and revived his opera in Venice in 1730 with modifications.\(^9\) The Venice version is the most likely to have been used in Brno,\(^{11}\) but, no doubt, only partially, as we will see. The librettos for Graz and Ljubljana do not mention any composer. In Hamburg in 1744 and 1746 as well as in Copenhagen the music is ascribed to Paolo Scalabrini, the troupe’s composer at this time, “except some arias by different authors” (“a risserva di alcune Arie, di diversi Auttori”). For the Hamburg 1746 production composer names are quoted for the arias in a copy of the libretto preserved in Brussels.\(^{12}\) So at first glance it seems that different scores by Albinoni, Sarro and Scalabrini were produced by the Peruzzi, Denzio and Mingotti troupes and that they contain music by other composers.

But if we have a closer look at the recitatives and the changes made from performance to performance it becomes evident that recitative texts remain basically the same, regardless of which composer is named as the author of the piece. Doesn’t this point to the fact that the music of the recitatives must have been identical, especially in such cases where the text version deviates from the original librettos profoundly? Some examples (in comparison to Metastasio’s original from 1724): the Denzio and all Mingotti librettos begin with “Donna real; del re de mori in nome” a text that is completely different from the original one and replaces “No principessa, amico” (see Appendix 1). Moreover, Scenes 1 to 5 have been contracted. Text cuts are the same in the librettos, for example in I,3 of the Mingotti version. At the beginning of Act II, Scenes 1 to 4 of the original are cut. Also, the heavy text cuts in Act III are found in every Mingotti and the Denzio libretto. Minor text changes and additions like in II,1, are repeated through all the librettos. That the librettos are based on the Albinoni version is shown by texts that are not found in the version of the premiere, but in Albinoni’s only (cf., for example, the end of I,1, or II,5-6, or III,5 in the Mingotti version).\(^{13}\)

---


10 Score of the Venetian version: I-Nc, Rari 7.2.5.

11 Cf. the article by Jana Spáčilová in the present volume, p. 492; also Spáčilová, forthcoming 2021, pp. 73f.; Spáčilová, 2014. I would like to thank Jana Spáčilová for sharing her newest book with me.

12 B-Bc, 19903.

13 Most probably, Antonio Denzio was the arranger of the libretto whose task in the Denzio/Peruzzi business in Prague was to adjust the texts. Cf. Jonášová, 2013; Spáčilová, forthcoming 2021, p. 73; Freeman, 1992a, pp. 283f.
Thus, the text version of the recitatives is the same although reportedly the composer is Albinoni, Sarro or Scalabrini and in the cases of Albinoni and Sarro they definitely never composed it as evidenced by librettos and scores. Therefore, I presume that the troupe (i.e. Angelo and Pietro Mingotti) used the same recitatives for a long time with major or minor changes due to text arrangements, style, different singers and changed keys of the varying arias. In fact, the rather awkward tonal structure of the Hamburg score suggests that the arias were inserted in a stable recitative skeleton. There are many unusual chord progressions. Twelve normal ones (same key, major/minor mode, fourth/fifth, less often third) are faced by nine uncommon ones (see Appendix 2). Thus, it seems highly probable that the recitative structure remained the same since the 1730s and that arias were exchanged when necessary and wanted. The rather high percentage of uncommon progressions – in Catone, performed twice until 1744 (and four times between 1740 and 1747), there is only one \(^{14}\) may be explained by the rather long performance history of Didone that led to a high turnover of arias.

But, with respect to the recitatives, what do the composer names mean that are printed in the librettos? In the case of Albinoni, his name may in fact point to his authorship of the recitatives. Since the recitative structure remains the same it is not probable, however, that the recitatives were by Sarro, even if the 1734 libretto claims his authorship for the entire opera. Because of the stable recitative structure, it is also improbable that Scalabrini composed new music in 1744,\(^ {15}\) even if we speculate that he might have set to music the specific Didone text version of the opera troupe. In fact, in some instances, not only the inserted arias but also those written by him do not fit the preceding recitative: “Vivi superbem regna” is in B major, the preceding recitative ends in C major. Had Scalabrini written the recitatives himself the harmonic progression would be regular.\(^ {16}\) So, it could be that in the only preserved score we may not find any recitatives by Sarro or Scalabrini, but some music originally written by Albinoni.

Moreover, there is no doubt that the existing score is a copy of the Mingotti working score containing the basic recitative structure and the inserted arias. A clue for this assumption is the insertion of “Va crescendo il mio tormento” at the wrong place in the score (between III,3 and III,4 and not at the beginning of III,5). The cavatina may have been cancelled already in the Hamburg production of 1744 as it was in 1746 when the text was pasted-over in the libretto. This may have been the reason why the fascicle

\(^{14}\) I,7, Fulvio: “Mio cor, non sospirá”, E-B flat. Catone was performed in Graz (1740), Hamburg (1744), Dresden (1747) and Leipzig (1747); the score documenting the Hamburg production is preserved in I-MOe, Mus.F.1590.

\(^{15}\) Or even earlier as proposed by Kokole (2012, pp. 76f.).

\(^{16}\) If we assume that the Scalabrini arias of the 1746 production were also sung in 1744 – the texts are identical, but the composer is only mentioned in the 1746 libretto – progressions are in most cases unusual as well: “Non ha ragione ingrato” (B minor/major -A major), “Se resto sul lido” (G minor/major-F major), “Vedi nel mio perdono” (G minor/major-A major). Only “L’augelletto in lacci stretto” (B flat major-G major) and “Cadrà fra poco in cenere” have a normal progression (D minor/major-G minor).
containing the music was taken out from the scene, but left elsewhere in the score. The impression of a working score is strengthened by the fact that Selene’s part is written in two clefs: the recitatives in the alto and the arias in the soprano clef. Sometimes wrong clefs are written in the score: Iarba’s aria “Cadrà fra poco in cenere” (III,8), for example, is clearly written in pitches of the tenor clef, but preceded by a soprano clef, suggesting that the vocal part has been transposed but the clef was overlooked. The same applies to Osmida’s “Scherza il nocchier talora” (II,5) with pitches in the alto clef, but preceded by a soprano clef and Iarba’s recitative in II,11 with pitches in the tenor clef, but preceded by an alto clef. However, these inconsistencies as well as the unusual chord progressions must have been adjusted in the performance material: either recitatives were arranged to fit the arias and/or the voices or arias were transposed to fit the recitatives and/or the voices.

Because of the characteristic and relatively unchanged recitative version used over several years we can also definitely exclude the possibility that the Didone libretto Graz 1741 and the Didone score preserved in Pesaro, which have been linked to the Mingotti business, have anything to do with the troupe. They simply present another text version.

17 Similar working scores are found amongst material coming from other operas troupes. Cf. Pegah, 2011, p. 65 (Argippo, Peruzzi troupe); Spáčilová, 2018, p. 233 (Antigona, Burigotti troupe).

18 An example for an aria transposition may be “Quando freme altera l’onda” by Domingo Terradellas that appears in a transposed version in the Mingotti score (from D to C major) and so matches the preceding recitative. Cf. the D major version in Terradellas’ Merope score, P-Ln, C.I.C. n°116 (RISM entry).

19 On the Pesaro score (I-PESo, ms.2007) cf. Gialdroni, 1998, p. 457 (adopted by Strohm, 2004, p. 541); on the 1741 performance Theobald, 2015, p. 29; Strohm, 2004, p. 560; Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. 22, LXXXIV. The Graz libretto sometimes is qualified “lost”, but extant in A-Gl (C 15340) and D-B (Mus.Td 363, online: http://resolver.statbibliothek-berlin.de/SBB00009D5800000000, 03.02.2020). It is not signed by Angelo or Pietro Mingotti as usual, but by “the interested party” (“gli Interessati”). The copy preserved in A-Gl contains a second title page linking the opera to the Viennese Kärntnertortheater. This title page was pasted over with the last page of the dedication. The copy in D-B seems to contain this additional page too: it shines through the “Argomento”, but it is still stuck together. This evidence suggests that the libretto, originally printed for the Kärntnertortheater, was also used for a performance in Graz, most probably of the Kärntnertortheater’s troupe. For this purpose, a new title page and a dedication were printed and pasted over the former title. On Didone productions at the Kärntnertortheater in 1729 and 1740/41 cf. Sommer-Mathis/Zsovár, 2018. A similar case seems to be Aristeus in einer deutschen Opera vorgestellet […] Graz 1741, containing a second title page linking the libretto to a Kärntnertortheater production in the same year.

20 See Appendix 1.
Constant and varying arias

If we have a look at the arias, we notice that they often change, though a certain performing tradition can be perceived. Especially for the roles of Didone, Iarba and Enea, Metastasio’s original texts have been retained in almost every performance:

“Son regina e sono amante” (I,1, Didone)
“Fra lo splendor del trono” (I,3, Iarba)
“When saprai chi sono” (I,4, Enea)
“Non ha ragione, ingrato!” (I,9, Didone)
“Se resto sul lido” (I,10, Enea)
“Vedi nel mio perdono” (II,4 Enea)
“Chiamami pur così” (II,12, Iarba)
“Vivi superbo e regna” (III,1, Iarba)
“Va crescendo il mio tormento” (III,5, Didone)
“Cadrà fra poco in cenere” (III,8, Iarba)

It is very probable that the music of these texts changed (and, indeed, a big choice of arias was at the disposal of the singers given the numerous settings of Didone since Sarro’s from 1724), but their persistence shows that Metastasio’s emotional and affective conception of the protagonists Didone, her fugitive lover Enea and her antagonist Iarba present in their arias was perceived as rather consistent and convincing by the Mingottis. Another reason for their retention may have been that their performance was expected by the public because they were famous texts by Metastasio or indivisibly bound to a role: a Didone without “Son regina e sono amante” would not have been a Didone. For the secondary roles – Selene, Osmida and Araspe – arias were changed more often. They draw on Metastasio’s text only occasionally. This suggests also that to sing a Metastasio text seems to have been a prerogative of the primary singers. It points to the role hierarchy of 18th-century opera and, at the same time, to the high status and great renown of the famous author.

21 Tomaso Albinoni (Venice 1725), Nicola Porpora (Reggio 1725), Leonardo Vinci (Rome 1726), Domenico Sarro (Venice 1730, second version), Gaetano Maria Schiassi (Bologna 1735), Giovanni Battista Lampugnani (Padua 1739), Egidio Romoaldo Duni (Milan 1739), Rinaldo di Capua (Lisbon 1741), Andrea Bernasconi (Venice 1741), Baldassare Galuppi (Modena 1741), Johann Adolf Hasse (Dresden 1742) besides pasticcios (Rome 1732; George Frideric Handel, London 1737) and numerous performances whose composers are unknown.
The Hamburg and Copenhagen productions from 1744, 1746 and 1748
Musical choices, singer’s influences and professional networks

To have a closer look at aria substitutions and musical choices the performances in Hamburg (1744, 1746) and Copenhagen (1748) will be examined in detail. With regard to these productions the overview in Appendix 3 shows the music preserved. Since, as noted, several settings of the Didone libretto were available since its premiere in 1724 we must, however, use caution and cannot link any ascription in one source to other productions unconditionally.22 Only for arias that do not draw on Metastasio’s texts may an ascription be correct, but not necessarily so, because the text could also have been set to music by another composer (e.g. as a ‘baggage aria’ expressly composed for a singer)23 as by the one mentioned in a source.

As we can see, Copenhagen marks the return to the original Hamburg version that may have been considered economically safer, artistically more convincing and more apt for the singers than the other versions. Indeed, Giovanna della Stella who sang in the Hamburg production of 1744 and was engaged in the same year at the court of the Elector of Cologne, Clemens August of Bavaria,24 rejoined the troupe and came to Copenhagen to sing her role of Enea, whereas other singers changed. Moreover, the lack of experience with opera of the Copenhagen public may have influenced the return to the version of 1744. And Hamburg must have been a reference for the Danish taste since Danish aristocrats and merchants were often in the city which touched the Danish border in that time.25 There, they could have attended the opera. Among them was the royal prince who was responsible for the engagement of the troupe and who attended it in 1743.26

Let us have a closer look at the aria substitutions. The two librettos and the score of the 1744 production reveal that the exchange of arias seems to have been a common procedure to keep public interest high. Two texts pasted over in the Brussels libretto (“Bel labro lusinghiero”, “Quando freme altera l’onda”) show that the arias must have been replaced during the performances. Although no libretto with paste-overs exists

22 This procedure is used by Bärwald, 2016, in his study whose results must, therefore, be questioned (on Didone cf. vol. 2, pp. 450-454).
23 On this kind of arias cf. Freeman, 1992b.
24 In 1744, the Elector visited Hamburg (11-25 August), heard the Mingotti troupe and employed della Stella and Rosa Costa for his Bonn Hofkapelle. Between 1744 and 1746 the two singers were paid from the Hofkammer budget of the Bishopric of Münster where Clemens August was bishop since 1719. Cf. Riepe, 2006; Reincke, 1950; Beusker, 1978, pp. 28-30, 136, 173; also Over, 2016, p. 73.
25 Today’s Schleswig-Holstein was part of the Danish Kingdom; the city of Altona, now a district of Hamburg, was Danish too.
(any more) the exchange of two arias in the *Catone* score in comparison with the libretto points to a similar strategy that may have been a general one. It is not known how these substitution arias may have come into the possession of the impresario, the singers or other agents involved in the production.

More arias have been substituted in the 1746 version of the opera. As is known from other cases these aria substitutions seem to benefit mainly from two factors: the mobility of the singers and their professional network. Let us consider first the mobility aspect: almost the complete music for *Didone* was changed in the 1746 Hamburg version. Significantly, all the arias are by Giovanni Battista Lampugnani and taken from his *Didone abbandonata*, first performed in Padua in 1739. Only the final recitative with the famous death scene remains; as has been noted, the short arioso “Va crescendo il mio tormento” was cancelled. Apparently, the soprano Giustina Turcotti joined the troupe in 1746 who had sung Lampugnani’s *Didone* just a year before in Crema. She certainly took over her arias. Although it is not known if she sang Lampugnani’s original music or arias specifically composed for her the music may have been preserved. Lampugnani’s *Didone* was performed once again in Naples in 1753 and a score of the first two acts

27 On the same strategy in opera performances in Wrocław see the article by Jana Spáčilová in the present volume, pp. 492-494.

28 It is pasted over in the libretto (B-Bc, 19903).

29 According to Theobald, 2015, p. 48; the Hamburg librettos of this year mostly do not mention the singers. Turcotti appeared in carnival 1746 in Ferrara and could well have been in Hamburg in autumn. Apart from Giustina Turcotti (S) Theobald lists Francesco Arrigoni (T), Cecilia Belvederi, Rosalba Buini, Settimio Canini (T), Antonio Casati (castrato), Rosa Costa (S), Giacinta Forcellini (S), Mad. Keyser, Regina Mingotti (S), Antonio Pereni (T); in addition, Gaspera Beccheroni and Pellegrino Gaggiotti for the *intermezzi*.


31 Turcotti seems to have adopted a similar procedure in *Catone in Utica* given by the Mingotti troupe in Dresden in 1747. If we trust the handwritten ascriptions in the libretto preserved in US-Wc, ML50.2.C315 (they are clearly by a late 19th- or early 20th-century hand, but conform to Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. LXXVF., who based his observations on a libretto now apparently lost), she sang exclusively arias by Leonardo Vinci in whose setting she performed in Florence in 1729.

32 An interesting example for such an aria is another version of “Son regina e sono amante” which Leonardo Vinci composed expressly for Turcotti (“alla S: Giustina Turcotti 1729.”, “Del Sig:r Vinci”, GB-Lbl, Add.31605). In 1729 Turcotti sang *Didone abbandonata* in Lucca; Vinci wrote his *Didone abbandonata* in 1726 for Rome. Although the composer of the Lucca production is qualified as anonymous in Corago (cf. http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/000097555739, 03.02.2020; it is not listed in Sartori, 1990-1994), Vinci’s obvious involvement may point to the fact that his *Didone* was revived. However, if he is not the composer of the Lucca opera another setting may have been produced (at this time, apart from Vinci, Sarro, Albinoni and Porpora had set to music *Didone*) or a pasticcio with some new music written for the singers.
of this production is extant in Madrid. Since the singer of the title role, Caterina Visconti, was the same in both the Naples 1753 and Padua 1739 productions she may have transferred some of the music (maybe reworked) she had sung earlier at the opera’s première—despite the long lapse of time. A singer’s choice certainly is also the reason for inserting Lampugnani’s “Chiamami pur cosi” sung by Iarba, i.e. Settimio Canini, who appeared in the same role in the Didone production in Alessandria in 1742.

The effect of the network becomes apparent in the following example: Hasse’s “Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno” sung by Osmida is scored for bass, and a composition of Osmida’s second aria “Scherza il nocchier talora” by Scalabrini, equally for bass, has survived in the Royal Library in Copenhagen. One may suspect that the shift to a bass for Osmida may have occurred due to the presence of a bass singer in the troupe, but documentary evidence is lacking. It is however beyond doubt that the aria came to the troupe via Giuseppe Schuster, a bass singer in the Dresden Hofkapelle. Schuster sang with the troupe in the Saxon capital in summer 1746 where the Mingotti performed from June until September (he appeared in Argenide, Artaserse and La clemenza di Tito). Immediately thereafter, from September 1746 to February 1747, the troupe was in Hamburg. The aria “Tu mi scorgi al gran disegno”, taken from Hasse’s Didone abbandonata, was premiered by Schuster in Hubertusburg and Dresden in 1742/43. But since Schuster’s voice was a high one in the baritone register – “Tu mi scorgi” ranges from c to g’ – it also could have been sung by a tenor. Giuseppe Alberti, for example, had a voice ranging from B to b flat’. The other aria for Osmida, “Scherza il nocchier talora”, is ascribed to Scalabrini in the 1746 libretto. But on stylistic grounds and because of the lower tessitura (G–e’) the aria preserved in the Royal Library in Copenhagen may reflect a later version or reworking of the piece.

33 E-Mn, M.2369, M.2370.
36 DK-Kk, mu 7502.1831.
38 Handwritten singer names in the libretto copy preserved in Halle: Didone abbandonata [...], Dresden 1742; D-HAu, Q.289 (II), online: http://digitale.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/vd18/content/pageview/13134880, 03.02.2020; also in the score F-Pn, Rés.1351 (p. 72: “Sig. Schuster.”); further scores among others in: D-HAmi, 66; I-Vnm, Mss.It.CL.IV.266 (= 09837). See also SCHMIDT-HENSEL, 2009, vol. 2, pp. 587-618.
39 See his arias in the Mingotti scores of Didone abbandonata (Iarba) and Catone in Utica (Catone).
Shifts of focus in music and emotional content

It is an interesting question how aria substitutions affected the dramaturgy of the opera. If arias are identical in emotional content there is no alteration, but if they vary, they bear numerous implications. A shift of focus can be observed in the substitution of Metastasio’s original “Va lusingando amore” in the 1744 production, first by “Quando freme altera l’onda” by Domingo Terradellas from his *Merope* (Rome 1743) during the 1744 performances and then by “Io veggo [veggio] in lontananza” by Lampugnani in the 1746 production. In the preceding recitative of her solo scene Didone describes her love to Enea that persists even if he is angry with her. In “Va lusingando amore” she complains of the effects of love which apparently gives relief to her pains, but in fact only does so for a short while before the pains return. Thus, the aria presents her inner feelings. On the contrary, “Quando freme altera l’onda” is a virtuosic simile aria on the stormy sea that puts her feelings on a metaphorical level. The mariner fears to drown in the waves, but once the tempest has gone the waves take him to the shore, meaning in the case of Didone that her turmoil in love will turn out well. “Io veggo in lontananza” in turn is once again more connected to the action. It speaks of Didone’s hope for her love that may, however, delude her. Here too, she presents her inner feelings. In the two arias a basically fulfilled hope stands against deluded hope. But if we compare the music of “Quando freme altera l’onda” from the Mingotti score and “Io veggo in lontananza” from the Madrid score which may, as mentioned, retain some music of the 1739 production (most probably sung in Hamburg), the pieces are very similar (“Va lusingando amore” is not preserved): they are highly virtuosic arias with coloraturas, wide leaps and an enormous voice range. They even share identical instrumental motives. Whereas the music fits well in the case of “Quando freme altera l’onda” it seems out of place for “Io veggo in lontananza” and only motivated by the need for an effective aria at the end of Act II.

Whereas the musical (not the textual) ending of the scene is identical in the case just described, a shift of musical focus can be seen in the following example. Selene’s “Se questo mio core” was almost certainly replaced by “Amor non prometto” from Niccolò Jommelli’s *Astianatte*, Rome 1741. Although the aria was sung by Giovanni Cellini

---

40 Compare, for example, the broken chords in the Madrid and the Mingotti scores.

41 There seems to exist no other composition of the text and it appears in no other *Astianatte* libretto (alternative title: *Andromaca*) that could be checked online (the librettos of the productions in Florence 1702, London 1727, Macerata 1729, Alessandria 1729, Perugia 1743 were not available). The slightly different text in Mingotti’s version (“che m’ami lo vedo / che peni lo credo” instead of “che peni lo credo / che m’ami lo vedo” in the libretto) appears in Jommelli’s autograph as a correction (D-SI, H.B.XVII.235a., fol. 61r), but not in the copies in A-Wn (Mus.Hs.17661, fols. 55r-v), F-Pn (D.6267, fols. 1r-v) and I-Nc (7.7.1-2/Rari Cornice 5.17, fols. 39r-v/53r-v), repeating the first version of Jommelli’s score. In the autograph, representing the performance version, the aria for Ermione (Giovanni Cellini) is marked “Aria 3.” and, with red chalk, “un tuono sotto”. Since it is not the third aria
in Rome (Ermione), it was probably transferred via Ventura Rocchetti, singer at the Dresden court and primo uomo (Pirro) in Jommelli’s opera. The troupe could have come into possession of the piece during its Dresden stay in summer 1746. The content of the two arias is the same (Selene explains her refusal of love to Araspe) but the music is completely different. “Se questo mio core” is a passionate, virtuosic explanation marked Presto (Example 1) whereas “Amor non prometto” is an unpretentious aria in an Andante tempo bearing a certain simplicity (Example 2). This is due to the rather regular structure of the A¹ and A² sections of the da capo aria, including frequent literal repetitions (aabcc and aab’c’b’c’c’). Nevertheless, it is vocally demanding because of numerous leaps and arpeggios in the vocal line. In the first case, Selene appears as a ‘royal’ character and in the second, she is shown as a ‘simple’ (or ‘feigned simple’) personality. The substitution of a passionate aria by a rather restrained one shows a remarkable shift of focus regarding both the character and the dramaturgy of the opera.

Example 1: Anon., “Se questo mio core”, vocal entry.


in the opera or an aria in scene 3 or the third aria for Ermione, the clue may refer to the third version of the aria. This thesis is corroborated by the different typeface of the piece, Jommelli using a thicker quill in comparison to the other recitatives and arias surrounding it. In addition to the non-existent text changes the copies do not realize the transposition, so that it is certain that they were copied from the un-altered score. The Mingotti version instead must have been copied from the altered score (or a source based on it) because it incorporates the text changes. This first-hand transmission of the music may confirm Rocchetti’s involvement. On Astianatte see also D’OVIDIO, 2018; D’OVIDIO, 2017. The opera was revived in Perugia in 1743, cf. http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0005767, 03.02.2020.
To expand this observation and to prove that shifts of focus are a common practice in the Mingotti troupe, I will adopt a diachronic perspective. In II,9, for example, Selene has a solo scene. In a short recitative she laments on her love and realizes that she only can reveal Didone’s love pains to Enea, but not her own. In Metastasio’s original follows a simile aria (II,13, “Veggio la sponda”) where Selene compares her situation with a mariner who wants to reach the shore but is held back by the waves, alluding to her wish to declare her love that is inhibited by duty. In the Mingotti productions, several compositions were presented at this place. It seems that all but one of them are still extant – but it must, however, be repeated that authorship cannot be completely ascertained in every case.

### Table 1: Selene’s arias in II,9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>Taken from</th>
<th>Singer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1731-34</td>
<td>Linz</td>
<td>Son come farfalletta</td>
<td>A. Vivaldi, Arsilda regina di Ponto, Venice 1716 or Vicenza 1720</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Brno</td>
<td>Anime tormentate</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Anna Cosimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>Privo del caro bene</td>
<td>J. A. Hasse, Dalisa, Venice 1730</td>
<td>Marianne Pirker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
<td>Sino alle stelle andranno</td>
<td>G. Carcani, La concordia del Tempo con la Fama, Venice 1740</td>
<td>Giovanna Rossi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Linz production of 1731-1734 by the Denzio or Mingotti troupe “Son come farfalletta” was sung, most probably from Antonio Vivaldi’s Gl’inganni felici per vendetta (Vicenza 1720, RV 699-C = reworking of Armida al campo d’Egitto, Venice 1718, RV 699-A), taken over from Arsilda regina di Ponto (Venice 1716, RV 700). The texts are very similar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>Taken from</th>
<th>Singer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Di quest’alma il fier tormento</td>
<td>G. A. Paganelli, Barsina, Venice 1742</td>
<td>Catarina Bäräth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Speme di dolce calma</td>
<td>P. Pulli, Cajo Marzio Coriolano, Reggio Emilia 1741/ Naples 1745?</td>
<td>Giacinta Forcellini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Di quest’alma il fier tormento</td>
<td>G. A. Paganelli, Barsina, Venice 1742</td>
<td>Giacinta Forcellini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Graz production from 1737 features the aria “Privo del caro bene” from Hasse’s Dalìsa (Venice 1730). The text of the aria (originally sung by Faustina Bordoni) was slightly changed in the first and more extensively in the second stanza to fit into the situation. But note also its references to the aria sung in 1731-1734. In the second stanza “tortorella” was exchanged by “farfalletta”, which was the basic theme in the earlier aria:

Vivaldi 1716
Son come farfalletta
che in mezzo a due facelle
dubbiosa errando va.

Vivaldi 1720
Son come farfalletta
ch’in mezzo due facelle
dubbiosa errando va.

Denzio/Mingotti 1731-1734
Son come farfalletta
che intorno ad una face
dubbiosa errando va.

Ambe le sembran belle
e in tanto semplicetta
arde di qua e di là.

Timor si fa rubelle
speranza mi diletta
peno di qua, di là.

E mentre pena e tace
lo sguardo altrui diletta
col gir di qua e di là.

The text has nothing to do with “Privo del caro bene” from Zeno’s Amor generoso (present in the librettos Venice 1707, Milan 1709).

Note the takeover of the word “diletta” in the second stanza from the 1720 to the 1731-1734 text.

1716: II,12, Arsilda (Anna Vicenza Dotti); 1720: III,6, Osmira (Cecilia Belisani). Two scores of Arsilda are preserved in Turin (I-Tn, Foà 35, online in Internet culturale), a copy of the aria in a reduced version for soprano instead of alto with basso continuo only and a different bass line in Dresden (D-Dl, Mus.1-F-30, fols. 34v f./pp. 68f.).

Several sources (cf. RISM and Internet culturale) including D-MÜs, Sant.Hs.1981 and I-Rc, Ms.2252.

The text has nothing to do with “Privo del caro bene” from Zeno’s Amor generoso (present in the librettos Venice 1707, Milan 1709).
Dido Abandoned?

Hasse 1730
Priva del caro bene
ah! che partir conviene.
E pur (non so che sia)
sento nell’alma mia
qualche speranza ancor.

Mingotti 1737
Privo del caro bene
ah! che morir conviene
e pur non so che sia,
sento nell’alma mia
qualche speranza ancor.

Tal per campagna errando
vedova Tortorella
trova la cara, e bella
delizia del suo amor.

Vicina al lume errando
trova la farfalletta
una morte diletta
mercede del suo amor.

In Ljubljana in 1742, “Sino alle stelle andranno” by Giuseppe Carcani was sung at this place. The aria was taken from his serenata La concordia del Tempo con la Fama which he wrote in Venice in 1740 for the Ospedale degli’Incurabili to pay homage to the Electoral Prince Friedrich Christian of Saxony. Only in the second stanza were changes made:

Carcani 1740
Sino alle stelle andranno
spinte dal vento l’onde:
tutte si scopriranno
le valli più profonde
del procelloso mar.

Cosi l’odiato pegno
in braccio a mille morti
Fia scopo del mio sdegno:
cosi saprò i miei torti
irata vendicar.

Mingotti 1742
Sino alle stelle andranno
spinte dal vento l’onde,
tutte si scopriranno
le valli più profonde
del procelloso mar.

Cosi l’amato pegno
mi getta a mille morti
in braccio de l’affanno,
cosi crudel tiranno,
che mi fa sospirar.

46  D-Dl, Mus.F-82,5-8; on his stay cf. Żórawska-Witkowska, 1996.
“Di quest’a’lma il fier tormento”, sung in Hamburg in 1744, is an aria ascribed to several composers in different sources: Christoph Willibald Gluck, Carl Heinrich Graun, Giuseppe Antonio Paganelli. In the Mingotti score it bears no composer name. But there is no doubt that Paganelli composed it and that it was transferred to the Mingotti score once again by a singer. The aria is found in Paganelli’s opera Barsina which premiered in Venice in autumn 1742. The role of Statira singing the aria in I,13 was created by “Catterina Barat, Romana”, i.e. Catarina Bäräth who was member of the Mingotti troupe in summer 1744 and appeared as Selene in Hamburg. The text is slightly different in the original and a different prosody resulting in a rather clumsy word setting in the Mingotti source suggests that the adaptation was not made very carefully and perhaps in a hurry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paganelli 1742</th>
<th>Mingotti 1744</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Di quest’a’lma il fier tormento</td>
<td>Di quest’a’lma il fier tormento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idol mio solo è per te.</td>
<td>idol mio solo è per te.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caro amor</td>
<td>Caro amor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questo cor</td>
<td>questo cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si costante ogn’or sarà.</td>
<td>si costante ogn’or sarà.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Modern ascription in D-SWl, Mus.146 (RISM entry). The sources in A-Wn, Mus.Hs.1039 (ascribed to Gluck) and Mus.Hs.17881 present the aria in an arrangement with French text (“Dors aimable Aurore”). It is part of the pasticcio Tircis et Doristée produced in Laxenburg in 1756. However, the pasticcio, text by Charles-Simon Favart, was already given in Paris in 1752. The new edition of the libretto of 1759 presents some of the music, including on pp. 3-6 the mentioned air (Tircis et Doristée. Pastorale; parodie d’Acis et Galatée; représentée pour la premiere fois par les Comédiens Italiens Ordinaires du Roi, le 4 Septembre 1752. Nouvelle édition […], Paris 1759, several copies in F-Pn). It shows the vocal line only and presents a simplified version of the first part of the Italian aria on the text “Paresseuse Aurore”. In the 1752 edition of the libretto the music is not printed, but there is a clue instead: “N° 1. Air: De la Serva Padrona.” However, Pergolesi’s Serva padrona does not contain an air with the same music. Maybe it was substituted or added in the Paris performances in 1752 since the editor of the published score claims that the intermezzi had been given at Paris opera in a corrupted form: “L’Éditeur de cet Ouvrage le donne au Public, non dans l’état de mutilation où l’on a été constraint de le mettre à l’opera de Paris pour satisfaire l’impatience des spectateurs, mais entier, et tel qu’il fait depuis trente ans l’admiration publique sur tous les Theatres de l’Europe.” (La Serva Padrona Intermezzo. Del Sig. Gio. Batta. Pergolese. Rappresentato in Pariggi nell’Autunno 1752, Paris [1752]).

48 CZ-Pak, 432, with text „O rosetta semper laeta”.

49 PL-Wu, RM 4749, with text „Ave maris stella”/”O rosetta semper laeta”.

50 Barsina […], Venice 1742; online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0006811, 03.02.2020.

51 The original text is also found in the manuscript in D-SWl.
As a parenthesis, it may be of interest that the aria already had a past history. It was sung in Prague during the coronation ceremonies that made Maria Teresa of Austria Queen of Bohemia in 1743. As one of the operas given during the ceremonies Paganelli’s Barsina was revived. But “Di quest’alma il fier tormento” is already found in the libretto of the pasticcio Semiramide riconosciuta, the first coronation opera, where the text appears in III,8 (Scitalce). Consequently, it is not included in the Prague version of Barsina. Since documentation on the ensemble is lacking it is not known if Catarina Barath was singing during the coronation ceremonies. It is, however, documented that the Mingotti were interested in performing operas during that same period. In March 1743 Pietro Mingotti applied for permission to give performances in the Prague theater (Kotzentheater). He did not obtain permission but still came with his troupe to Prague in early 1744. Thus, whereas it must remain speculation whether Bärath was engaged for the Prague coronation operas where she could have created once again the role of Statira in Barsina and the one of Scitalce in Semiramide riconosciuta singing in the latter “Di quest’alma il fier tormento” and where she may have been engaged by Mingotti when he came to the city some months later, it is obvious that the aria was inserted in Mingotti’s pasticcio Didone at her instigation.

In 1746 this aria was substituted by Pietro Pulli’s “Speme di dolce calma”, taken from his opera Cajo Marzio Coriolano (III,5, Volumnia; maybe Reggio nell’Emilia 1741, maybe Naples 1745). Only a minor textual change in the second stanza which may be the result of misreading can be observed (“languo” instead of “langue” at the very beginning)
It is, however, not clear which musical version was sung in Hamburg. The aria is preserved in an opulent and sonorous scoring for flutes, “Trombe con sordine”, violins “con sordine”, viola, bass and two solo violins in the B section in Venice and in a reduced version for strings only in Brussels. In Copenhagen in 1748 Mingotti returned to “Di quest’alma il fier tormento”, sung at this time by Giacinta Forcellini.

If we compare the music of these pieces, we must affirm that it is very different in each case. In the Linz version the simile aria by Vivaldi is a rather catchy tune with gentle syncopations in an extravagant scoring with divided first violins (Example 3).

Example 3: Antonio Vivaldi, “Son come farfalletta”, vocal entry (voice and basso continuo only).
The Graz aria “Priva del caro bene” is a virtuosic piece containing the original singer’s vocal specialties: syncopated rhythms, tone repetitions, alternating chromatic notes (Example 4).

Example 4: Johann Adolf Hasse, “Priva del caro bene”, vocal entry (voice only).

Example 5: Giuseppe Carcani, “Sino alle stelle andranno”, vocal entry (voice only).

Carcani’s simile aria on the conventional stormy sea is an aria di bravura with lots of coloraturas as well as typical tremolo figures and broken chords in the (Example 5).

58 Cf. Woyke, 2010, pp. 116-125. Tempo markings vary in the sources. Whereas D-MÜs, Sant.Hs.1981, says Andante, the short score in I-Rc, Ms.2252, says Allegro assai, a tempo more often used by Bordoni.
Like “Anime tormentate” (Brno 1734), whose music is lost, “Di quest’alma il fier tormento” is not a simile aria and describes a psychic state of the character not with images but with explicit words. In the latter Selene is characterized as a more sensible human being than in the former, more generic simile arias. Consequently, “Di quest’alma” presents a tender musical language in a minuet tempo with appoggiaturas and a scoring including two transverse (Example 6).

Example 6: Giuseppe Antonio Paganelli, “Di quest’alma il fier tormento”, vocal entry (voice only).

\[
\text{Tempo di Minuett}
\]

\[
\text{Di que} - \text{s’t’al} - \text{ma il} - \text{fier} - \text{tor} - \text{men} - \text{to i} - \text{do} - \text{mi} - \text{o} - \text{so} - \text{lo} - \text{e} - \text{pe} - \text{r} - \text{te},
\]

\[
\text{ca} - \text{ro} - \text{a} - \text{mor} \quad \text{que} - \text{sto} \quad \text{co} - \text{esta} - \text{t} - \text{si} - \text{co} - \text{stan} - \text{te} - \text{o} - \text{gnor} - \text{sa} - \text{ra},
\]

\[
\text{si, si, si} - \text{co} - \text{sta} - \text{nte} - \text{o} - \text{gnor} - \text{sa} - \text{ra, o} - \text{gnor} - \text{sa} - \text{ra}.
\]

“Speme di dolce calma” in an Andante tempo shows in the first stanza the hope for calm (in the turmoil of love) that is illustrated in the second by an image. An irregular melody structure due to the attempt to unify the verses makes the aria a little bit awkward. The melody contains syncopations and leaps that characterize Selene’s rejoicing at the first glimmer of hope. It also conforms to the tender type of aria (Example 7).

The arias are very different in style and mood. They certainly reflect the strengths and predilections of the singers, but they also show different facets of the character and result in a protean dramaturgy. In every pasticcio production Selene appears in a different way at the end of the scene, even though the preceding recitative always remains the same.

Selene shows in the same single scene different psychic states: in Linz she is graceful, in Graz passionate, in Ljubljana emotional, in Hamburg sensible and two years later cautiously rejoicing. In Copenhagen she continues to follow the sensible pattern. Thus, all in all, in this scene a shift from conceptions of ‘external’ passions to concepts of ‘internal’ sensibility can be perceived – a shift that, of course, conforms to overall tendencies in the mid-century.\(^{59}\) It seems that in Selene’s scene a consistent role conception was not intended, but a reflection of aesthetic and social developments.

---

\(^{59}\) After its beginnings in France around 1700, in England around 1720 this tendency reaches Germany around 1740. Cf. amongst others SAUDER, 2015; LLOYD, 2013; BECKER-CANTARINO,
At the same time, it seems that music was at the center of attention. This approach may be traced back to two facts: the fact that Metastasio’s texts were well-known all over Europe\(^{60}\) (so that they can be qualified as truly European cultural assets at the time) may have called the audience’s attention to other aspects of the operatic spectacle than the action – music, aria disposition, emotions, singer performance, etc. The fact that the audience of the Mingotti performances in Northern Europe was non-Italian and unfamiliar with traditions and conventions of Italian opera may have caused problems in understanding (despite German translations printed in the librettos) so that the German audiences may have enjoyed music above everything else – just like an anonymous German reviewer put it when he wrote on the Hamburg performances by the Mingotti troupe in 1740: “Anyway, the action of an opera is a forced work. Will we do wrong if we praise the singing as the principal element of the opera we heard?”\(^{61}\) Mingotti may have taken this situation into account while arranging his operas.

---

\(^{60}\) See the numerous translations of his librettos, including French (Paris 1749), English (London 1767) and German (Leipzig 1769-1774) translations of his works. On the reception of Metastasio especially in northern Germany cf. LÜTTEKEN/SPLITT, 2002.

\(^{61}\) “Die Handlung einer Oper ist überhaupt ein gezwungenes Werk. Thun wir also unrecht, wenn wir bey dieser Oper, welche wir gehöret haben, daß Singen als das Hauptstück prei-
Nevertheless, opera was not a concert. The action must not be underestimated and seems to have been an important element of the operatic spectacle too. In fact, in the Mingotti version of the Didone libretto there are several sequences of scenes that contain no arias, for example I,7-9 and III,5-8 (about 100 lines each, 10-12 pages of music in the score), and, the longest II,10-12 (about 160 lines long, 15 pages). In order that the opera would not become boring for the German speaking audience (because it did not understand the rather long Italian recitatives) these sequences must have capitalized on the acting abilities of the singers. With regard to these long recitative passages the Mingotti troupe foregrounded Italian drama (we have to bear in mind that, at the heyday of a Goldoni, Chiari or Gozzi, almost no serious spoken theater existed in Italy worth mentioning and therefore opera seria must be considered the true serious dramatic art form there) as opposed to, for example, George Frideric Handel who in similar conditions cut the recitatives drastically to emphasize music.

**Conclusion**

It is not a new insight that characters of 18th-century opera seria do not behave in a psychologically coherent manner. It has been repeatedly stated that characters are variable and change their mood from scene to scene. But what is striking in the case of Selene’s aria is that a single scene is subject to so much change. An invariable scene as constituted by always the same recitative can have variable music-dramatic realizations in the aria. It also gives the singers various opportunities for self-fashioning. Moreover, this scene is found in an opera that was repeatedly performed by the same impresarios. Though a certain performance tradition was established, a performing tradition or a tradition of interpretation cannot be perceived. Since the scene obviously was not considered a stable entity with a

---

62 See also Reinhard Strohm’s characterization of the Hamburg audience in the 1720s: “The Hamburg audiences were sufficiently interested in the opera plots to expect that recitatives were actually sung in German.” (STROHM, 2013, p. LVIII).

63 This applies even more for Catone in Utica where numerous scene sequences are actually longer.

64 Cf. BUCCIARELLI, 2000. A well-known exception was Luigi Riccoboni (1676-1753) and his troupe, cf. ALFONZETTI, 2016.

65 This is, however, not the rule. It is amazing to see how similar the musical realization of a scene resp. its emotional climax, the aria, could be in different settings. Metastasio’s La clemenza di Tito, for example, was set by different composers and the musical features employed in the arias resemble each other very closely (cf. LÜHNING, 1983, pp. 376ff.). Whereas this regards settings of the same text Handel’s approach to the emotional content of the scene is similar in his pasticcio Catone (London 1732). In Catone he inserted arias that often reflect the musical features of the model, Leonardo Leo’s Catone in Utica (Venice 1729). Cf. OVER, 2020.
specific emotional content and instead displayed variable emotional endings, the opera plot and the opera story appear here as a mere vehicle for music of every kind.

There are several motivations behind such a procedure: besides the singer’s wishes they could involve economics or the expectations of the public or local taste or overall socio-cultural tendencies. In Hamburg in 1746 a further motivation behind the aria exchanges was certainly to present the opera as a variation. The piece was well known from the performance in 1744. Two years later it was given with substituted arias and even during the short stay of the Mingotti troupe in Hamburg in 1747 before traveling to Copenhagen it was presented to the audience (most probably with modified music). In the advert the troupe put in the Hamburger Relations-Courier it functioned as a crowd puller. Thus, in 1746 Didone abbandonata became a ‘new’ opera with new singers and new arias, maintaining the curiosity of the Hamburg public, enabling a comparison and guaranteeing income. Moreover, the threefold repetition of the opera over several years conforms to a concept that was well established in the city. Hamburg had a long experience of ‘repertoire opera’ in the modern sense: operas were repeated in successive seasons. Didone abbandonata was not the only opera to be revived by the Mingotti troupe over successive years, there are many others (see Appendix 4). The fact that in other centers where the Mingotti played several seasons, for example in Graz, Leipzig or Copenhagen, the repertoire aspect is almost inexistent shows that in Hamburg the troupe followed local traditions and expectations. The quasi-seismographic observance of local preconditions is corroborated by the fact that popular arias were taken over to other productions. In Didone, not all arias were substituted in 1746, but some remained.

The fact that in several cases the entire or most of the music is ascribed to a composer in the libretto may not refer to the recitatives, most probably the same in all the

66 “Herewith, it is notified that the opera Didone will be performed in the known opera house at the Gänsemarkt, together with the intermezzi Monsieur de Porsignac, next Wednesday, 15 November. All Sirs who rented boxes in the opera in the past shall retain them during the two weeks, beginning from the mentioned date, during which six operas shall be presented, i.e. on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday.” (“Es wird hiemit notificirt, daß nächstkünftigen Mittwoch, als den 15 Novemb. im bekannten Opernhause auf dem Gänsemarkt, die Opera DIDONE, mit dem Intermezzo oder Zwischenspiel, Monsieur de Porsignac, vorgestellet werden soll, und daß alle diejenigen Herren, welche vormals in der Opera die Logen gemiethet, solche während vierzehn Tage, von obigem Dato ab an, in welchen Sechs Operen, nemlich Montags, Mittwochs und Donnerstags représentiret werden sollen, auch die nehmlichen Logen behalten wollen.”) Hamburger Relations-Courier, no. 178 (10 November 1747); see also BECKER, 1956, pp. 27f. The other opera presented was Farnace (Theobald, 2015, p. 52).

67 See, for example, the performance calendar in MARX/SCHEIDRÖDER, 1995, pp. 469-501; also STROHM, 2013, pp. LVf. and passim as well as his contribution in the present volume, pp. 52f.

68 On the transfer of popular arias in Hamburg cf. REINHARD STROHM’s article in the present volume; also STROHM, 2013, p. LVII.
Denzio and Mingotti productions, but to a big portion of arias of a single composer. Looking at Scalabrini in 1746, he wrote seven out of 19 arias, plus the sinfonia, plus the last recitative scene. Twelve arias are from other composers (amongst them four by Lampugnani and one by an unknown composer). This conception of opera as a ‘work’ (however problematic this term may be) made of arias was well established in the latter part of the century as we know from several cases, of which Mozart’s La clemenza di Tito is only the most prominent.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{69} It is probable that Mozart wrote only the closed numbers of the opera and entrusted another composer with the composition of the recitatives. (In older accounts his pupil Franz Xaver Süßmayr is mentioned, but there is no evidence.) Cf. Giegling, 1968. Another case is Giovanni Paisiello whose Zenobia in Palmira (1790, score in I-Nc, 16.5.11-12 [Rari 2.8.1-2]) contains autograph arias and ensembles together with recitatives by another scribe. Whether this scribe is the composer of the recitatives is not known, but possible.
### Appendix 1

Overview of the *Didone* text versions Naples 1724 (premiere); Venice 1725/Wrocław 1726; Denzio and Mingotti troupes (several cities, 1731-1748); I-PESo, ms.2007; Graz 1741

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples 1724 (Sarro)</th>
<th>Venice 1725 (Albinoni)</th>
<th>Prague 1731 (Albinoni, Denzio)</th>
<th>unknown (I-PESo, ms.2007)</th>
<th>Graz 1741 (Kärntnertortheater troupe?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,1 No principessa, amico</td>
<td>1,1 No principessa, amico</td>
<td>1,1 Donna real; del re de mori in nome</td>
<td>1,1 No principessa, amico</td>
<td>(I,1) No principessa, amico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,2 Enea d’Asia splendore</td>
<td>I,2 Enea d’Asia splendore</td>
<td>I,2 Enea d’Asia splendore</td>
<td>(I,2) Enea d’Asia splendore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,3 Parte così, così mi lascia Enea?</td>
<td>I,3 Parte così, così mi lascia Enea?</td>
<td>I,3 Parte così, così mi lascia Enea?</td>
<td>(I,3) Parte così, così mi lascia Enea?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4 Venga Arbace qual vuole</td>
<td>I,4 Venga Arbace qual vuole</td>
<td>I,4 Venga Arbace qual vuole</td>
<td>(I,4) Venga Arbace qual vuole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5 Vedi, mio re...</td>
<td>I,5 Vedi, mio re...</td>
<td>I,5 Vedi, mio re...</td>
<td>(I,5) Vedi, mio re...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,6 Araspe alla vendetta</td>
<td>I,6 Araspe alla vendetta</td>
<td>I,2 Araspe alla vendetta</td>
<td>(I,6) Araspe alla vendetta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,7 Quant’è stolto se crede</td>
<td>I,7 Quant’è stolto, se crede</td>
<td>I,3 Quanto è stolto, se crede</td>
<td>(I,7) Quanto è stolto, se crede</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,8 Empio! L’orror che porta</td>
<td>I,8 Empio! L’orror che porta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Act I**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I,9</th>
<th>Già tel dissi, o Selene</th>
<th>I,9</th>
<th>Già te’l dissi, o Selene</th>
<th>I,4</th>
<th>Già te’l dissi, o Selene</th>
<th>I,8</th>
<th>Già te’l dissi, o Selene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>Tutta ho scorsa la regia</td>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>Tutta ho scorsa la regia</td>
<td>I,9</td>
<td>Tutta ho scorsa la regia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>Non partirà se pria…</td>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>Non partirà, se pria…</td>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>Non partirà se pria…</td>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>Non partirà, se pria…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,12</td>
<td>Non è più tempo Araspe</td>
<td>I,12</td>
<td>Non è più tempo Araspe</td>
<td>I,6</td>
<td>Non è più tempo Araspe</td>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>Non è più tempo Araspe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,13</td>
<td>Dove corri o signore?</td>
<td>I,13</td>
<td>Dove corri o signore?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,14</td>
<td>Lo so, quel cor feroce</td>
<td>I,14</td>
<td>Lo so, quel cor feroce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,15</td>
<td>Come? Da’ labri tuoi</td>
<td>I,15</td>
<td>Come? Da’ labri tuoi</td>
<td>I,7</td>
<td>Come? Da’ labri tuoi</td>
<td>I,13</td>
<td>Come? Da’ labri tuoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,16</td>
<td>Ecco il rival né seco</td>
<td>I,16</td>
<td>Ecco il rival, né seco</td>
<td>I,14</td>
<td>Ecco il rival, né seco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,17</td>
<td>Siam traditi o regina</td>
<td>I,17</td>
<td>Siam traditi o regina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,18</td>
<td>Enea, salvo già sei</td>
<td>I,18</td>
<td>Enea, salvo già sei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,19</td>
<td>E soffrirò, che sia</td>
<td>I,19</td>
<td>E soffrirò, che sia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Act II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II,1</th>
<th>Signor ove ten vai?</th>
<th>II,1</th>
<th>Signor ove ten vai?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>Giovino i tradimenti</td>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>Giovino i tradimenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>Chi sciolse</td>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>Chi sciolse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,4</td>
<td>Chi fu, che all’inumano</td>
<td>II,4</td>
<td>Chi fu, che all’inumano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>Tu dici ch’io non sperì</td>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>Tu dici ch’io non sperì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>Già so che si nasconde</td>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>Già so che si nasconde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>Come! Ancor non partisti? Adorna ancora</td>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>Come! Ancor non partisti? Adorna ancora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,8</td>
<td>Io sento vacillar la mia costanza</td>
<td>II,8</td>
<td>Io sento vacillar la mia costanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10</td>
<td>Fra il dovere, e l’affetto</td>
<td>II,11</td>
<td>Fra il dovere, e l’affetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,12</td>
<td>Allor, che Araspe a provocar mi venne</td>
<td>II,13</td>
<td>Allor, che Araspe a provocar mi venne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,13</td>
<td>Chi udi, chi vide mai</td>
<td>II,14</td>
<td>Chi udi, chi vide mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,14</td>
<td>Incerta del mio fato</td>
<td>II,15</td>
<td>Incerta del mio fato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,16</td>
<td>Senti</td>
<td>II,17</td>
<td>Senti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,17</td>
<td>E pure in mezzo all’ire</td>
<td>II,18</td>
<td>E pure in mezzo all’ire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Act III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III,1</th>
<th>Compagni invitti a tolerare avvezzi</th>
<th>III,1</th>
<th>Compagni invitti a tolerare avvezzi</th>
<th>III,1</th>
<th>Compagni invitti a tolerare avvezzi</th>
<th>III,1</th>
<th>Compagni invitti a tolerare avvezzi</th>
<th>(III,1)</th>
<th>Compagni invitti a tolerare avvezzi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Dove rivolge, dove</td>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Dove rivolge, dove</td>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Dove rivolge, dove</td>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Dove rivolge, dove</td>
<td>(III,2)</td>
<td>Dove rivolge, dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Già di larba in difesa</td>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Infelice, che sento!</td>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Già di larba in difesa</td>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Parti da’ nostri lidi</td>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Parti da’ nostri lidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>Non son contento</td>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>Non son contento</td>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>Non son contento</td>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Principessa ove corri?</td>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Principessa ove corri?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Addio Selene</td>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Addio Selene</td>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Addio Selene</td>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Sprezzar la fiamma mia</td>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Sprezzar la fiamma mia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Sprezzar la fiamma mia</td>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Tutta di larba all’ira</td>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>Tutta di larba all’ira</td>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Sprezzar la fiamma mia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,10</td>
<td>Va crescendo il mio tormento</td>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Va crescendo il mio tormento</td>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Va crescendo il mio tormento</td>
<td>(1744, 1746: –)</td>
<td>Va crescendo il mio tormento</td>
<td>(III,4)</td>
<td>Va crescendo il mio tormento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,11</td>
<td>Oh dio germana!</td>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Oh dio germana!</td>
<td>III,11</td>
<td>Oh dio germana!</td>
<td>(III,5)</td>
<td>Oh dio germana!</td>
<td>(III,5)</td>
<td>Oh dio germana!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,12</td>
<td>Ah non fidarti. Osmida</td>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Ah non fidarti. Osmida</td>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>Ah non fidarti. Osmida (1731-34: Vanne a lui, pringa, e piangi)</td>
<td>III,12</td>
<td>Ah non fidarti. Osmida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,13</td>
<td>Araspe in queste soglie!</td>
<td>III,10</td>
<td>Araspe in queste soglie!</td>
<td>III,13</td>
<td>Araspe in queste soglie!</td>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>Araspe in queste soglie!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,15</td>
<td>Al tuo periglio</td>
<td>III,12</td>
<td>Al tuo periglio</td>
<td>III,15</td>
<td>Al tuo periglio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,17</td>
<td>I miei casi infelici</td>
<td>III,14</td>
<td>I miei casi infelici</td>
<td>III,17</td>
<td>I miei casi infelici</td>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>I miei casi infelici</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,18</td>
<td>Fuggi o regina</td>
<td>III,15</td>
<td>Fuggi o regina</td>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Fuggi o regina (1731-34: = III,7)</td>
<td>III,18</td>
<td>Fuggi o regina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,19</td>
<td>Fermati</td>
<td>III,16</td>
<td>Fermati</td>
<td>III,19</td>
<td>Fermati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,21</td>
<td>Ah che dissi infelice! A qual’èccesso</td>
<td>III,18</td>
<td>Ah che dissi infelice! A qual’èccesso</td>
<td>III,10</td>
<td>Ah che dissi infelice! A qual’èccesso (1731-34: = III,9)</td>
<td>III,21</td>
<td>Ah che dissi infelice! A qual’èccesso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Chord progressions between recitative and aria in *Didone abbandonata* (Hamburg 1744); unusual progressions in bold, progressions of a third in italics, composer names, if known, in brackets.

I,1, Didone, Son regina e sono amante: G minor/major-C major
I,2, Osmida, Sdegno, ingegno, affetti, inganni: A minor/major-G major
I,3, Iarba, Fra lo splendore del trono: F major-F major
I,4, Enea, Quando saprai chi sono: C major-B flat major
I,5, Selene, Nel tuo sen ignoto affetto: G major (sixth chord)-F major
I,6, Araspe, Costanza, mio core (B. Galuppi): D major-D major
I,9, Didone, Non ha ragione ingrato: B minor/major-A major
I,10, Enea, Se resto sul lido: G minor/major-F major
II,3, Didone, Tu mi guardi e ti confondi: D major-G major
II,4, Enea, Vedi nel mio perdono: G minor/major-A major
II,5, Osmida, Scherza il nocchier talora: A major-C major
II,7, Selene, Bel labro lusinghiero (G. Giacomelli): D minor/major-E major
II,9, Selene, Di quest’alma il fier tormento (G.A. Paganelli): G minor/major-G major
II,12, Iarba, Chiamami pur così: G major-A major
II,13, Didone, Quando freme altera l’onda (D. Terradellas): G major (hereafter an additional, but rather superfluous C)-C major

III,1, Enea, Vivi superbo e regna (P. Scalabrini): C major-B flat major
III,4, Araspe, L’augelletto in lacci stretto: B flat major-G major
[III,5, Didone, Va crescendo il mio tormento: G minor-A major (sixth chord)]
III,8, Iarba, Cadrà fra poco in cenere: D minor/major-G minor
III,9, Didone, Ah che dissi: B flat major-G major

---

70 The short aria stands at the beginning of the scene and is followed by a recitative. Chord progressions of the following recitatives are much freer. The piece was possibly cancelled in the 1744 production because it is found at the wrong place in the score: it appears between Scene 3 and 4 of the third act. It was definitely cancelled in the 1746 production.
Appendix 3

Comparative overview of the Didone productions Hamburg 1744, Hamburg 1746 and Copenhagen 1748

bold = music extant, grey = musical changes from production to production
Since in the 1746 libretto singers are not listed the cast has been conjectured. Conjectures are based on the troupe’s singer ensemble of that year,\(^7^1\) the singers in the previous and subsequent performances and the music inserted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene role</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744 (rev.) = version in score (I-MOe)</th>
<th>Hamburg 1746</th>
<th>Copenhagen 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[G.M. Marchi (?)], Sinfonia(^7^2)</td>
<td>„di Scalabrinki“ Sinfonia</td>
<td>most probably: [G.B. Lampugnani], Son regina e sono amante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,1 Didone</td>
<td>?, Son regina e sono amante</td>
<td>? , Son regina e sono amante different from 1746 production</td>
<td>“di Lampugnani” G.B. Lampugnani, Son regina e sono amante (Didone abbandonata), Padua 1739, 1,5(^7^3) subsequent performances: Alessandria 1742, Crema 1745 different from 1744 production (G. Turcotti?)</td>
<td>(G. Turcotti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R. Costa)</td>
<td>(R. Costa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7^1\) Theobald, 2015 (p. 48), lists the following singers for the 1746 season in Hamburg: Francesco Arrigoni (T), Cecilia Belvederi, Rosalba Buini, Settimio Canini (T), Antonio Casati (castrato), Rosa Costa (S), Giacinta Forcellini (S), Mad. Keyser, Regina Mingotti (S), Antonio Pereni (T), Giustina Turcotti (S) (in addition: Gaspera Beccheroni and Pellegrino Gaggiotti for the intermezzi).


\(^7^3\) Maybe in E-Mn, M.2369 ("Didone Abbandonata / Musica / Dell Sig:mm Lampugnani”, score, Naples 1753 version), no foliation/pagination; Turcotti sang Didone in the 1745 production in Crema.
### Dido Abandoned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744 (rev) = version in score (I-MOe)</th>
<th>Hamburg 1746</th>
<th>Copenhagen 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,3 Iarba</td>
<td>?, Fra lo splendor del trono (G. Alberti)</td>
<td>?, Fra lo splendor del trono (G. Alberti)</td>
<td>?, Fra lo splendor del trono (F. Arrigoni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4 Enea</td>
<td>?, Quando saprai chi sono (G. della Stella)</td>
<td>“di Lapis” S. Lapis, Quando saprai chi sono (R. Valentini Mingotti or R. Costa?)</td>
<td>?, Quando saprai chi sono (G. della Stella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,6 Araspe</td>
<td>most probably: [B. Galuppi], Costanza mio core (Arsace, Venice 1743, III,12)⁷⁶ (R. Valentini Mingotti)</td>
<td>“di Galuppi” B. Galuppi, Costanza mio core (R. Valentini Mingotti or A. Casati?)</td>
<td>most probably: [B. Galuppi], Costanza mio core (A. Casati)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


75 The provenance of the aria is not known. However, Giacinta Forcellini sang in Giuseppe Carcani’s *Ambleto* in Venice in 1742 so that the aria may have been a classic ‘baggage aria’ expressly commissioned by the singer and written for her by the composer. On this kind of arias cf. Freeman, 1992b.

76 Concordant source: F-Pn, Vm 7345 (“Aria del Sig.‘ Galuppi”). In the libretto I-Mb, Racc. dramm.3007, the opera is qualified a pasticcio (handwritten notice: “M: di Diversi”); in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene role</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744 (rev.) = version in score (I-MOe)</th>
<th>Hamburg 1746</th>
<th>Copenhagen 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,9 Didone</td>
<td>?, Non ha ragione, ingrato! (R. Costa)</td>
<td>?, Non ha ragione, ingrato! (R. Costa)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Non ha ragione, ingrato! (G. Turcotti?)</td>
<td>most probably: P. Scalabrini, Non ha ragione, ingrato! (G. Turcotti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,10 Enea</td>
<td>?, Se resto sul lido (G. della Stella)</td>
<td>?, Se resto sul lido (G. della Stella)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Se resto sul lido (R. Valentini Mingotti or R. Costa?)</td>
<td>?, Se resto sul lido (G. della Stella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3 Didone</td>
<td>?, Tu mi guardi e ti confondi (R. Costa)</td>
<td>?, Tu mi guardi e ti confondi (R. Costa)</td>
<td>“di Lampugnani” G.B. Lampugnani, Ah non lasciarmi no (Didone abbandonata, Padua 1739, II,7) subsequent performances: Alessandria 1742, Crema 1745 (G. Turcotti?)</td>
<td>?, Tu mi guardi e ti confondi (G. Turcotti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,4 Enea</td>
<td>?, Vedi nel mio perdono (G. della Stella)</td>
<td>?, Vedi nel mio perdono (G. della Stella)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Vedi nel mio perdono (R. Valentini Mingotti or R. Costa?)</td>
<td>?, Vedi nel mio perdono (G. della Stella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5 Osmida</td>
<td>?, Scherza il nocchier talora (A. Romani)</td>
<td>?, Scherza il nocchier talora for alto different from 1746 production (A. Romani)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Scherza il nocchier talora78 most probably for tenor/bass different from 1744 production (F. Arrigoni?)</td>
<td>?, Scherza il nocchier talora (L. Calvetti)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Grove Music Online (Monson) it is listed under Galuppi’s operas, in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Wiesend, 2002) it is not found at all.

77 Two different musical versions of Lampugnani’s aria are known: S-Skma, T-SE-R, fols. 15r-17r (“da Lampugnani”); E-Mn, M.2370 (Naples 1753 version), no foliation/pagination.

78 The manuscript in DK-Kk, mu 7502.1831, probably contains a later or reworked version of the aria, see p. 294.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene role</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744 (rev.) = version in score (I-MOe)</th>
<th>Hamburg 1746</th>
<th>Copenhagen 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 7 Selene</td>
<td>?, Se la bella tortorella (C. Bäräth)</td>
<td>[G. Giacomelli], Bel labro lusinghiero, (<em>Epaminonda</em>, Venice 1732, III,4)79 (C. Bäräth)</td>
<td>“di Giacomelli” G. Giacomelli, Bel labro lusinghiero (G. Forcellini?)</td>
<td>? Se la bella tortorella (G. Forcellini)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79 Concordant source: B-Bc, 2109 (“EPAMINONDA. / DRAMMA PER MUSICA / Soggetto, e Poesia di diversi / Musica / Del Sig.r Giminiano Jacomelli”), fols. 347v-353v.

80 Concordant sources: D-SWl, Mus.146 (“Aria Canto solo / Allegretto. / 2 Flute Travers. / 2 Violin / Con Bassus / et Partitur”, score), Mus.160 (parts), modern ascription to Gluck in RISM; CZ-Pak, 432 (ascribed to Graun, with two additional horns and text “O rosetta semper laeta”; in Henzel, 2006, listed under Graun’s doubtful works, [D.X:16]); PL-Wu, RM 4749 (manuscript from 1754, first ascription to “Graun” crossed out in favor of “Paganelli”, with text “Ave maris stella”/”O rosetta semper laeta”, see RISM entry). See also n. 46ff.


82 Maybe in E-Mn, M.2370 (Naples 1753 version), no foliation/pagination; Canini had sung the aria in the 1742 production in Alessandria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene role</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744 (rev.) = version in score (I-MOe)</th>
<th>Hamburg 1746</th>
<th>Copenhagen 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III,1 Enea</td>
<td>most probably: [P. Scalabrini], Vivi superbo e regna <em>(G. della Stella)</em></td>
<td>[P. Scalabrini], Vivi superbo e regna[^85] (G. della Stella)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Vivi superbo e regna (R. Valentini Mingotti or R. Costa?)</td>
<td>most probably: [P. Scalabrini], Vivi superbo e regna (G. della Stella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3 Selene</td>
<td>? Se questo mio core</td>
<td>? Se questo mio core</td>
<td>author not mentioned, most probably: [N. Jommelli], Amor non promettato, non ngeio pietà <em>(Astianatte, Rome 1741, I,8)</em>[^86] (G. Forcellini?)</td>
<td>? Se questo mio core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4 Araspe</td>
<td>? L’augelletto in lacci stretto</td>
<td>? L’augelletto in lacci stretto</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, L’augelletto in lacci stretto (R. Valentini Mingotti or A. Casati?)</td>
<td>most probably: [P. Scalabrini], L’augelletto in lacci stretto (A. Casati)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^83]: Concordant sources: P-Ln, C.I.C. n/o 116 (score, D major); D-RH, Ms 583 (C major); S-Skma, T-SE-R (C major). The tonality of the aria in the Mingotti score is C major.

[^84]: Maybe in E-Mn, M.2370 (Naples 1753 version), no foliation/pagination. The text is slightly different from Metastasio’s *Semiramide riconosciuta* that Lampugnani had set to music for Rome in 1741 (II,5).

[^85]: Concordant source: F-Pn, L.19908 (“Scalabrini / Aria | Vivi superbo e regna”, “Aria. / Vivi Superbo / del Sig. Scalabrini”). The manuscript in DK-Kk, mu 7502.1738, contains another version.

[^86]: Sources: D-Sl, H.B.XVII.235a. (no title), fols. 61r-63r (autograph score); A-Wn, Mus. Hs.17661 (9) (no title), fols. 55r-58v; A-Wn, SA.68.D.1 (7) (“Verschiedene Opern-Arien” by Jommelli); F-Pn, D 6267 (“Argentina / 1741 / Del Sig.” / Nicolò Jom[m]elli”); I-Nc, Rari 7.7.1-2/Rari Cornice 5.17 (“L’Astianatte / = Tomo Primo =”, score without recitatives), fols. 39r-42v/53r-56v.
### Appendix 4

Repeated opera performances of the Mingotti troupe until 1755

**Brno**

(4 seasons: 1733, 1733/34, 1734/35, 1736)
none

**Copenhagen**

(7 seasons: 1747/48, 1748/49, 1749/50, 1752/53, 1753/54, 1754/55, 1755/56)

*La furba e lo sciocco*: 1747/48, 1752/53

*Artaserse*: 1748/49, 1752/53

*Demofoonte*: 1749/50, 1754/55

**Dresden**

(2 seasons: 1746, 1747)

*Don Tabarano*: 1746, 1747

**Graz**

(13 seasons: 1736, 1736/37, 1737, 1737/38, spring 1738, autumn 1738, 1739, 1739/40, 1741/42, 1742/43, 1745, 1746, 1749)

*Semiramide riconosciuta*: 1742/43, 1746

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene role</th>
<th>Hamburg 1744 (rev.) = version in score (I-MOe)</th>
<th>Hamburg 1746</th>
<th>Copenhagen 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III,5 Didone</td>
<td>??, Va crescendo il mio tormento (R. Costa)</td>
<td>[cancelled]</td>
<td>??, Va crescendo il mio tormento (G. Turcotti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,8 Iarba</td>
<td>??, Cadrà fra poco in cenere (G. Alberti)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Cadrà fra poco in cenere (S. Canini?)</td>
<td>most probably: [P. Scalabrini], Cadrà fra poco in cenere (F. Arrigoni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,10 Didone</td>
<td>??, Vado… Ma dove?… Oh dio! (R. Costa)</td>
<td>“di Scalabrini” P. Scalabrini, Vado… Ma dove?… Oh dio! (G. Turcotti?)</td>
<td>most probably: [P. Scalabrini], Vado… Ma dove?… Oh dio! (G. Turcotti)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berthold Over

Hamburg
(11 seasons: 1740, 1743, 1744/45, 1745, 1745/46, 1746/47, 1747, 1748, 1751/52, 1753, 1754)
Ipermestra: 1740, 1743, 1744/45, 1746/47
Venceslao: 1743, 1744/45
La serva padrona: 1743, 1744/45, 1745, 1746/47, 1751/52, 1753
Artaserse: 1743, 1746/47
Siroe: 1743, 1751/52
Amor fa l’uomo cieco: 1743, 1744/45
Didone abbandonata: 1744/45, 1746/47, 1747
Bacocco e Serpilla/Il marito giocatore e la moglie bacchettona: 1744/45, 1745/46, 1748, 1753
Demetrio: 1744/45, 1746/47
Fiammetta: 1745, 1745/46
Diomeda: 1745, 1753
Monsieur di Porsugnacco: 1745, 1745/46, 1747, 1753
La clemenza di Tito: 1745/46, 1748
Lucio Vero: 1745/46, 1746/47
Le gelosie fra Grullo e Moschetta: 1745/46, 1746/47, 1748
La furba e lo sciocco: 1746/47, 1748

Leipzig
(6 seasons: 1744, 1745, 1746, spring 1747, Michaelmas fair 1747, 1751)

Ljubljana
(3 seasons: 1733, 1740, 1742)

Lübeck
(3 seasons: 1746, 1752, 1753)

Prague
(4 seasons: 1744, 1745, spring 1746, summer 1746)
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Palladio as a Tool for opera buffa Research
Mapping Opera Troupes and opera buffa
Outside of Italy (1745-1765)

Kordula Knaus/Andrea Zedler

The establishment and European dissemination of the new genre opera buffa characterizes the 18th-century operatic landscape. In 1745, Angelo and Pietro Mingotti traveled with a troupe of Italian singers to Graz, Prague, Leipzig, and Hamburg to perform the opere buffe La finta cameriera, Orazio, and La Fiammetta – operas that were successfully imported from Naples over Rome to Venice in the early 1740s.¹ In the years to follow, several impresarios tried their luck with opera buffa in various European cities. Antonio Denzio performed the opera parody L’industria galante in Munich in 1748. This comic opera was followed by La commedia in commedia, Orazio and Madama Ciana (1748-1749) presumably performed by the troupe of Eustachio Bambini who later on traveled to Paris with a similar repertoire.² Giovanni Francesco Crosa went to London, Brussels and Amsterdam to perform, among other works, Orazio, La commedia in commedia and La finta cameriera (1748-1750). It was mostly traveling troupes that disseminated the new genre in the late 1740s and 1750s, with varying degrees of success as the bankruptcy and flight from London of impresario Giovanni Francesco Crosa vividly illustrates.³

By the 1760s, opera buffa was performed all over Europe, from St. Petersburg in the Northeast to Cádiz in the South-West, and not only by traveling troupes (which were very prominent in the early years of the genre) but also by court opera ensembles.

To explore these manifold travels of the new genre is one aim of the research project Opera buffa as a European Phenomenon. Migration, Mapping and Transformation of a

¹ See Müller von Asow, 1917; Theobald, 2015.
New Genre (1745-1765).\(^4\) It started in October 2017 at the University of Bayreuth and investigates the dissemination of opera buffa in Europe from 1745 to 1765. To analyze dissemination practices of that scale (with over 500 different opera buffa productions) requires the use of applications developed in the field of Digital Humanities. For this project, the open-access tool Palladio was chosen to visualize the collected data.\(^5\) Palladio is a powerful tool to map geovisual data and to combine it with person data (e.g. names of singers, impresarios, etc.). Until now, the tool has not been used in the field of opera buffa research. While working with Palladio, it quickly became clear that it is not only helpful in achieving several visualizations of the results, but also facilitates the analysis of the opera network while entering data in the project’s database and preparing qualitative analysis of several opere buffe. After introducing the general outline of the project and its three parts (‘migration’, ‘mapping’, and ‘transformation’), this paper will focus on the ‘mapping’ aspect of the project and give an insight into the work with Palladio using the opera buffa Orazio as a representative example. Ortrun Landmann described Orazio as “a particularly stark example for the pasticcio practice that was virtually raised to the level of a principle”.\(^6\) This opera was particularly chosen for the following reasons:

1. *Orazio* was performed outside of and within Italy throughout the whole period of investigation\(^7\) and was therefore extensively adapted after the first performance in Naples (1737).
2. The geographical dissemination of *Orazio* is representative for the whole repertoire.
3. *Orazio* was taken up by opera companies that played a key role in the success of the repertoire outside of Italy – including the troupes of the Mingotti brothers, Santo Lapis, Giovanni Francesco Crosa, Eustachio Bambini and Nicola Setaro.
4. The 41 performance series,\(^8\) which could be reconstructed for *Orazio*, are well documented. Already with this representative opera, the basic assumption, that there...

---

\(^4\) The project is funded by DFG – Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (no. 362114878: online: http://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/projekt/362114878, 06.12.2019) and runs from 2017 to 2020.

\(^5\) Palladio is already used as a tool within American theater research: see Best et al., 2018.


\(^7\) Within the project, the performance series on Italian territory will also be included for the qualitative analyses of certain opere buffe. For Orazio the investigation period is between 1737 and 1765 and includes 41 performance series.

\(^8\) The term performance series is here understood as a run of performances of one opera buffa at a certain performance place. Therefore, information on performance dates (on a daily basis), the performance place, names of singers, dancers and persons involved in the opera production, such as librettists, composers, impresarios, stage decorators, costume designers and dancing masters are collected based on information found in librettos, music scores, playbills, newspaper announcements, correspondence and literature.
is a strong network of persons involved in the early opera buffa business not only inside but also outside of Italy can be well demonstrated.

The aims of the project

The terms used in the project’s subtitle (“migration”, “mapping”, and “transformation”) designate particular conceptual approaches to central research questions that immediately relate to the extensive pasticcio practice in opera buffa. On its way through various European cities, opera buffa was adapted to fit to local social or political conditions, to fit the abilities of certain singers, to serve as a basis for the compositional experiments of local maestri di cappella and for many other reasons. The adaptation practices varied from minor changes to complete reworkings in the typical pasticcio manner. So far, opera buffa research has mainly focused on single works, particular composers or certain cities. The project Opera buffa as a European Phenomenon instead wants to provide a more systematic approach and explore the preconditions that could, among others, lead to pasticcio practices.

The part of the project addressing “migration” aims to generate knowledge about the dissemination mechanisms and migration processes of people (e.g. composers, impresarios, singers, musicians, dancers, etc.) and objects (e.g. scores, librettos, costumes, stage designs, etc.) that were involved in the production and performance of opera buffa in Europe. The project carves out the particularities of opera buffa in comparison to opera seria and intermezzi, and shows the varieties of dissemination practices. This concerns, for example, the singers: in contrast to opera seria singers who were often engaged by a particular court and intermezzi singers who often traveled as a couple from city to city, opera buffa singers had manifold forms of contracts and travel patterns in the 1750s and 1760s. The fact that an opera buffa troupe in this time also involved two serious parts that could be casted with opera seria singers makes the formation of the opera buffa ensemble even more complicated. A differentiated and systematic approach is necessary to study the dichotomy between the permanent positions of court singers and the individually manifold terms and contracts of employment for traveling impresarios and singers.

Another question concerns the mobility of musical manuscripts: many of them were copied in the city of their first performance, mostly in Venice (indicated by paper, wa-

9 Martina Grempler, for example, studied the dissemination of Sacchini’s L’isola d’amore in Europe (Grempler, 2015), Giovanni Polin explored several operas by Baldassare Galuppi (Polin, 1995 and 2008), numerous publications (Brandenburg, 2007; Calella, 2009; Grempler, 2012; Schraffl, 2012 and Grempler, 2015), partly originating from the project Die Opera buffa auf der Wiener Bühne 1763-1782, give detailed information about the establishment of opera buffa in Vienna in the 1760s.

10 On the topic of adaptation and modification, concerning serious and comic parts see Knaus, 2017, pp. 239-261.
termarks and scribes). These manuscripts often reveal traces of adaptation for performances in other, often non-Italian, cities (e.g. inserted arias, comments, transpositions). Other scores were written outside of Italy and represent specific versions performed at these venues (e.g. the scores preserved in Dresden or Vienna). One goal of the project is to find out how the Italian manuscripts found their way to performance venues all over Europe. Impresarios, composers, singers, maestri di cappella, agents, diplomats, or other culturally interested persons in the broader sense were potential intermediaries. The project examines and specifies the role that these particular groups of people played in the dissemination of opera buffa outside of Italy. This leads to a broader knowledge of operatic networks and how they were established in Europe. These findings are examined in relation to other genres (opera seria, intermezzi, theater plays).

The part of the project dedicated to “mapping” generates a map of opera buffa performances and the corresponding migration processes in Europe. All data of opera buffa performances in Europe between 1745 and 1765 is collected in a database. The terms “mapping” and “space” are here also understood as concepts for a broader cultural analysis. Cultural and musical networks of courts and aristocratic dynasties are investigated with regard to both questions of cultural rivalry and attempts to establish unique cultural spaces.

Finally, the issue of “transformation” in the project’s title aims at identifying the transformation processes of both musical works and the genre of opera buffa as a whole when moving from one place to another in Europe. In the project we focus on five aspects that represent distinctive transformation processes throughout the development of the genre and which can result in pasticcio-like practices:

1. Transformations of works with regard to the performance of traveling opera troupes. We identify and analyze performance versions of traveling troupes and discuss if traveling troupes changed performance versions throughout their travels, and if so, why.

2. The project connects questions of genre transformation in the 1760s with the changing structural elements of opera buffa present in the cities of their origin. This concerns in particular the difference between the three-act opera buffa in Venice and the two-act intermezzi in Rome that were disseminated in Europe in the 1760s much more often than in the 1750s.

3. The project explores transformations in early opera buffa production on institutional levels. One goal is to find out if and when court theaters could afford specific opera buffa ensembles and if we can observe the engagement of steady opera buffa ensembles in the 1760s that can be associated with the European success of opera buffa.

4. The project deals with the transformation of the operatic repertoire initiated by the establishment of opera buffa. In the second half of the 18th century, opera seria continuously lost ground and was successively replaced by opera buffa in playing schedules.
(5) The transformation processes of the operatic landscape in the 1750s and 1760s also entail aesthetically and socially substantiated changes in taste that seem to be particularly influenced by the establishment of *opera buffa*. *Vice versa, opera buffa* also induced these changes in taste. Hereby, the project will not only contribute to a better understanding of 18th-century opera and court culture but will also give new insights into the changing aesthetic values at the time of the Enlightenment.

Within the first year of the project, the source material was collected, the database was created and the corpus of performance series was digitally processed. This was an important precondition for the systematic and qualitative investigations in all three of the project’s parts.

**A tool for ‘mapping’ opera buffa performances and visualizing opera buffa networks: Palladio**

The open access tool *Palladio* is a product of the Stanford University Humanities + Design Lab. It allows structured data to be presented in several ways: The collected geodata can be visualized with individual points on maps. For the following visualization (Figure 1) around 420 performance series of *opere buffe* in over 50 cities outside of Italy were reconstructed between 1745 and 1765. The size of the points represents the quantity of performances.

As the map clearly shows, a pronounced reception of the *opera buffa* repertoire in the German-speaking area can be detected within the period under investigation. The only counterweight to the North-East reception is Spain, where the highest number of performance series, with around 60 series given in Barcelona could be identified. Apart from the capital of Catalonia, the hotspots of the early *opera buffa* reception across the Alps, with more than 20 performance series are Prague, Amsterdam, Vienna, Dresden and Munich.

---


12 Structured data is essential for the work with *Palladio*. For the standardisation of the singer’s names the entries in Sartori (see SARTORI, 1994) are used as role models. In addition, all name variants are recorded. Of course, if GND (*Gemeinsame Normdatei*, i.e. the joint authority file of Deutsche Nationalbibliothek) provides an authority file, the respective GND-number is collected in the database not only for the personnel involved in the opera performances, but for performance places and musical material as well. For GND see online: [https://www.dnb.de/DE/Standardisierung/GND/gnd_node.html](https://www.dnb.de/DE/Standardisierung/GND/gnd_node.html), 06.12.2019.

13 Please note that the database, which delivers the geodata for the visualization with *Palladio*, is still in development. Therefore, there will still be changes in this visualization at the end of the project.
Figure 1: Opera buffa performances outside of Italy between 1745 and 1765.

*Palladio* does not only provide different possibilities to visualize maps as the filter options bring other tools to the assistance of a researcher as well. The following visualization with *Palladio* illustrates that the reception of *opera buffa* in the capital of Catalonia did not start until 1750, when Nicola Setaro was invited to perform *opere buffe* with his opera company in Spain.14 The feature timeline (Figure 2) allows users to pick out a certain period and enables us, for example, to take a closer look at the first stations of *opera buffa* reception across the Alps.

To show a third option of *Palladio* (point-to-point map view [Figure 3]) the performance places of *Orazio* from 1737 to 1765 within and outside of Italy were chosen for a visualization. In addition, contemporary maps15 can be added to present e.g. border crossings, Alpine passes or administrative districts, which is essential when it comes to the question of traveling opera troupes and their contribution to the dissemination of the operas within Europe. The starting point for the reconstruction of the dissemination in the project is always the material of the first Italian performance, in this case, the libretto of 1737 by Antonio Palomba, which was set to music by Pietro Auletta.

15 Of course, the maps have to be available in a usable electronic form and have to be geo-referenced. For example, the New York Public Library’s Map Warper application allows the creation of an interactive historical map, which can be used for the visualization with *Palladio*. See online: http://maps.nypl.org/warper/, 06.12.2019.
After the premiere Orazio was performed mainly in Northern Italy, more precisely in Lombardy and in Veneto, before it was taken up by Angelo Mingotti in 1745 to be performed firstly in Graz and afterwards in Prague and Leipzig in the same year. Already in 1749, Orazio reached its northernmost station (Copenhagen) with Pietro Mingotti’s opera company at a very early stage of opera buffa reception outside of Italy. Until 1765, the opera was given in nearly every important European metropolis where opera buffa was performed. Orazio is therefore an ideal example of the entire repertoire in terms of geographical dissemination. Of course, the performance of Orazio through Europe brought about changes in the tectonics of the original opera: for example, the role of Bettina was removed, the recitatives were shortened and arias or even entire scenes were exchanged due to different performance contexts.
With regard to the arias, the singers had an important impact on the adaptations of the operas. It is often the case that newly integrated arias can be directly connected to the change within the cast. Where such adaptations and transformations of *opere buffe* are the subject of research, it is important to record details of troupe constellations. *Palladio* again is a useful tool because it enriches the understanding of the personnel aspect of the *opera buffa* and helps to explore the whole network. In this case, the corpus of the singers who performed *Orazio* between 1737 and 1765, consists of more than 110 individuals (Figure 4).
Figure 4: The network of the Orazio singers (1737-1765).
The graph that visualizes the category “singers” in correspondence with the category “performance places” makes it clear, that about three-quarters of the performance series are linked to each other via one or more singers, making the grey nodes bigger depending on the frequency of performances of each singer. Going into detail, the mentioned troupe of Giovanni Francesco Crosa is an outstanding example of early modern theater companies and the related adventurous lives of their impresarios. His troupe was formed around 1742 in Italy – more precisely in Milan. Performances of Orazio by this troupe can be proven outside of Italy for London (1748), Brussels (1749) and Amsterdam (1750). Actually, Crosa’s troupe in London was composed out of two ensembles with top buffo singers who already had celebrated successes in Italy. The starting point for the London version of Orazio were two performances in Italy: Venice in 1743 and Milan in 1746. The latter was organized by Crosa himself. Palladio provides a filter system (“Facet Filter”) with which e.g. the personnel of troupes at certain performance places – in this case Venice, Milan and London, can be filtered (Figure 5):

In Venice, the singer couple Anna and Filippo Laschi and Eugenia Mellini Fanti sung in Orazio, in Milan, Caterina and Pietro Pertici and again Mellini Fanti can be detected. Under impresario Crosa, the five singers formed a new troupe, went to London and were joined by the castrato Gaetano Guadagni. Interestingly, the singer Mellini Fanti took part in Venice and Milan and a closer look at the London libretto shows that elements of both librettos were taken over for the performances of 1748. The texts of the arias “Alla selva al prato al rio” or “Mentre l’erbetta”, for example, can be found in all of the three textbooks. It is striking, although not surprising, that in contrast all arias for the role of Leandro differ from their predecessors. The role was taken over by Guadagni and led to the integration of new arias within Orazio. Two of them are preserved, because they are part of the print The Favourite Songs in the Opera call’d Orazio. This print shows in a particularly drastic way how strongly the musical texture of the original opera has already been shaken within the first eleven years of its performance history. Different to the London libretto, which still mentions Auletta as the only composer of the opera, there is – correctly – no reference to the Neapolitan composer in the Favourite Songs to be found. The music print represents a ‘best of’ compilation with six arias beginning with “Giovinotti d’oggi di” (composer unknown) attributed to a performance by Caterina Brogi Pertici, followed by “Pupille amabili” (Niccolò Jommeli) and “Quanto è

---

16 It has to be mentioned that on the left side of the graph one can find some performance series that are not connected to the others. For only two of them, the premiere in 1737 and the performances in Lucca in 1752, no personnel overlaps with the other performances can be identified. For another eight performance series the different casts could not be reconstructed (yet).


18 For the preserved librettos of Orazio see Appendix I.

dolce quanto è caro” (Natale Resta) both sung by Guadagni, “Alla selva al prato al rio” (Michele Fini) sung by Eugenia Mellini Fanti, “Procuri la prego” (Alessandro Macchiarì) sung by Filippo Laschi and finally “Se non sai, che cosa è amore” (Pietro Paradies) sung by Anna Quercioli Laschi. The Favourite Songs are of special importance for the research of this opera buffa in two respects: Firstly, it is currently the only musical document that proves the London performances took place. Secondly, Walsh’s compilation is an important testimony for the reception of Orazio as a pasticcio.

Figure 5: The formation of Crosa’s opera troupe for the London performances of Orazio.

After successful London performances (not only of Orazio), problems came up around Crosa and the following year Guadagni and the Pertici abandoned him. Crosa, on the other hand, became more and more involved in financial difficulties, was arrested, fled to Holland and started again performing among others Orazio in Amsterdam and Brussels with the rest of his troupe. In fall 1750, the impresario was caught by the London lenders and was imprisoned in The Hague. And his troupe? Mellini Fanti (Figure 6), who, along with the singer Caterina Brogi Pertici is most frequently to be found in Orazio performances between 1737 and 1765 (both: nine times), remained in Amsterdam for some...
years and continued to perform in *buffo* roles with the troupes of Giuseppe Giordani and Santo Lapis. With the latter, she appeared again in *Orazio* in 1753 in Amsterdam.

**Figure 6:** *Mellini Fanti’s performances of Orazio.*

Using the example of Crosa’s company, it becomes clear that most of the troupes cannot be characterized by an excessive personnel stability. One can imagine the environment of an impresario as a contact and information platform, which determined the profes-

---

sional progress of the individual singers, but also had effects on the way the *opere buffe* were adapted. The stability of troupes within a certain period of time and the individual paths of singers from one to another performance is precisely what is recorded within the project’s database.

*Figure 7: Roles of Brogi Pertici and Mellini Fanti in *Orazio*.*

*Palladio* not only visualizes connections between performance places and individual singers: with the integrated facet filter, it is possible to analyze, for example, the role stability of *Orazio* as well, as some of the singers were always touring around with the same role, like Caterina Brogi Pertici. Of all performers, she most often took the part
of Lauretta (nine times). Eugenia Mellini Fanti, on the other hand, changed roles, performed the parts of Giacomina, Lauretta and took also the male role Leandro (Figure 7).

* * *

As the case of Orazio shows, Palladio is an adequate tool to explore the geographical dissemination of opera buffa performances and the corresponding personnel network. Information on both is currently recorded on paper (e.g. librettos, newspapers or even Sartori, 1994) and can now be visualized in their network-likeness. This opens up new perspectives for qualitative studies that would otherwise not be possible because the particular connections and networks would not have been known of, such as, for example, personnel patterns or trends in the field of distribution channels that have contributed to the success of opera buffa. Particularly with regard to questions of the social history of opera buffa, Palladio helps us to look at the topic from different angles. Therefore, such data analysis and visualization make it possible to discover, for example, who were the important protagonists of the opera buffa business; who performed with whom, how often in which role, and when; and which were the cultural centers that have fertilized the success of opera buffa outside of Italy.

Geo-visualization has lately become a prominent research tool for several projects within the field of musicology.21 The work with Palladio shows that geo-visualization in the humanities can be much more than solely creating dots on a map. However, it is also important to be constantly aware of the particular ways in which specific digital tools shape our knowledge production. One of the huge challenges of the next years and decades will be to keep up a fruitful and constant dialogue between developers and researchers – and between the things we want to know and the tools provided for gaining this knowledge.

21 See for example the The Musical Geography Project, online accessible at https://musical-geography.org/about, 06.12.2019, which brings together numerous musicological projects dealing with “mapping” or the “mapping” aspect of the Verzeichnis deutscher Musik-früdrucke project (online: http://www.vdm.sbg.ac.at/db/music_prints.php?content=mapping&menu=2, 06.12.2019).
Appendix

Datable performances of *Orazio* and preserved librettos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance Place</th>
<th>Libretto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>I-Vgc, ROL.0527.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>I-Bc, Lo.06861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>I-Bc, Lo.02634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>I-Gc, B.S.Misc.A.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>US-Wc, ML50.2.067 A9 1945 (Case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>A-Gl, C 135448 I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>RUS-Mrg, Palomba / it. - 4°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>D-B, 12 in. Mus. T 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>I-Rn, 40 9 C 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>I-Rn, 40.9.F.17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>I-Mb, Racc.dramm.3597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Brescia</td>
<td>I-PLZc, C. VIII.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748/49</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>GB-Lbl, 11714.b.39.(4.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Reggio Emilia</td>
<td>I-Bc, Lo.00356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>D-MHrm, T 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>DK-Kk, 56,-381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>D-Mbs, Bavar.4015-33,24#Beibd.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>I-Bc, Lo.06863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Pesaro</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>I-Bc, Lo.00358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>D-W, 1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>D-B, Mus. T 44-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>US-CA, 011311072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Leyden</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td>I-Lg, Busta n. 19462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td>undetectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>E-BBe, C400/239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>I-Bc, Lo.06864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Performance Place</td>
<td>Libretto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>D-Mbs, Bavar.4015-32,1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>E-Bu, 07 XVIII-3346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>E-Mn, T/22353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>D-Bim, Ff 28 Aule 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>CZ-Bu, ST1-0160.626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Local Conditions of Pasticcio Production and Reception
Collaboration, Arrangement, ‘Dressing’
The Different Recipes for the
pasticcio alla napoletana in the First Half
of the 18th Century

ANGELA ROMAGNOLI

In recent years a number of projects and essays have been dedicated to the operatic pasticcio, a topic attracting increasing interest from scholars.¹ The aura of suspicion which for a long time enveloped the theme, inevitably leading to a drastic aesthetic judgement linked to the identification of exclusively commercial reasons for adaptations and impasticciamenti, and to the fragile authorship status of operas subject to these practices, has partially dissolved, and the many reasons for the phenomenon have begun to emerge more clearly, giving a picture much richer in nuance than the previous one.

The definition of “pasticcio” has been discussed on several occasions;² I will just underline here how the Neapolitan reality approaches the actual pasticcio, passing through a series of adaptation practices, alongside a small but present vein of compositional collaborations by several hands. My investigation is focused on the activities of the Palazzo Reale and the Teatro di San Bartolomeo between the last years of the 17th century and 1737, and therefore to the dramma per musica, given the fact that a large and recent essay by Paologiovanni Maione is dedicated to the commedia impasticciata of the early

¹ Lazarevich, 1976; Strohm, 1985 and 2009; Pitarresi, 2011a; the project PASTICCIO. Ways of Arranging Attractive Operas (financed by the Polish and German Research Councils – NCN and DFG), also presented in the round table The European Pasticcio in the Eighteenth Century, coordinated by Berthold Over in the context of the 18th Biennial Baroque Conference (Cremona 2018).
² In addition to the literature and the project mentioned in the previous note, for a more in-depth theoretical discussion see also Polin, 2011, and Thomas Betzwieser, in this volume pp. 27-43 (also for further bibliographical suggestions).
18th century; however, I do not exclude a few episodes outside the box, for example regarding the Teatro dei Fiorentini when it proposes serious repertoire, or in the comic realm if useful to the present context.

The term “pasticcio” does not appear in the period I am dealing with, although it is clear that the concept and the practice is present in Naples in the early 18th century: the music of some operas was, to say it *alla napoletana*: “a mixed salad of different virtuosos, in which someone has put an aromatic herb, someone a flower” where “the poet put salt in it, the impresario vinegar and oil”; as in other operatic centers of the time, they lived together peacefully with more or less invasive adaptations, *ex novo* compositional collaborations, and entirely original scores. I therefore think it is important to look at the boiling cauldron of 17th- and early 18th-century adaptations as a sort of laboratory experimenting with the potential of an increasingly modular structure, such as the one the opera then was taking on, to open itself up to additions, variations, replacements and cuts. With this training, the transition to the pasticcio was a natural step. At the same time, it is useful to maintain a certain distinction and not to use the term “pasticcio” for any kind of manipulation, because from the point of view of creative responsibilities (including those of the impresarios) the differences between the different types of interventions exist and have a relevance.

The Neapolitan *modus operandi* of the period and of the repertoire we are considering does not abuse the ‘true’ pasticcio: the works consisting entirely or almost entirely of pre-existing material are few in number. On the contrary, the habit of adapting the works to a specific context is very regular, partly the result of the need to ‘neapolitanize’ texts born elsewhere to enhance local resources and habits and to give space to local craftsmen, be they poets, musicians, set designers or singers. The musical adaptations were mostly assigned to the staff of the Real Cappella: the Neapolitan elaborations are not the work of secondary composers, but of the top levels of the most prestigious musical institution in the city, inserted in an impresarial system as far as production is concerned, but always linked to the court. Looking at the repertoire as a whole, we can speak of a strong ‘workshop’ imprint, a work aimed at impressing a well-defined mark on texts and scores from outside, conducted according to tried and tested methods within a system in which each of the players, from the impresario to the singers, passing through librettists, musicians and set designers, contributed to making the dish attractive to Neapolitan palates.

---

3 Maione, 2011.
4 *Lo castello sacchejato*, Naples 1732: “La Museca è na nzalata mescata de paricchie Vertuluse, addò chi ng’ha posta n’eversciolla addorosa, e chi no shiorillo” where “lo Poeta ng’ha puosto lo ssale, e lo Mpressareo ‘acito, e l’uoglio”.
5 I am happy to refer to the considerations of Strohm’s fundamental essay on Handelian pasticcios: “In cases where an arranger modified an already existing opera by making additions that were exclusively his own, we should speak rather of an ‘adaptation’, since here again the numbers appear roughly in the same connection for which they were originally designed” (Strohm, 1985, p. 164).
Compared to similar but more commercial initiatives (perhaps in small provincial theaters) or to the composite panorama of the Venetian scene, where, apart from the obvious analogy due to the operatic genre-statute, each theater could propose its own strategy, the centralized production of *drammi per musica* between the court and the theater of San Bartolomeo certainly favored a specific routine, the stability of the actors in the processes of production, adaptation, collaboration and *impasticciamento*, and some distinctive features.

In the following pages we will look at some examples for different categories of multi-handed works, from typical late 17th-century adaptations to real 18th-century pasticcio, to trace a path that goes from a practice of adaptive re-composition of sections of imported scores, the authorship of which is normally attributable to a local composer who put his signature next to that of the original author, to ‘anthological’ scores, in which the identification of the authors must be made on the basis of individual arias and the responsibility for the combination may also fall on figures other than composers. In the field of *dramma per musica* in Naples this combinatorial practice does not seem linked only to commercial production needs but also to the tacit desire (of singers, impresarios and composers themselves, as we will see) to offer the public the best arias available on the market: so much so that the occasions to propose pasticcios are very often the festivities linked to the viceroy, the Habsburgs, or, later, the Bourbon royal family.

A very short remark on librettos

An issue not to be dealt with here because of its too broad implications is that of librettos. However, it is necessary to mention that in 18th-century Naples the practice was common of first rearranging all the operatic poetic text, which very often came from other stages, in some cases in homogeneous waves related to political events, to the mobility of particular impresarios or singers, or to the wish to perform on the Neapolitan stage particularly successful works. A very large proportion of the librettos staged in Naples resulted from adaptations, rewritings, shortenings, sometimes made by several hands. Adopting a broad definition of “pasticcio” which also applies to the poetic text, it may be said that almost the entire 18th-century Neapolitan production of *drammi per musica* belongs to this category. On the other hand, this practice finds in Naples its justification not only in the need to quickly and cost-effectively respond to the demand for new productions, as well as in the obvious and in some cases explicit pragmatic reason to shorten and to change the original drama for the performer’s benefit, but also in the need to imprint the brand of a particular workshop, as we have just mentioned, whose most visible feature in the early 18th century is the inclusion of comic characters even in the serious textures of the drama and their organization in *scene buffe* that are, to all intents and purposes, *intermezzi*. The

---

7 In this same volume, Betzwieser also highlights the mixed nature of many operatic texts (pp. 31-33).

outcome is a theatricality perhaps little rational but rich in contrasts and parodistic potential and clearly pleasing to the audience, both of the court and of the theater.

We have repeatedly stated that textual adaptation in new performances is connatural to the operatic genre of the period in question. In general, therefore, the Neapolitan milieu does not present significant peculiarities from the literary point of view, except for the persistence of a taste for the mixture of serious and comic, even when in other operatic production centers the clear distinction between drama and intermezzi was by now opted for. However, the study of the adaptation of the librettos does not exhaust the theme of the possible specificity of the Neapolitan interventions on imported works: the question of the adaptation of the scores remains open, but unfortunately it is often destined to remain pending due to the deficient situation of the sources. But it is mainly there that we should look for the ‘neapolitanity’ of the elaborations.

**Compositional collaboration and adaptation**

Compositional collaboration and adaptation are two areas in which we find the sharing of authorship without, however, the use of pre-existing material characteristic of pasticchos. Therefore, they cannot be ascribed to that category but represent a contiguous terrain, possibly providing a kind of training for the combinatorial practice of the pasticcio.

We dedicate only a few lines to the collaboration, just to refer to a few cases and to mention some titles. Collaborations of this kind are not a quantitatively important presence; nevertheless, they are interesting also because operas made by several hands are often proposed on relevant occasions and the realization is entrusted to the best composers available; it is therefore certainly a way to save time but does not necessarily come at a lesser financial cost. We might just recall the *Engelberta* by Antonio Orefice and Francesco Mancini (text by Zeno-Pariati revised by Giovanni Papis) for the name day of Charles III (later Charles VI) of Habsburg at the Royal Palace in 1709, where the two composers split the score in two halves. Or *Demofoonte* by Mancini, Sarro, Leo and Sellitti, for the birthday of Charles III of Bourbon (Teatro San Bartolomeo, 1735); or, in another context, *L’Elmira generosa* (Teatro Nuovo 1753), in which the impresario Pietro Trinchera declares to have divided the score between Nicola Logroscino and Manuele Barbella so that the music would be excellent. Therefore in the collaborations we find both attention

---

9 Not by chance, perhaps, this is more evident when Naples came under Habsburg rule: Vienna is another important stage where the taste for tragicommedia is evident, so much that it was cultivated as a true subgenre of dramma per musica.


11 I dealt with *Demofoonte* in a specific essay (Romagnoli, 2011), to which I refer for every detail and for an example of compositional collaboration; on that occasion I used the term “pasticcio” in defining this opera, but today maybe I would not use it.

to the compliance with the time limits and production needs and to the quality of the outcome, elements in common with pasticcios; nevertheless, the music composed from scratch, with full awareness of the authors in relation to the overall project, distinguishes these operations from the patchwork sewn together from pre-existing material.

Adaptations and arrangements are such a recurrent element that they can be considered structural; unfortunately, the dispersion of many scores, the incomplete state of many sources or the lack of certain attributions, problems that afflict both the corpus of the original works and that of the re-elaborations, make it hard to really deepen the topic. The librettos frequently state the authorship of the revisions, but fieldwork shows that they are often inaccurate and their apparent clarity in fact conceals more complex situations. As an example, let’s take a very successful opera of the late 17th century, *Tito Manlio* by Matteo Noris.

First staged at Pratolino in 1696, resumed in Venice in 1697 and then in Naples in 1698, proposed in several other theaters to return to Naples in 1720 and then continue its life on stage until the late 18th century, *Tito Manlio* is an interesting and well documented case. In Naples, the adaptation of an adaptation was staged, since the Venetian libretto is an explicit revision of the Pratolino text; in the dedication to the vicereine Duchess of Medinaceli, the publisher Michele Luigi Mutio remembers both previous productions, but is silent on the adaptation. The composer is not mentioned; according to the musical sources, however, the music is considered to be by Carlo Francesco Pollarolo (composer of the Venetian score) with adaptations and additions by Luigi Mancia. We have three scores to clear the relationship between the Venetian and Neapolitan *Tito Manlio*, plus a few single numbers. The manuscripts correspond to the Venetian version, to the Neapolitan one and to the *buffo* scenes of the latter.

---

13 Various librettos and collections of arias are preserved; the texts used for comparison here are: *Tito Manlio. Drama per musica rappresentato nella villa di Pratolino*, Florence 1696 (copy in CZ-Pu); *Tito Manlio. Drama per Musica. Da rappresentarsi nel famosissimo Teatro di S. Giovanni Grisostomo. L'anno 1697*, Venice 1697 (copy in I-Rn); *Tito Manlio. Dramma per musica del sig. Matteo Nores [Noris?]*, Naples 1698 (copy I-Rn and GB-Lbl).

14 D-SWl, Mus.49, anonymous, ascribable to Pollarolo; concordant in large part, but not perfectly, with the Venetian libretto of 1697; according to Strohm, 1976, vol. 2, p. 200, it could refer to a Venetian revival of 1698. This version also matches some surviving single arias.

15 I-Nc, Rari 6.5.11, an anthology of arias for voice and basso continuo, matches the 1698 Neapolitan libretto. It is annotated with numerous remarks by the librarian Francesco Rondinella, unfortunately misleading, indicating the presence of arias by Ignazio Prota, involved in the Neapolitan *Tito Manlio* of 1720. Rondinella clearly did not know the 17th-century libretto and this generated a series of inconsistencies.

16 D-DI, Mus.1-F-39,2 (fols. 149v-176r [pp. 298-351]), a full score collection with recitatives and closed numbers of ten sets of scene buffe (in the uniform title of the manuscript defined as “intermezzi”). At fol. 149v we find authorship and origin of the pieces clearly expressed: at the left top margin we read “Scene Buffe Breno / e Zelta / del Tito, e Manlio” and at the
In Pratolino we find only one comic character, Lindo “servant of Vitellia”, who becomes Breno in Venice. In Naples, Breno is joined by Zelta “nurse of Servilia”; the two are the protagonists of the scenes added in I,6, I,15 (with a scenery ad hoc, a “grove”), II,6, II,19, III,9. Breno appears in several scenes next to Vitellia; instead, apart from the scene buffe Zelta has only a small role in scene I,13 (which precedes the deadly duel between Geminio and Manlio), where she comments on the events with single recitative verses or distichs.

The presence of a score, even if incomplete, of the Venetian Tito Manlio and of a large anthology of the Neapolitan one allows us to check the musical adaptation, in many cases impossible for lack of sources; however, this is not the place for a detailed comparison: I just quickly summarize the results. The whole buffe parts are frankly Neapolitan and can be precisely reconstructed thanks to the Dresden manuscript. Otherwise, the collation between librettos and scores points out that the music of the arias is often different even if the poetic text is maintained, whereas the lack of indications in the libretto leads us to think of a more faithful reprise of Pollaro’s score; assuming that Mancia was actually the composer of all modifications and not only of the scene buffe, the Neapolitan Tito is much more his own than the mere collation of the poetic text made us suspect. If this modus operandi was the common practice, or at least if it was quite widespread, much can still be discovered of the real relationships between the Venetian scores (or Roman ones, or the ones coming from other centers) and the Neapolitan scores, until now considered mainly on the basis of the indications in the librettos.

**Pasticcios**

Despite some important contributions, the field of the Neapolitan pasticcio of the early 18th century is still little explored: the widespread lack of scores, the inaccuracies or silences of the librettos, the complexity of the network of responsibilities that connects singers, impresarios, librettists, musicians and patrons make it still at times impervious. After 1710, pasticcios began to be identified as such (although the term doesn’t yet appear in the sources): the roles played by singers and impresarios became more evident, even if the questions of authorship of the individual arias could not always be resolved definitively and to full satisfaction.

Between 1710 and 1736, the Neapolitan seria scene offers only a few works that are presented as pasticcios (with music “by different authors”/“di diversi autori”) or

17 In spite of the obvious need to revise data decades later, STROHM, 1976, pp. 266-285 is still essential. For its specificity is also important Pitarresi, 2011b, who provides a list of pasticcios.
that are unequivocally such, including the *drammi per musica* staged at the Teatro dei Fiorentini:¹⁸

- **Il comando non inteso et ubbidito** (Silvani/?Giuvo), Fiorentini, May 1713 (Gasparrini, Lotti, Orlandini, D. Scarlatti)
- **Eumene** (Zeno/?), San Bartolomeo 1715 (Gasparrini, Leo, Orlandini, Ristori, Vivaldi)
- **Il duello di Amore e di Vendetta** (Silvani/?), San Bartolomeo 1715 (Feo, Ziani and various unidentified)
- **Merope** (Zeno/?), Palazzo Reale 1716
- **Lucio Papirio** (Zeno), San Bartolomeo 1717 (Gasparrini, Orlandini, Feo)
- **Rinaldo** (Rossi/?), San Bartolomeo 1718 (Bononcini, Gasparrini, Handel, Leo, Orlandini, Porta)¹⁹
- **La fortezza al cimento** (Silvani/?), San Bartolomeo 1721 (Mancini)²⁰
- **Arianna e Teseo** (Pariati/Saddumene), San Bartolomeo 1721 and 1722 (A. Bononcini, Leo, Orlandini, Porpora, Vivaldi)
- **Bajazete imperador de’ Turchi** (Piovene/Saddumene), Palazzo Reale 1722 (Gasparrini, Leo, Porpora)
- **Turno Aricino** (S. Stampiglia/L.M. Stampiglia), San Bartolomeo 1724 (Albinoni, Cappelli, Chelleri, Giacomelli, Leo, Lotti, Porpora, Scarlatti, Vinci)
- **Stratonica** (Salvi/De Palma), San Bartolomeo 1727 (Orlandini, Porpora, Porta, Vinci, Vivaldi)
- **Siface** (Metastasio/?), San Bartolomeo 1734 (Giacomelli, Hasse, Porpora, Porta, Sellitti)

The Neapolitan *Ciro* from 1716, repeatedly classified as a pasticcio following Reinhard Strohm’s hypothesis,²² in my opinion should, according to the evidence we have today, be attributed exclusively to Domenico Sarro, as indicated in the libretto preserved in a single copy in Parma.²³ The comparison with Scarlatti’s *Ciro* performed in Rome in...
1712, of which libretto and score are still preserved, confirms the mismatch between the two texts; the arias in the manuscript GB-Lbl, Add. 31515 reported by Strohm do not match the 1716 libretto; the list of singers has only one element in common, Senesino, who in Rome sang the role of Arsace while in Naples that of the protagonist. On the contrary, the anonymous Merope of the same year could perhaps be a pasticcio. Strohm considers it one of Sarro’s dubious works on the basis of an aria in the pasticcio Elpidia (1725) stemming from the 1716 Merope; the libretto in I-Bu bears a handwritten annotation that attributes the opera to Orlandini (citing also the Milanese performance, again attributed to Orlandini) with Leo’s adaptations, and indicates Giovanni Papis for the re-elaboration of Zeno’s text; Franco Mancini (and several scholars with him) considers it Scarlattian (but the work does not even appear among the doubtful works in the Scarlatti article in the New Grove); in her precious essay on Zeno’s Merope Francesca Menchelli-Buttini is silent on the authorship of this production, for lack of objective data. This opera is therefore a good candidate to increase the number of pasticcios in the years we are considering, and would deserve to be investigated further.

Among the works listed above only a few have been focused on by scholars and, to my knowledge, only Turno Aricino has been the subject of a specific essay. Rinaldo was the subject of a recent reconstruction that attempted to attribute the authorship of several arias; a brief discussion of Arianna e Teseo appears in the appendix to an essay on Porpora. Here, I will focus on three titles in the list, representing different moments and situations and which are also useful for pointing out the research paths that open up by digging into the repertoire of pasticcios (declared, confirmed or concealed): Il ico Sarro”, without any indication of either adaptation or reuse of previous texts (which, however, can never be completely excluded: the trunks of the singers certainly struggled to remain closed even in the presence of a robust compositional authorship).

29 PITARRESI, 2011b.
30 For an overview of the Neapolitan Rinaldo see EHLMANN-HERFORT, 2011. The reconstruction, available on CD and DVD, was presented at the 44th Festival della Valle D’Itria (13 July-4 August 2018). The editor of the performance score, Giovanni Andrea Sechi, has not yet published an essay on the subject, but his reconstruction work is outlined both in the festival program notes, in the CD and DVD booklets, and in some online materials, first of all the daily operatic information Opera Click that dedicated ample space to the reconstructed Rinaldo: http://www.operaclick.com/specials/deeps-merito-al-rinaldo-napoletano-saggio-di-giovanni-andrea-sechi-interview-di, 20.08.2019.
31 SECHI, 2018, pp. 259-263.
comando non inteso ed ubbidito of the 1710s (the first on the list), the *Stratonica* of the 1720s, and *Siface* of the 1730s (the last on the list).

As it is presented in the libretto, which as we will immediately see makes no mention of the presence of arias by different authors, *Il comando non inteso ed ubbidito* at first glance seems to belong more to the category of adaptation than to that of pasticcio; it is sufficient, however, to dig a little below the surface to realize that it is fully within the scope of the latter.

The address to the “generous reader” (“Generoso lettore”) points out that the “drama” (i.e. the poetic text) has been changed in comparison to the original and that the added *scene buffe* have been composed by Sarro; it does not mention the authors of other adaptations, although they are numerous. The Neapolitan setting is based on the Venetian production of February 1710 (1709 *more veneto*, text by Silvani, music by Lotti); a copy of the libretto in I-Bu presents handwritten notes that match the cuts and – less regularly – the additions to be found in the Neapolitan version. Strohm indicates Nicolò Giuvo as the adaptor of the text and, even if in very general terms, hypothesizes Sarro’s intervention in the adaptations or in the new composition of the serious arias, something that cannot be excluded but, at the same time, cannot be accepted without perplexity, since the possible interventions of the authors of the comic scenes in the serious fabric of the drama were usually pointed out.

Overall, the work presents few real differences in the vocal range of the characters, except for the replacement of Leone (captain of the imperial guards, played by the contralto castrato Giuliano Albertini) with the *buffo* Frullo, performed by the bass Giovanni Battista Cavana accompanied by Spilletta, the soprano Livia Nannini. However, the *buffo* roles are interwoven with the drama, often even intervening in scenes which were originally monologues of the serious characters; in addition to the *scene buffe* as intermezzi, therefore, we have a comic ‘stuffing’ that requires a conspicuous adaptation of the recitative. The *scene buffe* added from scratch are six (I,11, II,9, II,17, III,5, III,12), to which are added six scenes in which the *buffi* interact with the serious characters (I,9-10, 12-13, 17; II,6, 8; III,2, 9-10, 14-15). Some scenes are cut to give space to comic interventions or as a result of the elimination of Leone’s role. The recitative is shortened and, in some cases, like the passage of lines from Leone to Frullo, modified in a comic direction, as exemplified by the few comparable lines to the beginning of III,13:

---

The only role that requires an adaptation of the vocal register is Isacio, performed by the bass Giuseppe Maria Boschi in Venice and by the tenor Gaetano Borghi in Naples; otherwise the Neapolitan company could have easily resumed the Venetian score, but evidently this was not the case, given the number of arias replaced and added. Together with Isacio, the other two main characters, Zoe (the soprano Angiola Augusti) and Costantino (the castrato Antonio Archi, Cortoncino), present considerable interventions compared to the Venetian version; minor but not irrelevant is the incidence of changes for the roles of Teodora (the soprano Maria Maddalena Tibaldi), Argiro (the bass Giovanni Paolo di Domenico) and Maniace (the contralto specialized in male roles Silvia Lodi). In light of the observations on *Tito Manlio*, it is difficult to say to what extent the maintenance of the text necessarily entails the adoption of Lotti’s setting without variations. The following table summarizes the situation, and gives an account of the added or replaced arias that can be identified with relative certainty even in the absence of a score:

_Table 1: Il comando non inteso ed ubbidito: the Neapolitan version compared with the Venetian one_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>A,S</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Repl.</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Origin or Concordance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isacio</td>
<td>Più a penar non mi condanna</td>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>La fede tradita e vendicata</em>, Rome 1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atterrate, disoroccate</td>
<td>I,12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Par di Zeffiro soave</td>
<td>I,15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verrò mia stella</td>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Già vicino è il mio contento</td>
<td>II,15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ho costanza, ho cuor si forte</td>
<td>III,13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Incipit</td>
<td>A,S</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Repl.</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>Origin or Concordance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Ne la calma degl’affetti</td>
<td>I,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D’un tiranno ch’ac-carezzi</td>
<td>I,8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ifigenia in Tauri, Rome 1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ombra errante del caro mio sposo</td>
<td>I,14</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deh dipingi me fedele</td>
<td>II,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passo di pena in pena</td>
<td>II,4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ifigenia in Tauri, Rome 1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cieco amore e cieco sdegno</td>
<td>II,10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giustino?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volere di stella</td>
<td>III,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il cor più non sente</td>
<td>III,10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costantino</td>
<td>Mi sento nel seno</td>
<td>I,10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publio Cornelio Scipione, Rome 1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nacqui vassallo, il so</td>
<td>I,13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agitato in alto mar</td>
<td>II,5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amor tirannico, Rome 1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S’io so levarti un trono</td>
<td>II,7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Di speranza una lusinga</td>
<td>III,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per me / non v’è / timore</td>
<td>III,4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amor tirannico, Rome 1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parto o cara e lascio il core [a 2?]</td>
<td>III,11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teodora</td>
<td>Tu non m’intendi, il so</td>
<td>I,9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nel tuo bel volto</td>
<td>I,15</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un non so che mi sento</td>
<td>II,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non gli do certa speranza</td>
<td>II,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice 1710, I,12, adapted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sin, che non scocca</td>
<td>III,4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanne, pugna, e ’l tuo valore [a 2?]</td>
<td>III,11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maniace</td>
<td>Bella gara occhi amorosi</td>
<td>I,4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice 1710: “Bella gara è di splendore”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dentro al campo di quest’alma</td>
<td>I,16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veggo impresso nel tuo volto</td>
<td>II,1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verrò per ubbidirti</td>
<td>II,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dirò ch’ellè un’ingrata</td>
<td>II,15</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ho diviso il cor, è vero</td>
<td>III,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vi vendica begli’occhi il mio tormento</td>
<td>III,9</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argiro</td>
<td>Amor sdegnato / s’è vendicato</td>
<td>I,8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedo a destra più felice</td>
<td>III,8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The identified arias come from previous Roman productions:34

- **La fede tradita e vendicata** (Silvani/?Capece – ?Gasparini/?Orlandini), Rome, Capranica 1712: Borghi sang Rodoaldo, Archi Vitige; Cavana acted in the *intermezzi* *Madama Dulcinea e il cuoco*. Isacio’s aria is a parody of Rodoaldo’s: “Sino a questo ne condanna” (I,2).
- **L’Amor tirannico** (Lalli/? – Gasparini/Orlandini), Rome, Capranica 1713: Archi sang Radamisto, Cavana Delfo in the *intermezzi*. Cortoncino’s aria matches Radamisto’s aria (III,12); “Per me / non v’è / timore” is a very clear parody of Polissena’s “Per me / non v’è / chi parli” (I,12).35
- **Ifigenia in Tauri** (Capece – D. Scarlatti), Rome, palazzo Zuccari 1713: both arias had been sung by Ifigenia, respectively in I,3 and II,2.
- **Giustino**: the case is more complex. Zoe’s aria is found in various librettos of Giustino, but not in Bologna 1711, where Augusti sang the role of Eufemia.36 I just record the coincidence.

Considering the content of the pasticcio *Il comando non inteso*, there are several elements of interest. In *primis*, it is clear that while the Neapolitan librettos were often (but not always) taken over from the Venetian stages, the same cannot be said of the music: in the case we are examining, for example, there is a substantial Roman contribution. In addition, the role of the singers is beginning to become evident: it is not by chance that Borghi, Archi (and Cavana) were part of the same troupe in Rome and that the added and substituted arias identified come from their *bauli*, or, as in the case of Polissena’s aria, from the appropriation of presumably very effective arias of other roles in operas which they had sung. Moreover, the presence of the two Ifigenia arias sung by Augusti opens up an interesting perspective on the cast of Domenico Scarlatti’s *Ifigenia in Tauri* (and perhaps also of the previously given *Ifigenia in Aulide*?), whose singers are un-

---

34 For data relating to the authorship of text and music not reported in the librettos cf. Francchi, 1997, pp. 87-100; however, it should be remarked that the attributions of the Roman versions are often, if not always, conjectural.

35 In Rome, Polissena had been performed by the castrato Francesco Natale; the aria concluded the beautiful solo scene.

36 The aria does not even appear in the *Aggiunta d’arie nuove nell’opera del Giustino*, Bologna 1711 (I-1E). It is found instead as an aria for Arianna (I,14) in *Giustino* librettos for Bologna 1691 and 1692, Lucca 1694 and Modena 1697; we do not know the singer names for these performances, but Augusti seems to have begun her career after the early years of the 18th century (1706 is the first attestation in a libretto according to Sartori’s singer index); moreover, the recovery of an aria from the late 17th century in 1713 is musically totally unlikely.
known. We have no evidence of Augusti’s activity immediately before the Neapolitan engagement in 1713: her presence is documented only in two performances in 1712. At the same time, we do not know the performers who were active at the private theater of Maria Casimira of Poland in the 1713 season; if Augusti brought the two arias to Naples, we can assume that she was the performer in the Roman opera, and with this we would add a small piece to the knowledge of the stage of the Ex-Queen of Poland.

*Il comando non inteso ed ubbidito* is therefore fully added to the list of Neapolitan pasticcios of the period and shows with great clarity that when the sources are not very explicit on the details of adaptation and authorship, it is always appropriate to question the possibility that we are encountering a pasticcio.

About 15 years later, pasticcios had made their way to the San Bartolomeo opera house; the impresario Angelo Carasale staged *Stratonica*, recovering an old libretto by Antonio Salvi (Florence 1707), but radically refreshing the aria stock with a robust insertion of elements from other librettos plus texts composed *ex novo* by Carlo de Palma. The address to the “most considerable reader” (“Discretissimo lettore”) declares:

“[...] If this drama comes to you different from its first being, this was done to accommodate it to the actors, to whom liberty was left to put on arias for their satisfaction, and these are all marked with the asterisk *, the others were written *ex novo*, not out of disregard for its eminent author, but only to please the genius of the performers, and this has been done by Sig. Carlo de Palma, who had all the veneration for the erudite pen of the aforementioned first Author.”

Therefore, the composite nature of the work and the contribution of the performers are proclaimed *apertis verbis*: the “genius of the performers” seems to be here the pasticchio’s *raison d’être*. The arias coming from the vocal baggage of the performers (marked with an asterisk) need to be identified: the Neapolitan libretto is silent on the authorship

---

37 *Alarico* (text by Silvani?, music by Albinoni), Piacenza, carnival 1712, and *Peribea in Salamina* (music by Pollarolo), Vicenza, May 1712 (Cavana performed in the *intermezzi*).

38 STROHM, 1976, vol. 2, p. 283, brings the libretto back to Zeno’s and Pariati’s *Antioco* (first performance Venice 1705), but the recitative is clearly derived from Salvi’s Florentine libretto; even a comparison with a Venetian *Seleuco* of 1725, derived from Zeno’s *Antioco* and chronologically the closest to the Neapolitan *Stratonica*, gives a negative result, if not for some occasional concordance of individual verses. MARKSTROM, 2007, p. 201, re-proposes Strohm’s hypotheses.

39 “[...] Se diverso dal suo primo essere, ti verrà sotto l’occhio, il presente Drama, sappi, che si è fatto per meglio accomodarsi agli Attori, a libertà de quali s’è lasciato il poner l’arie a loro sodisfazione, e sono tutte quelle contrasegnate con il presente asterisco * l’altre si sono fatte di pianta, non già per pregiudicare il suo Degnissimo Autore; ma sol per incontrare il genio de Rappresentanti, e questo si è fatto dal Sig. Carlo de Palma, il quale ha avuta tutta la venerazione alla erudita penna del detto primo Autore.” *Stratonica*, Naples 1727, p. 4.
of the score at all (and consequently also on that of the individual airs). Logically speaking, recitatives and arias without an asterisk should have their own author, presumably a homogeneous one, but he is not mentioned. Strohm proposed to attribute recitatives and unmarked arias to Vinci, supported by some surviving arias (in the absence, it seems, of other documents); the hypothesis has been accepted by all subsequent scholars.  

Characters and performers are as follows:

Seleuco re dell’Assiria: Antonio Barbieri (tenor)
Antioco suo figlio: Carlo Scalzi (soprano)
Stratonica promessa sposa di Seleuco: Maria Giustina Turcotti (soprano)
Arsinoe Principessa nipote di Seleuco: Barbara Stabile (soprano)
Tigrane principe confidente d’Antioco: Anna Bagnolesi (contralto)
Intermezzi: Madama Vesperetta e D. Valasco (Celeste Resse, soprano, and Gioachino Corrado, bass)

Once again, a table helps to have an overall view of the opera (the arias marked in the libretto in bold):

Table 2: Strattonica: origin of the arias and musical sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/S</th>
<th>Singer: Character</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Origin and musical sources</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Barbieri: Seleuco</td>
<td>Vedi lo scoglio in mar</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Partial concordance with Tullo Ostilio, Prague 1727, II,3: Curazio, “Sarò qual scoglio in mar”; however, no elements of contact with Barbieri or with the Neapolitan Stratonica have emerged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>Scalzi: Antioco</td>
<td>Dirti vorrei qual sia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>Barbieri: Seleuco</td>
<td>Con tuoi prieghi, e con l’impero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 Strohm, 1976, vol. 2, p. 283; Markstrom, 2007, p. 201, also lists Strattonica as one of Vinci’s pasticcios, apparently based only on Strohm’s attribution. Neapolitan Avvisi do not help us either, as they are silent for the period of time we are interested in. The attribution of the entire work to Vinci, but with an earlier date (1719 or 1720) has ancient roots: it appears in the Neapolitan historical bibliography, starting with Sigismondo, 2016, p. 164.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/S</th>
<th>Singer: Character</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Origin and musical sources</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.7</td>
<td>Turcotti: Stratonica</td>
<td>Plange la lontananza</td>
<td>Isacio Tiranno, Livorno 1725 (anonymous), Pulcheria (Turcotti) L2 US-Wc, M1505. V64 A 4: ascribed to Vinci; in the margin “Sig.ra Giustina Turcotti” (RISM 108487). D-B, Mus.ms.30208, previously attributed to Hasse and now to Vinci (RISM 455032611).</td>
<td>In Arianna imperatrice d’Oriente (pasticcio?, Palermo 1726), Turcotti sang “Gode la rondinella” which has the same metric-rhythmic scheme, is compatible from an expressive point of view and could be a parody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9</td>
<td>Stabili: Arsinoe</td>
<td>Un lampo solo / Di due bei lumi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/10</td>
<td>Turcotti: Stratonica</td>
<td>Fuggi dagl’occhi miei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11</td>
<td>Scalzi: Antioco</td>
<td>Quel nocchier, ch’il suo naviglio</td>
<td>The text matches the aria sung by Bartolomeo Bartoli in Ormisda, Bologna 1722, II,15, and Alessandro Severo, Milan 1723, II,14, both by Orlandini.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERMEZZO 1**

| II.6 | Scalzi: Antioco | T’inganna il tuo pensier | Il trionfo della virtù, Venice 1724, Cornelia (Faustina Bordoni) II,2 | Scalzi sang Elio and Barbieri Silla. |
| II.7 | Stabili: Arsinoe | Vaghe luci, luci belle | Vivaldi, Ipermestra 1727, Linneo (Lucia Lanzetti) I,1 | RV Anh. 124; Stabili sang Delmiro. |
| II.8 | Bagnolesi: Tigrane | Priva del caro sposo | | |
| II.9 | Barbieri: Seleuco | Nave altera, che in mezzo all’onde | Vinci, Gismondo re di Polonia, Rome 1727, Primislaio (Barbieri) I,8 I-Re, 2513 | Cfr. GIALDRONI, 2005, pp. 308, 321, 329 |
| II.11 | Bagnolesi: Tigrane | Ape amorosa / Fugge, e disprezza | Porta, Siroe re di Persia, Florence 1726, Siroe (Carestini) I,4 | Bagnolesi sang Emira. |
| II.13 | Scalzi/Turcotti A2 Antioco/Stratonica | A: Parto si mia cara addio | | |
Stratonica is a pasticcio that, on the basis of a fairly solid dramatic structure due to Salvi’s original, musically seems to have no other common thread than the comfort of the actors denounced by the aforementioned address to the reader. Without a complete score it is, however, impossible to really evaluate the musical choices, but at least on paper the arias are a series of pearls of a certain value; nevertheless, no particular strategy is recognized in the selection. The origin, contrary to what was seen in Il comando non inteso, is quite varied and the singers generally reproduce arias sung by themselves in other productions (with due exceptions). The attribution to Vinci of the arias written from scratch seems to be confirmed by the surviving musical sources, as well as by the tradition that attributed the entire work to the Calabrian composer. Stratonica was not set up for special occasions, but is part of the usual theatrical routine of San Bartolomeo: perhaps this is a reason that may have led to the use of a pasticcio form similar to that widespread in other operatic centers, simply to meet the pressing production needs.

The third example, Metastasio’s Siface, dated to the end of the San Bartolomeo era (closed in 1737, with the opening of the new Teatro San Carlo), was performed in December 1734; it constitutes a different case from the previous ones but equally significant, and shows how over the years the attitude towards pasticcios was more and more explicit. From a political point of view Naples had just undergone an important change: the Kingdom passed from the Habsburgs to the Bourbons, punctually reflected in the dedications and calendars (except that the coincidence in name between the Habsburg emperor and the Bourbon king gave continuity to the tradition of celebrating the name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/S</th>
<th>Singer: Character</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Origin and musical sources</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II,1</td>
<td>Scalzi: Antioco</td>
<td>Serba fede, al bene amato</td>
<td>Stratonica, Flavio Antonino Olibrio, Florence 1723, Olibrio (Scalzi) I,10 Porpora, Damiro e Pittia, Munich 1724, Damiro (Scalzi) III,5</td>
<td>The aria appears in a Componimento per musica by Giovanni Bernardino Pontici performed for Christmas 1721 in Rome, Palazzo Apostolico, music by Orlandini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Stabili: Arsinoe</td>
<td>All’or ch’è più fiera</td>
<td>?Pasticcio, Mariane, Florence 1726, Tolomeo (Bagnolesi) I,14 ?Porpora, La Verità nell’inganno, Livorno 1727, Attalo (Bagnolesi) I,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>Bagnolesi: Tigrane</td>
<td>Si confonde quel nocchiero</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Scalzi: Antioco</td>
<td>In sen più non scintilla</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Turcotti: Stratonica</td>
<td>Nell’ardor di questo core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Barbieri: Seleuco</td>
<td>La sorte tiranna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,ult</td>
<td>TUTTI</td>
<td>Brilla e gode in seno il core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
day on 4 November). Siface, dedicated to King Charles of Bourbon, was staged on 4 December for his sister-in-law’s birthday; in the dedication, the impresario Salvatore Notarnicola makes explicit reference to the “heroic feelings of Viriate” (“eroici sentimenti di Viriate”) and his virtues, which also “adorn” (“adornano”) the celebrated princess of Asturias.

The text had been circulating for about ten years and had its first performance in the same theater, in 1723,41 but very little of the original arias remains in our pasticcio. A remark in the libretto at the end of the cast list allows us to attribute the score: “The music of both the Drama and the Intermezzi is by Signor Giuseppe Sellitti, Neapolitan Chapel Master, except for some arias of different Authors, marked with an asterisk *”.

The score and at least one copy of the libretto have survived; we are therefore able to identify the insertions with greater certainty.42 The cast was very impressive:

Siface: Gaetano Majorano (Caffarelli) (soprano)
Viriate: Giustina Turcotti (soprano)
Erminio: Maria Marta Monticelli (soprano)
Ismene: Catarina Fumagalli (soprano)
Orcano: Francesco Tolve (tenor)
Libanio: Margherita Chimenti (soprano)

Intermezzi: Lesbina: Laura Monti (soprano); Sempronio: Gioachino Corrado (bass)

The arias marked with an asterisk and their origin are evidenced in the following list:

Table 3: Siface: origin of the marked arias

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>Viriate</td>
<td>Mi vuoi dividere / il cor dal petto</td>
<td>Porpora, Annibale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/4</td>
<td>Siface</td>
<td>Se tu mi vuoi felice</td>
<td>Hasse, Siroe re di Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/5</td>
<td>Ismene</td>
<td>Mio cor non sospirar</td>
<td>doubtful: Fiorillo? Giacomelli?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/3</td>
<td>Ismene</td>
<td>Ride il ciel per me sereno</td>
<td>Hasse, Siroe re di Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/4</td>
<td>Siface</td>
<td>Ti parli nel seno</td>
<td>Porta, Farnace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 Siface is a radical revision by Metastasio (published anonymously) of old librettos linked to the tradition of Domenico David’s La forza della virtù, and the poet has always had a conflictual relationship with this work: cf. Candiani, 1998, pp. 91-147, and Tufano, 2001; cf. also Mellace, 2004, for a recognition of some stagings prior to our pasticcio linked to the analysis of Hasse’s Viriate, yet another variation of the text.

42 “La musica tanto del Drama, quanto degli’Intermezzi è del Signor Giuseppe Sellitti, Maestro di Cappella Napolitano, a riserva di alcune arie di diversi Autori, quali sono segnate coll’Asterisco *”.

43 The score in I-Nc (Rari 32.4.12; available online at www.internetculturale.it) is erroneously attributed to Vinci; the libretto is preserved in I-Rsc, Carv.14240. Sartori, 1990-1994, no. 21960, reports a copy in I-Nn, but it has not been possible to locate it.
The arias inserted seem to follow not only the ‘baule logic’, but also that of the professional challenge or the professional competition maintained between those singing title roles, which in the present example relates especially to the title role performed by Caffarelli. His true and impressive presentation to the public (besides the recitatives), i.e. Siface’s first aria, is indeed a piece of his repertoire, coming from Siroe re di Persia by Hasse staged in Bologna in 1733, where Majorano appeared as Medarse, brother of the eponymous protagonist entrusted to Farinelli’s voice. As in Siface, it was his first aria, in scene I,3; the text has been slightly adapted for the Neapolitan score. The musical authorship is confirmed by the score of Hasse’s Siroe preserved in D-Dl, Mus.2477-F-16.44

The other two marked arias were originally sung by Farinelli. The confrontation with Carlo Broschi characterized a large part of Majorano’s study and career; before Siface the two had also sung together several times, as we have also seen in Bologna in Siroe, and Caffarelli seemed to agree to be placed a step below his colleague. The aria “Ti parli nel seno” from Porta’s Farnace can be traced back to Farinelli’s baggage: he played Merione, who sang “Mi parla nel seno”. Majorano was not part of the cast but takes up the aria by Porta in Siface, also in this case subject to some textual adaptation.45

At the end of the 2nd act Caffarelli uses the workhorse aria of his most gifted colleague, “Quell’usignolo”, written by Giacomelli for Farinelli who was Epitide in his Merope (II,4) (Venice 1734), where Caffarelli impersonated Trasimede.46 In Porpora’s

44 As a proof of its success, there are also several copies of the aria, either detached or in anthologies, including: D-B, Mus.ms.9056, which bears the indication “Mr. B. Mus. ms. Cafariello Bologna 1733”; D-MÜs, Sant.Hs.1982 (no. 12); GB-Lbl, Add.14219 and R.M.22.d.25.(9.). For further copies see RISM online.
45 The identity of the two arias is confirmed by the manuscript HR-PORzm, ZMP 13702 (for voice and basso continuo). I could not control the collection of arias from Farnace by Porta in F-Pn, VM4-30, which also presents the aria we are interested in; the full score D-DI, Mus.2444-F-2, refers instead to the 1740 production in Munich, a different version. In an anthology of arias taken from works by Hasse coming from London and kept in US-BEm, MS 129 (RISM 120500), the aria is attributed to Hasse; here it is also found in a reduced form for soprano and basso continuo, and bears the indication “Con oboè solo nel primo violino”; however, this attribution does not seem to find any other confirmation.
46 Confirming Farinelli’s privileged relationship with this aria, we find it in the precious manuscript donated to Empress Maria Theresa of Austria a few decades later, in 1757 (A-Wn Mus.Hs.19111); a recording of the version reproduced in that manuscript is available thanks to the work of the ensemble Stile Galante directed by Stefano Aresi with Ann Hallenberg (The Farinelli Manuscript, Glossa 2019).
Siface (Rome, Capranica 1730) Majorano (in the title role) closed the 2nd act with an ‘ornithological’ aria: “Usignolo sventurato”,47 in Naples the ‘baule logic’ should have led rather to the recovery of this aria, but Caffarelli obviously wanted to impose himself on the attention of the Neapolitan public – and perhaps especially of the new King Charles of Bourbon, from whom he obtained positions and roles of the old Matteo Sassano (Matteuccio) in the Royal Chapel – with the repertoire of his rival. Let us not forget that 1734 was the year of Caffarelli’s debut on the Neapolitan stage: in summer he had been Ruggiero in Il castello di Atlante by Mariani – Leo, and then Farnaspe in Adriano in Siria by Metastasio – Pergolesi, set up on the occasion of the birthday of Charles of Bourbon; the Siface pasticcio, given in December and for another Bourbon occasion, offered him the opportunity to close the season with a pyrotechnical series of arias put together to bring out his best talents and attempting to position himself on the same level as his rival Farinelli.

Let us quickly review the arias related to the other singers. Turcotti has only one aria extraneous to Sellitti’s score; like in Caffarelli’s case, it is the first one she sings, her calling card for the public. “Mi vuoi dividere” (I,2) is attributed to Porpora in the only apparently surviving source in addition to the score of Siface.48 Going back to Turcotti’s career, we come across an aria with the same identical metric scheme in Porpora’s Annibale:

Porpora, Annibale, Venice 1731, I,3 Elisa
In seno accogliere / Si dolce affetto
Non sa quest’anima / che ha solo diletto
Di sempre vivere / in libertà.
Ad altre imprese / rivolsi il core
Più di me degne / del genitore
Che Roma un giorno / rammenterà.

Siface, Naples 1734, I,2 Viriate
Mi vuoi dividere / il cor dal petto
Lunge quest’anima / Dal caro oggetto
Non sa più vivere / Goder non sa.
Forse altro volto / T’accende il core
Ma più bel foco / Più puro ardore
Dì quel ch’io sento / Non vanterà.

Porpora’s score confirms the identity of the aria, appropriately disguised in Naples to make it compatible with the new context.49 As in the case of Caffarelli’s first aria, Turcotti also takes up her first aria of Annibale for her first appearance in Siface; however, she does not import other numbers, at least if we trust the libretto.

Ismene’s (Fumagalli) first aria marked in the libretto is “Mio cor non sospirar”: in this case the authorship is not easy to identify. An unlikely Pergolesian attribution is

47 The aria has a certain notoriety even today thanks to the recording by Cecilia Bartoli with Giardino Armonico directed by Giovanni Antonini (Sacrificium, Decca 2009).
48 I-MC, 5-B-18/11; see also Insom, 2003, p. 954, no. 7103. Following the manuscript titles, the aria is classified as “cantata”, but it is isolated and not included in the usual alternation of recitatives and arias typical of the cantata of the period.
49 Annibale is preserved in B-Bc, 2032; a heartfelt thanks goes to Olivia Wahnnon de Oliveira and Isabelle Mattart who have made available to me a reproduction with great courtesy and helpfulness.
reported in the manuscript D-MÜs, Sant.Hs.3090 (Nr. 14). The manuscript B-Bc, 3724 attributes it to Andrea Bernasconi instead, but the composer’s operatic activity, as far as we know, did not begin before 1737, therefore three years after our Siface; on the basis of the attribution of the Brussels manuscript the catalogographic entry\(^{50}\) of the manuscript F-Pn, Vm7 7272 also indicates, albeit as “compositeur présumé”, Bernasconi as possible author of an interesting score that bears the indication “For Mrs. Fumagalli” (“Per la Sig.ra Fumagalli”). For the aforementioned chronological reasons, I do not believe, however, that Bernasconi’s authorship is really to be taken into consideration. The attribution to Giacomelli to be found in the manuscript I-Mc, Noseda L.45.25 would seem more likely, given the fact that he was a much-appreciated author and present in the Neapolitan pasticcios. However, the first occurrence of the text can be located in La Zoe (Vienna 1732); it was probably sung by Maria Camati, called Farinella, in the role of Teodora.\(^{51}\) The same singer sang the aria, but with a slightly altered text, in Ignazio Fiorillo’s Egeste (Trieste 1733), and, with the text we find in Siface, in Gli amici, a pastorale per musica by Pier Jacopo Martello deeply reworked and performed in Bologna in May 1734 (III,5); in the copy in I-Baf a handwritten note on p. 8 reads: “The music is by [Giuseppe Maria] Buini” (“La musica è di Buini”); the aria is sung by Filli. At present the puzzle cannot be reassembled with certainty. But strategically it seems more likely for an ambitious singer early in her career to choose an aria of a well-established composer like Giacomelli instead of an unknown composer. In any case, the question is open and cannot be resolved without the scores of the operas she sang and more solid evidence of the authorship of Giacomelli.

In the 2nd act, Fumagalli takes up an aria from the already mentioned Siroe by Hasse, in which she had not participated: “Ride il ciel per me sereno” (Laodice, II,4) was sung in Bologna by Anna Maria Peruzzi, and in Naples is subjected to some textual adaptation.

Again, Libanio’s aria “Non ho più core” must be attributed to the Sassone; although not marked in the libretto, it comes from Demetrio, where it was sung by Faustina Bordoni (Cleonice, II,3). The aria is transmitted in several sources, including the manuscript D-DI, Mus.2477-F-108 (no. 4) (for harpsichord and voice). Also in this case we can perhaps think of Margherita Chimenti’s intention to emulate the great Faustina Bordoni.

Interesting, finally, is the replacement of the aria “Per godere il bene amato” (Erminio, III,6), with “Tu che m’accendi”, the first in the libretto, the second in the score. The aria bears the asterisk, and is present in a Milanese Zidiana (1728, music by Giacomelli), sung by the celebrated tenor Annibale Pio Fabri (Cino), one of the most acclaimed tenors of the time. The cast included Monticelli (Erminio in Siface) in the role of Zelin-da. I do not think we can completely exclude that in the first instance the singer wanted

---

51 I am grateful to Berthold Over for bringing this match to my attention (the Vienna appearance based on information by Judit Zsovár and Reinhard Strohm), as well as the match in L’Egeste and in the Parisian manuscript. On Over’s findings cf. also ALBRECHT-HOHMAIER/HEROLD in the present volume (pp. 738f., n. 13) and ALBRECHT-HOHMAIER et al., 2020.
to try her hand at Fabri’s aria, obviously transporting and adapting it, and then for some reason she backed down. However, it was impossible to follow the fate of this aria in the years from 1728 to 1734, nor to trace musical sources, and I was able to find only this occurrence of the text before *Siface*. The replacement in the score is instead a parody of the aria “Qual ripercossa” from Sellitti’s *Nitocri* (III,2, Manete, sung by Caterina Gior- 

52 Musically the aria is identical to the one we find in the Neapolitan *Siface*, except for some details, especially in section B; the text instead is completely rewritten:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Nitocri</em>, Venice 1733, III,2, Manete</th>
<th><em>Siface</em>, Naples 1734, III,6, Erminio (score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qual ripercossa / Se l’è sfavilla</td>
<td>Tu che m’accendi / d’un bell’ardire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tale riscossa / Mia fè scintilla</td>
<td>Tu mi difendi / fra i rischi, e l’ìre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall’alta forza / Del tuo parlar.</td>
<td>Al caro bene / mi guida amor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questo rossore / Che in me sì vede</td>
<td>Se tu mi rendi / l’idolo mio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parte è del sangue / Che tutto chiede</td>
<td>L’antico affanno / spargo d’oblio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questo mio core / Per te versar.</td>
<td>Non mi rammento / del tuo rigor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 D-B, Mus.ms.20720, available online.

53 See above, p. 352.

54 See above, p. 350.

The presence of this piece adds a small brick of self-pasticcio that probably responds more to the composer’s needs than to those of the singers and further confirms the complexity of the network of interrelationships connecting the scores of the time. In any case, the investigation of this pasticcio, as of those seen above, confirms the need to examine every single piece, since the indications in the librettos, although apparently precise, are often deficient.

**A quick look at the *commedia per musica***

Although my focus is on the serious repertoire, I would like to just mention the comic one, from a certain point of view more “authentically Neapolitan”, given that even the *impasticciamento* process tends to be managed locally, with less recourse to imports from outside. Moreover, they are pasticcios in which the role of the ‘cook’ who really organizes and chooses the ingredients is much more recognizable in the impresario, who explicitly claims it: we remember here the above mentioned examples of Pietro Trinchera for *Elmira generosa*, and of *Lo castello sacchejato*, where the impresarios who put the dressing in the musical salad were Filippo Ferretti und Gioacchino Grieco. Towards the middle of the century, Neapolitan comedies also began to spread more widely to other opera centers, and it is often seen that the term “Neapolitan” became an element of the marketing of Neapolitan impresarios in Italy and Europe. In an expanding
market that greatly appreciated the new comic repertoire, the pasticcio was an excellent solution to quickly increase the offer without losing quality in the individual arias, normally chosen from the best of production. Librettists’ and impresarios’ skills generally guaranteed at least an acceptable minimum of dramaturgical coherence, and a universal public could enjoy the novelties of a great opera capital like Naples.

In 1748 we encounter a somewhat unusual case for the reverence explicitly proclaimed for the two authors of the original text: the revival at the Teatro Nuovo of *Lo frate 'nnamorato* by Gennarantonio Federico and Giovanni Battista Pergolesi. The address to the “friendly reader” (“Amico lettore”), unsigned (the dedication is signed by the “interested party of the Teatro Nuovo”/“Interessati del Teatro Nuovo”), is in Italian (and not in Neapolitan) and is a long defense of the adaptation and *impasticciamento* practice put in place for the new performance. The most relevant adjustments are: the shift of Lucrezia’s role from the Neapolitan language to Tuscan “out of pure necessity, since the actress of the same cannot pronounce the Neapolitan” (“per pura necessità, non potendo l’Attrice della medema pronunziare il Napoletano”); the addition of a new character, Moscardino, with a brand-new part composed by the conductor of the performance; the adaptation of the score to the singers’ talents. It is declared, however, that they have remained “religiously” (“religiosamente”) faithful to the “essence” (“essenza”) of the opera, due to the veneration of its original authors; to the devotion are added, however, more pragmatic reasons related to the appreciation of the audience, which in the past would have shown no positive reception of the deformations of a perfect original simply due to “whim” (“capriccio”). Therefore, interventions carried out without solid reasons can harm the impresario’s interest; even taking into account that here evidently speaks Cicero pro domo sua (the anonymous writer is marketing his own dramatic proposal), this means, that not all the pasticcio works were received and assessed in the same way, and not all the *impasticciatori* worked in the same direction. The flaunted reverence towards the original authors and the declaration of respect for the essence of the work in the face of extensive adaptation and mixing looks almost paradoxical; but we know well how much the notion of work, as well as of authorship and text, have changed over time. The construction of a pasticcio using music of a single composer (except for the new character) when it is not, as we have seen above, the work of the composer himself, is apparently not a very frequent case, and seems to be linked to the special aura that surrounded Pergolesi already in the years immediately after his death. Nevertheless, this case makes clear that the study of pasticcio allows us to enter into the production process but also, precisely, in the understanding of the work’s ‘essence’ according to the mentality, conventions and aesthetics of the time.

There are many examples in the comic realm; more or less since the middle of the century the practice of pasticcio has been spreading like wildfire, with increasingly explicit statements. The Neapolitan authors are also present in pasticcios staged elsewhere, making ‘pastici napoletani’ in substance many works staged far from the Neapolitan

---

55 On the adaptations in the years after the premiere of *Lo frate 'nnamorato* see also MAIONE, 2018.
theaters; pasticcios built with Neapolitan components but performed on other stages are not the subject of this essay, but it is worth mentioning the topic, giving just a few quick examples.

In Mantua in 1750 the Neapolitan impresario Onofrio d’Aquino dedicated the *dramma giocoso* *Amor tutto può* whose music is partly his own work (the opening symphony and the arias marked with *), and partly “by various Neapolitan authors” (“di varj autori napoletani”) to the Austrian governor of Lombardy Ferdinando Bonaventura Harrach. In the same year *Il conte di Culagna* (“favolletta” from Alessandro Tassoni’s *La secchia rapita*) is staged in Pavia with the warning that “the arias marked with the following asterisk * have been placed for the actors’ convenience, nor are those born with the Drama. The music is by several authors, most of them Neapolitan.” In Bologna in the 1755 carnival for the resumption of Galuppi’s *La calamita dei cuori* (which had debuted in Venice in the previous carnival) to the music of Buranello is juxtaposed that of “other celebrated Neapolitan masters” (“altri celebri maestri napoletani”). And much more would be presumably found by digging into the repertoire staged on other European stages. Naples seems to become a trademark of guarantee, and the pasticcio an available channel of dissemination of the Neapolitan repertoire.

**In conclusion**

In Naples, the practice of pasticcio was part of a widespread habit of intervening on works from other sources, both in terms of texts, most of which were imported from other centers and, to a lesser extent, in terms of scores. In the case of imported musical products, the need was not only to respond to a generic local taste, but above all to reduce the compositions produced elsewhere to a form corresponding to the characteristics of Neapolitan orchestras, singers and theatrical workforce (we must not forget, for example, the visual aspect of the scene, which was anything but secondary even in the adaptation process), which soon became a tried and tested production system aimed at providing public and private patrons with a continuous flow of works.

The whole world of arrangements at the turn of the 18th century – the moment where the *dramma per musica* acquires a full modularity that allows for the easy extrapolation of the closed numbers and their use for the benefit of singers, composers and impresarios according to several needs – can be seen as a kind of training in the pasticcio, and can in fact conceal undeclared practices of *impasticciamento*; the explicit statement of pasticcio becomes evident in the 1710s. Pasticcios were often staged on the occasion of birthdays and name days of the ruling family, suggesting an artistic dignity and not exclusively a convenient trick to escape time constraints. In fact, there was plenty of time since dates of birthdays and name days were known well in advance. The arias were 56 “le arie segnate col seguente asterisco * sono state poste per comodo degli attori, né sono quelle nate col Dramma. La Musica è di diversi Autori la maggior parte Napoletani”. *Il conte di Culagna*, p. 8.
picked from the best of contemporary production and it allowed each performer to show off the best of his talent, an element of sure audience success.

Over the 18th century we find more often actual pasticcios, i.e. composite works resulting from mixing components of different origins, mostly pre-existing, where the authorship is shared between several players: the *pasticcere* can be identified, depending on the case, in a prominent singer, in the impresario, in the composer, or in a balanced sharing between different skills, as we would say today. In a very general way, it would seem that the role of the impresario emerges with greater clarity earlier in the comic opera, while in the serious one we can perhaps identify, at least in the time frame considered here, a greater responsibility of the singers.

The continuation of the research on adaptations and pasticcios, precisely identifying both the original contexts of the borrowed arias and the responsibility for the Neapolitan choices will be of great help in the reconstruction of the complex canvas that connects authors, performers and texts (verbal, musical, spectacular) of the *dramma per musica* of the period in all the centers of production.
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[PollaroLO, CARLO Francesco], Tito Manlio, Venice 1697 or 1698; score: D-SWl, Mus.49.
Porpora, Nicola, Annibale, Venice 1731; score: B-Bc, 2032.
Id., Mi vuoi dividere; score: I-MC, 5-B-18/11.
Porta, Giovanni, Farmace, Munich 1740; score: D-Dl, Mus.2444-F-2.
Id., Ti parli nel seno/Mi parla nel seno; reduced score: HR-PORzm, ZMP 13702; US-BEm, MS 129 (attributed to J.A. Hasse).
[Sarro, Domenico], Ciro, Naples 1716; libretto: I-Pac, F. Libretti sc89/412.
Scene buffe from Neapolitan operas; score: D-Dl, Mus.1-F-39.2.
Sellitti, Giuseppe, Nitocri, Venice 1733; score: D-B, Mus.ms.20720.
Id. et al., Siface, Naples 1734; score: I-Nc, Rari 32.4.12, online: www.internetculturale.it; libretto: I-Rsc, Carv.14240.
Stratonica. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di San Bartolomeo nella primavera del corrente anno 1727, Naples [1727]; libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2439.02 (and elsewhere).
Tito Manlio. Drama per musica rappresentato nella villa di Pratolino, Florence 1696; libretto: CZ-Pu 9 H 5409.
Tito Manlio, Naples 1698; aria collection: I-Nc, Rari 6.5.11.
[Zeno, Apostolo/Papis, Giovanni], Merope, Naples 1716; libretto: I-Bu A.V.Tab.I.G.III.25.5, I-PAc Sc. 254.404
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Production of Opera Pasticcios in Venice in the Early 18th Century
The Impresario’s Role

GIANLUCA STEFANI

The impresario\(^1\) played an important role within the complex circuitry of Venetian commercial operatic theaters between the late 17\(^{th}\) and early 18\(^{th}\) centuries.\(^2\) Since the impresario’s main objective was to earn with the business of music, he, more than anyone else, was sensitive to all the practical requirements in turning an opera into a successful, marketable product. So, he acted as an intermediary between the various professionals involved in the operatic production machine. To investigate the impresario’s workshop, we have to get our hands dirty and descend from the heights of art into an underworld made of concrete needs and individual or collective private interests. First of all, to be an impresario means to exercise the art of compromise, an art especially exploited in the theater.

In this respect, the operatic pasticcio could be considered the impresario’s product par excellence.\(^3\) Firstly, the staging of an opera entirely made of pre-existing material was the result of a complex network of agreements among all the agents involved:\(^4\) a real compromise between those who produced the work, those who realized it, and those

---

1. About the impresario’s ‘trade’, see in particular, ROSELLI, 1984; PIPERNO, 1987; GLIXON/ GLIXON, 2006; STEFANI, 2015.
2. See IVANOVICH, 1681; GIAZOTTO, 1967a; GIAZOTTO, 1967b; GIAZOTTO, 1969; MANGINI, 1974; ZORZI, 1977; MANCINI et al., 1995-1996; TALBOT, 2002; GLIXON/GLIXON, 2006; SELFRIDGE-FIELD, 2007; ROSAND, 2013; ANNIBALDI, 2017. The Venetian theatrical model, over and above the individual peculiarities, is highly representative of the opera system not only in Italy but also in Europe, also considering that many theatrical agents active abroad had gained significant experience in Venice.
3. The denomination “pasticcio” for this peculiar operatic genre initially had a negative connotation; see PAGANO, 2011, p. 1.
who performed it on the stage. Secondly, the pasticcio is based on the practice of reuse,\textsuperscript{5} one of the basic realities of theatrical life, and not only a commercial one, since ancient times. Everything in the theater is based on the idea of reuse: the daily realities of theatrical life consists of achieving the maximum results with minimum effort, in spite of the principle of originality so close to our modern sensitivity. Think of scenography.\textsuperscript{6} Each opera theater’s warehouse was equipped with scenes, effects, and machines \textit{di dotazione} regularly reused with just a few modifications, or even with no adjustments at all. This was permitted by the serial nature of subjects: codified scenic typologies were replicated from one opera to another.\textsuperscript{8} Something similar also applies to arias. The recurrence of similar feelings and dramaturgical situations determined the standardization of textual and musical themes and forms, paving the way for the codification of multivalent arias. Consequently, these arias, superimposable in literary, musical, and rhetorical terms, were interchangeable and more or less easy to substitute.\textsuperscript{9}

The pasticcio’s practice was functional to those, such as the impresario, who had to run a very expensive enterprise made of an abundance of resources and a company of numerous and various professionals. From this perspective, the production of pasticcios or more generally patched-up operas\textsuperscript{10} was ‘vital’ since it allowed significant energy savings. It benefitted everybody: the impresario could face the pressing rhythms of the opera business by quickly offering ‘novelties’ capable of mortgaging the success,\textsuperscript{11} and the singers who did not have to constantly learn and refine new pieces (time allocated for rehearsals was often very short), and who were also provided the opportunity to push themselves forward by displaying all the strong pieces of their repertoire. Librettists

\textsuperscript{5} See, in particular Cross, 1978; Buran, 2011; Sardelli, 2011.
\textsuperscript{7} About the definition of \textit{dotazione}, see Povoledo, 1975a.
\textsuperscript{8} See Povoledo, 1975b, pp. 440f.; Rosand, 2013, pp. 168-170. See also the article by Diana Blichmann in the present volume, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{9} See Strohm, 1982, p. 41; Buran, 2011, pp. 154, 161f. So satirized Pier Jacopo Martello: “But tell me, which remedy could you find if, in place of an aria of scorn previously located in the opera, you must overlay another one that was previously an aria of love, and now it is going to be arranged with scornful words? The original composer, if he is not a slob, must have made the notes suitable to the first expression, so that they cannot be adaptable to the second one.” (“Ma dimmi, e qual ripiego troverai tu se in luogo di un’aria di sdegno, che vi era già collocata, un’altra vi si dee porre che era d’amore e che di sdegnose parole vuol rivestirsi? Se non è stato un gaglioffo il compositore di quella musica, avrà adattate le note a quella prima espressione tal che non riusciran poi adattabili alla seconda.”) Martello, 1714, p. 291.
\textsuperscript{10} About the concepts of ‘pasticcio’ and ‘patched-up opera’, see the remarks by Polin, 2011, pp. 336-339.
\textsuperscript{11} “The pasticcio was an obvious answer to the demand for novelty in the opera house.” Cross, 1978, p. 429. And see Buran, 2011, p. 154.
and composers also saved time and money. We know that the fee of a professional poet assigned the task of patching together a libretto, or the honorarium of a composer called to connect old arias with new recitatives by creating appropriate musical passages was relatively modest. For example, a set of documents discovered by Micky White and Michael Talbot has shown that the Venetian musician Giuseppe Boniventi who was charged with refining the pasticcio La ninfa infelice e fortunata (1723) earned 10 sequins, whereas Vivaldi, as we well know, expected 100 sequins for a new opera at the Teatro San Cassiano.

Surely, in this productive context the singers played an important role. It was they who often demanded the integration of their bravura arias into operas. Usually, the more famous they were, the more exorbitant their demands. Frequently, it is not simply

12 In the preface (“Autore a chi legge”) introducing his play La donna bizzarra, Carlo Goldoni writes: “Sometimes, authors have to use their suitcase, in a similar manner as composers, especially when they are pressured and overburdened with work”. (“Qualche volta gli autori sono costretti a valersi del loro baule, come fanno i Maestri di Musica, specialmente quando sono egliino pressati e affollati.”) GOLDONI, 1763, p. 1159.


14 I-Vas, “Giudici del Mobile”, “Domande per fermar, per chiedere sequestro cautelativo e sentenza contro il debitore”, “Domande”, b. 75, no. 2, cit. in TALBOT/WHITE, 2014, pp. 45f. This opera, a patched-up version of La ninfa riconosciuta by Francesco Silvani (1709), was staged at the Teatro Dolfin in Treviso in autumn 1723.

15 See the famous letter from Antonio Vivaldi to Guido Bentivoglio, dated 3 November 1736, in WHITE 2013, p. 220.


17 The attitude sometimes capricious of certain opera singers laid itself open to lampoon. So argued Pier Jacopo Martello: “Cheer up and substitute passable arias for bad ones: who cares if male or female singers want that your recitativo is followed by an aria related to their previous successes in Milan, Venice, Genoa or elsewhere, which still is far from the feeling that was expected to be expressed? Let them put it inside, or else you see everyone reproaching you by their deafening soprano and alto voices. The best that can ever happen to you is making them accept notes less distant from your feeling, that is a very hard job.” (“Fatti ben animo a cangiar l’arie non cattive in cattive: se un musico o se una musica vorranno al piè di un tuo recitativo conficcarne una che abbia guadagnato loro l’applauso in Milano, in Vinegia, in Genova o altrove, e sia pur lontana dal sentimento, lo quale dovrebbe ivi esprimersi, che importa? Lasciala lor metter dentro, altrimenti te li vedrai tutti addosso trafiggerti le tempie con soprani e contralti rimproveri. Il meglio che ti possa accadere sarà il ridurli a capitolare che ti si permetta lo stirare su quelle note parole men discordanti dal tuo sentimento, nel qual caso t’intralcerai in un impegno spinoso.”) MARTELLO, 1714, pp. 290f.
a matter of caprice: in many cases, they introduced an original and intelligent proposal which added value to the opera.\textsuperscript{18}

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to absolutize or overemphasize the role of singers in the pasticcio workshop. If it is true that they were principally responsible for the acquisition of pre-existing arias, it can be assumed that it was usually up to impresarios and theatrical managers more generally to choose to produce a pasticcio (and anyway, this matter must be assessed on a case-by-case basis).\textsuperscript{19}

After all, the extent of the singer’s role needs to be considered in a more articulated system of relations ultimately linked to the expectation of the public.\textsuperscript{20} The protectors of the singers,\textsuperscript{21} for example, belonged to this network. They operated behind the scenes and often maneuvered their protégés as pawns in the context of diplomatic strategies from above.\textsuperscript{22} In the business of Venetian operatic theaters, the singers were part of a complex system of production composed not only of impresarios, but also of the owners of the opera houses (in Venice, they often coincided with the impresarios themselves),\textsuperscript{23} the protectors of the theaters,\textsuperscript{24} and even the carattadori. The latter, almost completely ignored by the bibliography, were external investors who exerted a decisive influence in the circuit of the commercial theaters, since they contributed with one share (one caratto) to the financing of the operatic season of each opera house.\textsuperscript{25} Their economic support offered a little more assurance about enterprises often destined for bankruptcy, or who at best achieved a balanced budget.\textsuperscript{26}

Numerous sources attested

\textsuperscript{18} See Durante/Piperno, 1988, pp. 555-558.
\textsuperscript{19} See Strohm, 2010.
\textsuperscript{20} See Durante/Piperno, 1988, p. 558.
\textsuperscript{21} These figures were ridiculed by lampoon; in the famous \textit{Il teatro alla moda} (1720), the Venetian nobleman and musician Benedetto Marcello devoted a separate section of his pamphlet to the female singers’ protectors: Marcello, 1720, pp. 59f.
\textsuperscript{22} See Rosselli, 1992, chapter “Musicians attending”.
\textsuperscript{23} See Mancini et al., 1995-1996; Glixon/Glixon, 2006, pp. 3-8.
\textsuperscript{24} The protectors of the theaters were ridiculed by Benedetto Marcello in the \textit{Il teatro alla moda} (Marcello, 1720, p. 46), distinguishing between them and the female singers’ protectors (see n. 21). As regards this kind of figures of uncertain identity as well as various types of external finance of opera business: Mancini et al., 1995-1996, II, p. X; Glixon/Glixon, 2006, pp. 4, 11f.; Stefani, 2015, pp. 163f.; Annibaldi, 2017, pp. 232-234.
\textsuperscript{25} The function of the carattadori often has been misconstrued by critical literature (according to Remo Giazotto, the carattadore is synonymous with impresario: Giazotto, 1967a, p. 286). They moved in the background of the opera management; since they were out of sight, their profile is not clear even today (see Talbot, 1990, pp. 195f.; Glixon/Glixon, 2006, pp. 4f., 11, 359). Anyway, the system of the carattadori was not exclusive to Venice (see Pastura Ruggiero, 1989, pp. 474-476).
\textsuperscript{26} See Piperno, 1987, pp. 24f. As stated concisely by Ivanovitch: “The expenses of theater are certain; but the income, since it depends on the whims of fortune, is uncertain.” (“Le spese
that the carattadori took an active part in the management and artistic decisions used by theaters, sticking up for their financial interests.\textsuperscript{27}

Impresarios often had to start a confrontation with singers and their protectors. The cliché of the submissive impresario ready to please singers’ caprices, handed down from much satirical literature,\textsuperscript{28} is only partly true and should be considered on a case-by-case basis. In an unpublished document dated 27 November 1717, the Vicentine Giovanni Orsatto, impresario at the Teatro Sant’Angelo, declared himself “in spite of any contrary agreements, to be the absolute master, since I have the complete freedom to lead my singers and decide for them, both male and female, their roles according to my own concern and the interest of the opera house”.\textsuperscript{29} His despotic claim was triggered by the insubordination of his singers, who threatened not to show up to the theater because of defaulted payments and broken promises by the impresario. That season ended badly for Orsatto: his theater was put under a commissioner by order of the Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci, a magistracy who exercised the power to maintain public order by ensuring the continuation of the opera calendar.\textsuperscript{30}

The document just quoted is very interesting for our purpose since \textit{Il vinto trionfante del vincitore} (RV Anh 58) was staged at the Teatro Sant’Angelo at that time,\textsuperscript{31} previously considered by scholars a probable pasticcio with music partly composed by Antonio Vivaldi.\textsuperscript{32} So, Orsatto’s outpourings were clearly part of the sensitive context of nerve-racking negotiations with the singers, with all their associated claims, favoritisms, permissions or refusals.

Just as there is nothing to prove that \textit{Il vinto trionfante del vincitore} was a pasticcio, we do not know whether or not many other similar operas produced in Venice in

\begin{quotation}

\begin{itemize}
\item del Teatro sono più che certe; ma gli utili derivando, come s’è detto, dagli scherzi di fortuna sono incerti.”) Ivanovich, 1681, p. 411.
\item \textsuperscript{27} See Stefani, 2015, passim.
\item \textsuperscript{28} I would draw attention once again, for the sake of brevity, to \textit{Il teatro alla moda}, in which the impresario is very deferent towards primedonne and castratos. “Receiving complaints from the singers about their roles, he will satisfy them by expressly ordering the poet and the composer to spoil the drama.” (“Ricevendo doglianze da’ personaggi intorno alla parte darà un ordine espresso al poeta e al compositor della musica di guastare il dramma a sodisfazione de’ sopradetti.”) Marcello, 1720, p. 47.
\item \textsuperscript{29} “Non ostante qualunque pato in contrario d’esser assoluto Patrone, et haver l’intiera libertà di poter disponer et assegnar à Cantanti ogni et qualunque parte tanto alle Donne quanto alli huomini secondo competirà al mio proprio interesse et del Teatro”. This is an extrajudicial document recorded in the acts by the Venetian public notary Francesco Maria Bonaldi: I-Vas, “Notarile. Atti”, b. 1917, ff. n.n.
\item \textsuperscript{30} See I-Vas, “Capi del Consiglio di Dieci”, “Notatorio. Filze”, b. 42, ff. n.n., by dates 22-25 January 1717 more veneto (= 1718).
\item \textsuperscript{31} The opening night of the opera was on 22 November 1717; see Selfridge-Field, 2007, pp. 335f.
\item \textsuperscript{32} See Ryom, 1974, p. 148; Bellina et al., 1982, pp. 118f.; Selfridge-Field, 2007, pp. 335f.
\end{itemize}
\end{quotation}
the early 18th century were pasticcios too. The scores of most of them have been lost. The librettos, for their part, often do not give us much information. It is not rare to find librettos in which operas created by multiple hands are attributed to just one author. Conversely, it is not easy to discover which composers were hidden behind the wording “music by different authors” (“musica di vari autori”), and the like.

In the absence of musical sources or more precise information from the librettos, we might, with luck, find sources of another type. In this respect, an emblematic episode was documented by the scholars Beth Glixon and Micky White.

Venice, Teatro Sant’Angelo, autumn 1705. Girolamo Polani was commissioned by the impresarios Giovanni Orsatto and Sebastiano Ricci to compose Creso tolto alle fiamme, which was to be the first production of the forthcoming season. Generally, if an opera had to be staged in the autumn, its music was supposed to be ready by the end of the summer. Polani was severely behind schedule. At some point, the composer asked Vivaldi for a hand. The Red Priest was then a mere violin teacher at the Ospedale della Pietà. He was unknown in the Venetian operatic system. Vivaldi not only composed all the recitatives for Polani but also many arias and ensembles: 41, to be exact. So, thanks to the help of Vivaldi the opera was finished and eventually put on stage on 5 December 1705. Better late than never. It was probably the impresarios Orsatto and Ricci who engaged Vivaldi as a ghost writer to help Polani. But if we did not possess this set of judicial acts found by Glixon and White, we could not have known that the Red Priest had composed most of the music for Creso. In Venetian catalogues this opera has been attributed to Polani. Who knows how many operatic scores for Venetian theaters were by Vivaldi before his official debut as composer in 1713; and who knows how much music not registered in catalogues was composed by other authors? In short, who knows how many collaborative compositions were produced in Venice in this time frame?

For now, we have to content ourselves with a few known collaborative compositions. Some of the basic processes employed in this kind of production were similar to

---

33 After all, it was only later that the pasticcio acquired its own precise definition as an independent genre and earned a degree of artistic respectability, and not only in Venice.
34 See Glixon/White, 2008. And see Stefani, 2015, pp. 139-143.
36 As we all know, his official debut as an opera composer took place much later, in 1713, when he staged Ottone in villa (RV 729), on a libretto by Domenico Lalli, in Vicenza at the Teatro di Piazza or delle Garzerie. He produced his first Venetian opera in the autumn of the same year, when he set Orlando furioso (RV Anh. 84) at the Teatro di Sant’Angelo.
38 See Talbot, 2008, p. 21, n. 2.
39 See Bonlini, 1730, p. 147; Groppo, 1745, no. 401; Wiel, 1897, p. 10; Sartori, 1990-1994, no. 6917.
those of pasticcios. Although it is not a pasticcio, Creso falls into the category of the so-called ‘collaborative compositions’.\textsuperscript{40} So, its case study can serve our purpose.

In fact, the diverse authorship could be the trace of the presence of a pasticcio. It is significant, in this respect, that the majority of the operas set by vari autori is related to the minor Venetian theaters. If the operas produced by the prestigious Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo are attributed to few authors (such as the dominant figure of Carlo Francesco Pollarolo), a great number of hybrid operas resulting from the cooperation of multiple anonymous composers were ascribed to the low-budget Teatro San Fantin.

This is a very small opera house endowed with only a few boxes.\textsuperscript{41} Making money out of opera was difficult even for the bigger Venetian opera houses, let alone for a tiny theater able to sell no more than a handful or two of tickets. In the early 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the San Fantin was managed by a company of shareholders who helped each other to recoup the expenses.\textsuperscript{42} Producing an opera was very expensive. Singers were especially expensive, but at the same time they were indispensable for the success of operatic productions. The only strategy available to economize on the costs of the librettist and composer was to produce hybrid operas based on recycled librettos and scores arranged with the singers’ suitcase arias or ensembles borrowed from here and there (in a market not yet regulated by any copyright). It was also a way to economize on singers: since they didn’t have to learn new arias, they certainly took lower fees. Even if the scores of \textit{Il Pericle in Samo} (1701),\textsuperscript{43} \textit{La Fillirosa} (1706),\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Il trionfo dell’innocenza} (1707)\textsuperscript{45} and \textit{L’Erginia imascherata} (1710)\textsuperscript{46} are unknown, we can imagine that they must, by necessity, have been patched-up operas, the result of an intelligent mix-and-match process for the sake of economy. In the foreword “Al lettore” of the libretto of one of these operas, \textit{Il Pericle in Samo}, the impresarios recommended that the audience not make comparisons with the productions of the Venetian major theaters, since there were not the same elaborate texts, magnificent scenography or the best singers.\textsuperscript{47} It’s a rhetorical device

\textsuperscript{40} For the definition of ‘collaborative compositions’: Boyd, 2001-2002.
\textsuperscript{41} This theater was defined a teatro domestico (Selfridge-Field, 2007, p. 244). Regarding the San Fantin: Mancini et al., 1995-1996, II, p. 130.
\textsuperscript{42} See Selfridge-Field, 2007, p. 250, n. 49. The dedication of the libretto related to one of the first operas staged at this theater, \textit{Il Pericle in Samo} (1701), was signed by “The shareholders of the San Fantin opera” (“Gl’interessati nell’Opera di S. Fantino”).
\textsuperscript{44} See Sartori, 1990-1994, no. 10311; Selfridge-Field, 2007, pp. 271f.
\textsuperscript{47} “Your eye, used to seeing eminent scenes and décor, your ear imbued with the singing of the best virtuosi, and your mind nurtured by elaborate poems, will not be satisfied in comparison with so different models”. (“Il tuo occhio avezzo à vedere Scene, & comparse, riguárdevoli, la tua orecchia imbevuta de canti de primi Cigni, & la tua mente pasciuta de Poemi alaborati, non potrà in paragoni si differenti rimaner sodisfasto.”) Il Pericle in Samo, p. 5.
like many you can read in other operatic librettos, of course; but I doubt that *Il Pericle in Samo* was one of the best operas in Venice. We know, for example, that the traveler Joseph Addison criticized the acting of the singers in that opera, whereas he did not refer to music\(^{48}\) (maybe because it was recycled music that it was not worth speaking about).

Another theater producing a good number of operas by multiple hands was the Teatro Sant’Angelo.\(^{49}\) This was a peculiar theater in terms of its organizational structure. It was the property of several patrician families. These different families gave the management of their theater to impresarios on an annual contract. They were often aided by patrons or companies of shareholders. It was a flexible and dynamic management style which made the Sant’Angelo an interesting laboratory of ideas catering for the contemporary market. Whereas the Grimani had the dignity and the prestige of their own theaters at heart, the *pro tempore* impresarios at the Sant’Angelo aimed simply to make money. Besides, they used to experiment to counter the lack of resources. On the one hand they had to economize on the productions, and on the other they had to produce a tempting item which would sell tickets (the Teatro Sant’Angelo was not as small as the San Fantin, but it had far fewer boxes than the San Giovanni Grisostomo or San Cassiano).\(^{50}\)

Early 18\(^{th}\)-century productions like *L’oracolo in sogno*\(^{51}\) and *Rosane, imperatrice degli Assiri*\(^{52}\) were revivals of operas already staged.\(^{53}\) Impresarios produced them because these kinds of operas provided not only an economic advantage (since they allowed them to cut back on the expenses of the librettist, composer, and sometimes singers too); but also because they provided a sufficient safety margin for their success. In fact, since they were revivals of operas which had earned applause before,\(^{54}\) one hoped that they would be successful again.

In particular, the case of *L’oracolo in sogno* is very interesting since it provides an opportunity to reflect on some working hypotheses about the impresario’s strategy behind multiple authorship. The *Oracolo* was the revival of a three-party opera composed by Antonio Caldara, Antonio Quintavalle and Carlo Francesco Pollarolo (Mantua, 1699).\(^{55}\) The impresarios of the Sant’Angelo at this time, Tomaso Malipiero and Giulio

---

50 The Teatro Sant’Angelo had about 30 boxes for five tiers (see *Mancini*, 1995-1996, II, pp. 14-16), against 33 larger boxes per tier at the San Giovanni Grisostomo (*ibid.*, p. 63) and 31 also large boxes per tier at the San Cassiano (*ibid.*, I, p. 97).
52 See *Sartori*, 1990-1994, no. 20149; *Selfridge-Field*, 2007, pp. 244f.
53 The first one is the revival of the homonymous opera staged in Mantua on 6 June 1699, with an almost identical cast (see *Sartori*, 1990-1994, no. 17126), whereas the second was set in the Sant’Angelo during the previous season (*ibid.*, no. 20148).
54 It is useful to re-read the testimony by Martello, n. 17.
Franchini, had judiciously ordered a collaborative composition midway between tradition and novelty. On the one hand, they had engaged two composers who were known and well-loved in Venice: Caldara, who composed the first act, and Pollarolo senior, author of the third and last act (also the most important). On the other hand, they had gambled on a novice in Venice like Quintavalle for the second act. Probably, this opera didn’t have the success that was expected (I have found a considerable number of judicial documents related to the financial troubles of Malipiero-Franchini’s management of the theater in that season). In fact, Antonio Quintavalle would never again appear on the stage in Venice, an indication that his music failed to please the audience sufficiently. We can assume that L’oracolo in sogno was a sort of popularity test for Quintavalle. Among the collaborative compositions’ functions, such as the pasticcios’ ones, was to carefully launch unknown composers. The debut of a new composer was a risk that the prudent Venetian market could ill afford. Provincial theaters were often a testing-ground for librettists, composers, singers, and even impresarios.

In general, at that time pasticcios were also related to the secondary theaters or to the opera houses whose availability of capital was lower. It is not by chance that the ‘pasticcio practice’, often assigned to an obscure and unskilled musical craftsman, was cautiously anonymous. An exception to this is Nerone fatto Cesare (RV 724), a production at the Sant’Angelo in 1715. Significantly, it was produced by the impresario Antonio Vivaldi. As is well known, he had the characteristics of both the professional musician and the unscrupulous businessman. It is not by chance perhaps that the producer of that pasticcio was Vivaldi. The Red Priest had rented the Teatro Sant’Angelo in partnership with his father Giovan Battista for two years since the autumn of 1713. During his management he acted more like an impresario than a composer: in fact, he put his desire for operatic success before his own musical ideas. After all, he worked

---

56 See Stefani, 2015, pp. 132f.
58 I will account for these sources in another context.
60 See Talbot/White, 2014, pp. 51f.
64 In the foreword “Al lettore” of the libretto of Lucio Papirio (p. 7), produced at the Sant’Angelo for carnival 1715, Vivaldi declared: “For two years now, I have been at the service of your entertainment at this Theater” (“Due anni finalmente hò servito al tuo divertimento nel Teatro”). For a documented reconstruction of Vivaldi’s activity as impresario of the Sant’Angelo during the seasons 1713-1714 and 1714-1715 see White, 2013, pp. 95-130.
65 See Durante/Piperno, 1988, pp. 554f. and Strohm, 1982, p. 13. The fact that Vivaldi cared a lot about the response of the audience is attested by his writing at the top of the manuscript of the third aria composed by him for the seventh scene of the third act of
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to earn money. Since he had to follow the complex production processes of his theater, he often preferred not to compose, and rather entrusted someone else with the task of composing the operas of the season. Sometimes he partially composed the operas, or decided to recycle old works, his own or those of others, thanks to an obscure, handcrafted process of adaptation.66

In autumn of the 1714-1715 season,67 Vivaldi composed *Orlando finto pazzo* (RV 727)68 on a text by Grazio Braccioli, while simultaneously reworking *Orlando furioso* (RV Anh. 84),69 a revival of the opera by Braccioli himself with music by Giovanni Alberto Ristori which had been staged at the Sant’Angelo the previous year, and to which Vivaldi now, at least in part, recomposed with his own music.70 For the following carnival, Vivaldi produced *Lucio Papirio* with music by Luca Antonio Predieri and a text by Antonio Salvi,71 as well as *Nerone fatto Cesare*, the last opera of that season. Four operas in all: a remarkable number, since Venetian theaters generally staged only two or three productions in one season.72 We should not imagine that the success of a theater depended on the number of operas produced. It was quite the reverse.73 When an opera worked, the impresarios generally let it run on stage for the whole season; but in cases of failure, they substituted the opera with an alternative. And so, it was probably under Vivaldi’s management.

After Christmas, *Orlando furioso* was staged:74 this revival was soon replaced by *Lucio Papirio*.75 A positive judgment on the latter was expressed by the traveler Johann

---

*Orlando finto pazzo* (1714): “If the audience does not like this opera, I do not want to compose music anymore.” (“Se questa non piace non voglio più scrivere di Musica.”) I-Tn, Giordano 38, fol. 174r, cit. in Ryom, 1994, p. 5.


67 To know more about opera production during the second season managed by Vivaldi: Strohm, 2008, I, pp. 122-159.


70 To know more about *Orlando*: Brizi, 1982.


72 So wrote Ivanovich: “There is entertainment, lasting a few hours, every night, at several theaters with a range of operas, two for each theater, in order to entertain more.” (“Ogni sera v'è trattenimento di più ore, in più Teatri con varietà di Opere, che per allettar maggiormente, sogliono comparire due per Teatro.”) Ivanovich, 1681, p. 378.


74 The opening night of the opera was on 26 December 1714; see Selfridge-Field, 2007, p. 318.

75 The opera premiered on 12 January 1715; see ibid., p. 320.
Friedrich Armand von Uffenbach. He judged the music pleasant and praised the violin performance by Vivaldi. Nevertheless, the opera did not achieve the expected success. It is likely that the faults indirectly highlighted by Uffenbach in his description of the performance counted for a lot: in short, the somewhat impoverished means at the theater’s disposal (stage machinery, orchestra) in comparison with the major rival theaters. Besides that, we know that the Bolognese Predieri, a novice in Venice, would not appear on the Venetian stages again until 1731. Finally, we know that the text of the heroic-tragic drama bored the audience to death: in fact, in the foreword to the libretto written for the subsequent opera staged at the theater, the producers assured the audience that in the new drama there was nothing tediously historical.

In short, Lucio Papirio must also have been short-winded. When Vivaldi realized that he was not able to carry out the season because of the under-performance of that opera, he immediately reacted and patched together Nerone fatto Cesare as quickly as possible, a pasticcio made of pre-existing arias and maybe of new pieces of his own on the basis of an old libretto by Matteo Noris “adapted to the modern stage by a famous pen” (“ridotto all’uso delle Scene Moderne da penna famosa”). This pasticcio was not programmed: in fact, the written libretto of Nerone was printed in great haste and then published in two different editions without Vivaldi’s signature. The first edition, which we will call A, is characterized by the presence of quite alarming typographical errors, and offers on the facing title-page a list of thirty-two arias and their respective

---

76 This famous testimony is quoted (in English translation) in Weiss/Taruskin, 2008, p. 200: “I […] went with several acquaintances to the St. Angelo theater, which is smaller and not so elegant as the one I described earlier [Santi Giovanni e Paolo]. The manager of this theater is the famous Vivaldi, who was also the composer of the opera, which was very good indeed and a fine spectacle too; the machines, however, were not as sumptuous as those at the other theaters, and the orchestra was not as large, but well worth hearing nevertheless.”


78 Cf. n. 76.

79 With Scipione il giovane, which premiered on 19 November 1731 at the Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo; see Selfridge-Field, 2007, p. 426.

80 “There is nothing historical that may bore you” (“Nulla vi hà da annojarti di Storico”): this can be read in the foreword “Al lettore” of the libretto Nerone fatto Cesare, p. 3.

81 This is stated in the title page of libretto. “Nerone fatto Cesare was a pasticcio-arrangement of the opera by Perti of the same title (of 1693, and then given in many theatres throughout Italy)”, Strohm, 1982, p. 41. To be exact, the original opera premiered at Teatro San Salvador on 27 December 1692, see Selfridge-Field, 2007, p. 204.

82 See Strohm, 2008, I, p. 156. By contrast, the libretto Lucio Papirio was signed by Vivaldi.

83 A copy of this edition is preserved in I-Vcg, S. ANGELO 119.4.

84 See e.g., on p. 21 of the libretto, “atto terzo” is incorrectly written instead of “atto primo” in the page headings; and besides, the numbering of the thirteenth scene of the second act is repeated twice (pp. 42, 45), etc.
composers. Nevertheless, there are inconsistencies with the text in the libretto. The list did not include Nerone’s aria “Doppio affetto”, which is present in the libretto (I,10); on the contrary, there is no evidence in the text of the aria “Cor mio” by Vivaldi which is instead listed on the facing title-page. Moreover, a second aria by Vivaldi for the eponymous character, indexed in the opening list under the title “Se lascio d’adorare”, is registered in the libretto with the morphological variant “Se lascio mai d’amare” (II,16).

Regarding the second edition of the libretto, B), it is identical to A) except for two variants: it does not include the list of the arias, but there is an extra, unnumbered page at the end of the little volume which lists eight substituted arias and one added piece (“Un altro in Ciel baleni”). Therefore, we can deduce that the publication of B) is subsequent to A): the success of the spectacle was maybe so great, and so many changes occurred during the working process between printing and staging, that it was necessary to print a second edition of the libretto, which is the same but with the addition of an errata corrigé (saving time and money in this way).

This turn of events is very meaningful: while waiting on the completion of a new production for the upcoming carnival, Vivaldi produces a revival of a previously successful opera. Unfortunately, the former was more or less a flop. Then, the impresario-musician himself (who, apparently, does not have a plan B) puts in place the one and only solution: to enlist a reviser (maybe the faithful Braccioli) and let him adapt an old libretto with texts of pre-existing arias, possibly those which have earned applause before and are not known in Venice (either because they were staged elsewhere or because they were produced in the city, but several years earlier and thus being already forgotten at the time of the revival). Vivaldi himself most likely sets the recitatives to music in order to hold together the hybrid material, as well as composing ensembles by his own hand (twelve arias by him are registered on the facing title-page). The singers do their part: probably, they are mainly responsible for introducing nine new pieces into the libretto B), substituting the arias initially envisaged or being additional to them when the opera was already running. And the result is Nerone.

Among its composers there were a few known successes like Antonio Pollarolo, Francesco Gasparini, and Giacomo Antonio Perti; and there was a gamble, Giuseppe Maria Orlandini. And here the pasticcio was once again employed as a trial run, which in this case passed with flying colors: Orlandini would be a regular at the Venetian theaters for many years.

85 On p. 2 of the libretto.
86 See Bellina et al., 1982, p. 80.
88 A copy of this edition is preserved at the I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2979.
90 See ibid.
91 “Few of the original aria texts of 1693 were retained”, ibid.
92 For example, we can find the same process of self-borrowing in the serenatas by Vivaldi; see Viviani, 2018, p. 276.
Besides the pieces by the known composers, *Nerone* also includes a few anonymous arias (indicated by the abbreviations N.N. and P.P.), and one aria surely brought in by a singer. Concerning this latter point, let me correct a small error. It has been claimed that the bass Antonio Francesco Carli composed an aria, “È la corte un vivo inferno”, for himself as Seneca. But, as we can read on the facing title-page of libretto A), the composer of that aria was the *quondam* Antonio Carli: *quondam* meaning dead. This problem can be easily explained into account that, as Winton Dean informs us, there were two people named Antonio (Francesco) Carli, a tenor and a bass, probably father and son. This clarifies that “È la corte un vivo inferno” was a suitcase aria which Carli junior had inherited from Carli senior, who was evidently a composer as well as a singer.

About ten years later, in the season of 1725-1726, Vivaldi was working at the Sant’Angelo once again. He was no longer the impresario, but, nevertheless, he had a great influence on the management of that theater, a situation similar to that of the season of 1720-1721, when he was the musical director of the Sant’Angelo. On that occasion, as is well known, Vivaldi was sarcastically portrayed on the title-page of the pamphlet *Il teatro alla moda* as a small angel playing a violin, giving time to the oarsman in the boat. The man rowing the boat is Antonio Moretti, the so-called Modotto, the impresario of the theater, a boatman by trade. The lampoon tells us that Vivaldi had much influence over the impresario Modotto. In the season of 1725-1726 the impresario of Sant’Angelo was no longer Modotto, but a certain Antonio Bisson, or Biscione. I have not been able to find out what his profession was: in fact, there were a lot of people of this name at that time in Venice, one of whom managed a casino. Whether or not he was a casino owner, Bisson was presumably a professional who did not belong to the operatic environment, just like Modotto. It is therefore only logical that, like Modotto, Bisson trusted in Vivaldi to manage the artistic relationships and the theatrical machine.

Vivaldi’s ‘brand identity’ is clear. The pattern is similar to that of the season of 1714-1715: the theater produced four operas, one for the autumn and three for carnival.

---

93 These acronyms stand for *nomen nescio* and maybe (*STROHM, 2008, I, p. 158) *persona privata*.

94 See ibid, p. 158.

95 See the entry *Carli, Antonio Francesco*, in *MACY, 2008, p. 76*.

96 See *STROHM, 2008, II, pp. 347-363*.

97 See *MARCELLO, 1720*.

98 See *MALPIERI, 1930; STEFANI, 2015, pp. 175f*.

99 He signed the dedications of the librettos of two operas staged at the Sant’Angelo during that season: *L’inganno trionfante in amore* (autumn) and *La fede tradita e vendicata* (the third carnival opera).

100 See I-Vas, “Capi del Consiglio di dieci”, b. 43, ff. n.n., by dates 23 December 1719 and 24 December 1721.

Among them, *Cunegonda* (RV 707) was certainly an operatic pasticcio.\(^{102}\) we know that the latter, attributed to Vivaldi,\(^{103}\) contained pre-existing pieces by multiple composers,\(^{104}\) including arias already performed by the rising star Farinelli.\(^{105}\) In the foreword “Al lettore” to the libretto of that opera we can read these eloquent words: “The scarcity of time and circumstances did not allow for the expurgation of a few arias, so, even though they are unsuited to the scenes, we left them in place in order to satisfy the conveniences of singers.”\(^{106}\) So, for lack of time and other eventualities correlated to the theatrical routine, the old libretto could not be adjusted to the new dramaturgical context by reconciling the staging exigencies with the singers’ needs: “a rare acknowledgement of the pitfalls of the pasticcio practice”.\(^{107}\) Once again, the pasticcio was prepared in a great hurry: in that carnival *Cunegonda* was staged between two other productions, *Turia Lucrezia* by Antonio Pollarolo and *La fede tradita e vendicata* by Vivaldi himself. The pattern was the same: *Turia Lucrezia* didn’t please the audience enough (the connoisseur Owen Swiney tells us that the *prima donna*, Costanza Pusterla, had “a small voice”).\(^{108}\) So, Bisson and Vivaldi put into production a buffer-opera (the pasticcio *Cunegonda*) which would then be substituted for the second opera of carnival (*La fede tradita e vendicata*, currently not yet ready).\(^{109}\)


\(^{103}\) See Bonlini, 1730, p. 200.

\(^{104}\) Among them there was Francesco Gasparini, the author of the music of the original opera: see Strohm, 2008, II, p. 357.

\(^{105}\) “Porpora’s aria ‘Pieno il core’ (II,05) had been sung by Carlo Broschi *detto* Farinelli in the serenata *Imeneo* (Naples, 1723) and in the pasticcio *Turno Aricino* (Naples, 1724). Vinci’s ‘Le belle che s’accendono’ (II,07) in *Eraclea* (1724) had likewise been composed for Farinelli, and was presumably the only available setting of that text by 1725”, ibid.

\(^{106}\) “La ristrettezza del tempo, e delle congiunture non ha permesso purgar alcune Canzoni, che si son dovute lasciar correre non del tutto confacenti alle Scene per uniformarsi al comodo de’ cantanti”. Those are the words of an anonymous reviser of the original libretto by Piovene. *Cunegonda*, p. 5.

\(^{107}\) Strohm, 2008, II, p. 357.

\(^{108}\) “Nothing good can be expected from The Theatres of St. Angelo and Cassano: In the former is one *Signora Costanza Pusterla*: Her person & action, very, passable, but with a small voice” (letter to the Duke of Richmond, Venice, 28 December 1725, in Llewellyn, 2009, p. 196).

\(^{109}\) *Turia Lucrezia*, *Cunegonda* and *La fede tradita e vendicata* premiered, respectively, on 27 December 1725, 29 January and 16 February 1726; see Selfridge-Field, 2007, pp. 383-386.
These were typical production processes behind pasticcios. Pretty soon, the operatic pasticcio would acquire its own precise definition as an independent genre and acquire a degree of artistic respectability.

Finally, we can say that in early 18th-century Venice the pasticcio was mostly, from a business perspective, a strategy undertaken by impresarios to cope with the exigencies of the theatrical routine. These productions for the most part were not the result of a standardized strategy, but instead arose from fortuitous events, as well as the frenetic rhythms of Venetian consumer theater (and partly from the desiderata of singers who aimed to capitalize on the success of their suitcase arias). This gives rise to further thought. Since at that time pasticcios were quickly prepared in an emergency situation, we can assume the existence of a long-standing practice of the quick assemblage of pre-existing material for changed dramaturgical and performative contexts. This is an established professional practice and the result of a centuries-old tradition. Let us look at the Commedia dell’Arte.

And we could cite other cases. Consider, e.g., the previously mentioned opera *Il vinto trionfante del vincitore*, in the libretto of which the poet Antonio Marchi writes: “I have been forced to set my Drama in just few days. This is the same subject with which you commiserated many years ago at the Teatro Santi Giovanni e Paolo; but now it has been adapted to the modern fashion, so that it is going to sound completely different.” (“Nel ristretto termine di pochi giorni sono stato obbligato ad alestire il presente mio Drama. Questo è lo stesso soggetto, che hai compatito molti anni sono nel Teatro di Santi Giovanni e Paolo; mà però ora ridotto più uniforme al tuo genio, ed al gusto moderno, in guisa tale, che ti sembrarà al tutto diverso.”) *Il vinto trionfante del vincitore*, “Generosissimo lettore”, p. 5.

In fact, as early as 1729, at the San Giovanni Grisostomo, which was a shrine for opera in Venice and Europe, on the occasion of the last night of carnival *L’abbandono di Armida* was staged, defined in the “Argomento” of the libretto by the poet Giovanni Bonlini as a “small composition” (“picciola Composizione”) that “serves only to connect with scenic harmony and regulated reason those arias composed and performed in other times, places and circumstances, now restored only in order to renew the pleasure and restrict, as far as possible, perfection to the greater audience satisfaction.” (“serve solamente a connettere con qualche Scenica Armonia, e regolata ragione quell’Arie, che in altri tempi, luochi, e circostanze diverse si sono concepite ed eseguite, e che ora sono nuovamente introdotte a solo fine di rinnovare il piacere, e restringere a commune maggior aggradimento, quanto è possibile, la perfezione.”) *L’abbandono di Armida*, p. 5. Regarding the term “pasticcio”, it came into use (initially with a negative connotation) only in the 1730s, acquiring its own degree of artistic respectability in the second half of the 18th century; see Price, 2001-2002. See the case studies considered in Romagnoli, 2011, and, staying with Vivaldi’s case, see Tàmmaro, 1988; and lastly, regarding the Venetian pasticcios of comic operas between 1740s and 1750s, see Polin, 2011.

About this important phenomenon of spectacle in Italy and Europe, see, for a complete overview, Ferrone, 2014.
together old memorized sketches onto new plots. It is conceivable that the processes behind the pasticcio are very similar. The processes involved in the pasticcio were the result of an accumulated experience shared by all the Italian theaters or the theater all’italiana. And this is a point on which, perhaps, we should reflect more deeply.

Sources


Cunegonda. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Sant’Angelo per il carnovale dell’anno M.DCCXXVI, Venice 1726; libretto: I-Bc, Lo.06161 (and elsewhere), online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001523, 24.06.2019.

La fedè tradita e vendicata. Dramma per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Sant’Angelo il carnovale dell’anno 1726, Venice 1726; libretto: I-Bc, Lo.05547 (and elsewhere), online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001526, 24.06.2019.

GOLDONI, CARLO, La donna bizzarra (1763), in: Tutte le opere di Carlo Goldoni, ed. by GIUSEPPE ORTOLANI, Milan 1943, vol. 4, pp. 1157-1222.

GROppo, ANTONIO, Catalogo di tutti i drammi per musica recitati ne’ teatri di Venezia dall’anno 1637 in cui ebbero principio le pubbliche rappresentazioni de’ medesimi fin all’anno presente 1745, Venice 1745.

L’inganno trionfante in amore. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di S. Angelo l’autunno dell’anno MCCXXV, Venice 1725; libretto: I-Bc, Lo.06608 (and elsewhere), online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001514, 24.06.2019.

IVANOvICH, CRISTOFORS, Memorie teatrali di Venezia (1681) (Musurgiana 27), ed. by NORBERT DUBOWY, Lucca 1993.

I-Vas, “Capi del Consiglio di Dieci”, bar 42, 43.


Lucio Papirio. Dramma per musica del Sig. Dottor Antonio Salvi da Firenze, da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Sant’Angelo il carnovale dell’anno 1715, Venice 1715; libretto: I-Bc, Lo.04425 (and elsewhere), online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001312, 24.06.2019.

MARCELLO, BENDEdTETT, Il teatro alla moda (1720) (Urania | Specola), ed. by MICHELE GEREMIA, Treviso 2015.
Martello, Pier Jacopo, Della tragedia antica e moderna (1714), in Id., Scritti critici e satirici (Scrittori d’Italia 225), ed. by Hannibal S. Noce, Bari 1963.

Nerone fatto Cesare. Dramma per musica ridotto all’uso delle scene moderne da penna famosa. Da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Sant’Angelo il carnovale dell’anno 1715, Venice 1715; libretto: I-Vcg, S. ANGELO 119.4 (1st ed.); I-Mb, Racc.dramm.2979 (and elsewhere, 2nd ed.), online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001313, 24.06.2019


Il vinto trionfante del vincitore. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Sant’Angelo l’autunno dell’anno MDCCXVII, Venice 1717; libretto: I-Bc, Lo.07358 (and elsewhere), online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DPC0001366, 24.06.2019.

**Literature**


Baker, Evan, From the Score to the Stage. An Illustrated History of Continental Opera Production and Staging, Chicago/London 2013.

Bellina, Anna Laura et al., I libretti vivaldiani: recensione e collazione dei testimoni a stampa (Studi di musica veneta. Quaderni vivaldiani 3), Florence 1982.


Id., La guerra dei palchi (prima serie), in: Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana 1,2 (1967a), pp. 245-286.


Id./WHITE, MICKY, Creso tolto a le fiamme: Girolamo Polani, Antonio Vivaldi and Opera Production at the Teatro S. Angelo, 1705-1706, in: Studi vivaldiani 8 (2008), pp. 3-19.


Production of Opera Pasticcios in Venice in the Early 18th Century


Id., The Opera Industry in Italy from Cimarosa to Verdi: The Role of the Impresario, Cambridge 1984.


SARDELLI, FEDERICO MARIA, Catalogo delle concordanze musicali vivaldiane (Studi di musica veneta. Quaderni vivaldiani 16), Florence 2012.


WHITE, MICKY, Antonio Vivaldi: A Life in Documents (Studi di musica veneta. Quaderni vivaldiani 17), Florence 2013.
Id. et al. (eds.), I teatri pubblici di Venezia (secoli XVII-XVIII), Venice 1971.
Artaserse (Rome, 1721),
Nicola Porpora’s First Pasticcio*

Aneta Markuszewska

When Artaserse, a “drama per musica” (as it was called on the title page of the libretto), opened the season at the Teatro d’Alibert in Rome in January 1721, its composer Nicola Porpora was known in Naples as the author of four operas which had been performed there: Agrippina (1708), Flavio Anicio Olibrio (1711), Basilio, re d’Oriente (1713) and Faramondo (1719). He was not completely unknown to the Roman audience because in 1718, together with Domenico Scarlatti, he had composed an opera entitled Berenice, regina d’Egitto, which was performed at the Teatro Capranica. Apart from his operas, Porpora also composed occasional pieces, of which Angelica, a serenata written in 1720 to a libretto by Metastasio, remains the best known. The piece, also known under its alternative title Orlando, is mostly remembered today because its performance constituted the debut for Porpora’s most famous pupil, Carlo Broschi (Farinelli).

Besides Artaserse, in 1721 Porpora also composed an opera entitled Eumene, which premiered at the Teatro d’Alibert as its second opera of the season. The piece was very well received by the Roman audience, as the following passage from the Gazzetta di Napoli attests:

“New operas and comedies premiered on the stages of our public theaters. A drama entitled Grigilla [sic = Griselda], which is shown at the Capranica won great praise from the audience, both by virtue of the virtuosi [i.e. the singers], conducted by maestro...”

* This article was written as part of a research project titled PASTICCIO – Ways of Arranging Attractive Operas, funded by Beethoven 2 Programme, which is co-financed by the National Science Center of Poland and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Beethoven 2: UMO-2016/23/G/HS2/04356.
3 Porpora, 2002.
stro di cappella Signore Alessandro Scarlatti, set designs by Bibiena and sumptuous costumes; but even better is Eumene, shown at the theater of Count d’Alibert, and composed by maestro di cappella Nicolò Porpora of Naples, a court musician of His Highness Prince d’Armetat [sic], where the principal part is sung by Nicolò Grimaldi, a virtuoso singer who mostly works in Naples. The appearance of the cavalry and the naval battle, which were both shown on the stage, were received with great satisfaction."

As mentioned, the first work performed during the 1721 carnival season in the Teatro d’Alibert was Artaserse, a pasticcio attributed to Porpora, which is the focus of this article. While discussing the pasticcio Artaserse, it should be stressed that records of Teatro d’Alibert for the years 1720 and 1721 do not survive and that there are no other documents from the period that would mention Porpora by name as the arranger of Artaserse. Although a situation where one composer would write two operas for the same season was not common, there is a precedent for it, also in the Teatro d’Alibert, where in 1720 Francesco Gasparini was commissioned to compose two operas for the same carnival, Amore e maestà and Faramondo. Likewise, in the 1730 carnival season (a decade after the premiere of Artaserse), Leonardo Vinci was also responsible for Alessandro nell’Indie and Artaserse at the same theater. Still, the usual practice would be for the two operas of the season to be set to music by two different composers. Additionally, while Artaserse featured arias by Porpora and Sarro, we also have to take into consideration the puzzling fact that the collection of arias from this pasticcio which survives in the collections of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris (F-Pn) lists Antonio Lotti as the composer. I will return to the riddle of Artaserse's authorship later in the article.

The goal of the article is to offer an overview of Artaserse, a work that so far has not received a lot of scholarly attention. I am also going to argue that Porpora’s work in Rome in 1721 paved the way for other Neapolitan composers such as Domenico Sarro and Leonardo Vinci, whose music also began to appear on Roman stages and in other

---

4 “Sono andate in Scena in questi pubblici Teatri le nuove Opere in Musica, e le Comedie, rapportando applauso il Drama intitolato, Grigilla [sic = Griselda], che si rappresenta nella Sala di Capranica si per la Compagnia de’Virtuosi, sotto la direzione del Maestro di Cappella Sig. Cavaliere Alessandro Scarlatti, come ancora per le nuove Scene dipinte dal Bibiena, e per li ricchi abiti; maggiore però è quello dell’Eumene, che si recita nel Teatro del Conte d’Alibert, composto in Musica dal Maestro di Cappella Nicolò Porpora Napolettano, Virtuoso di S. A. il Principe d’Armetat, in cui la principal parte viene sostenuta dal Cavaliere Nicolò Grimaldi virtuoso cantante parimente Napolettano, e riescono di gran soddisfazione le comparse d’un Esercito di Cavalleria, e del combattimento d’un’Armata Navale”. Griffin, 1993, p. 95.
5 Franchi, 1997, p. 175; Markstrom/Robinson.
7 Ibid.
8 F-Pn, D.12720.
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opercatic centers following Porpora’s success. More specifically, the fashion for the Neapolitan style began with the production of Porpora’s Artaserse and his already mentioned, highly regarded opera Eumene. In this article, I am going to analyze the surviving arias by Porpora which appear in Artaserse in order to demonstrate what the features of the Neapolitan style in 1721 were. It is important to remember that the beginning of the 1720s marks an important transition in terms of musical styles, namely a shift from Baroque to galant style. The Neapolitan composers were harbingers of the new style, so it is all the more important to study the works coming from this interesting, transitional period in the history of opera. In my article, I will also offer some information on the singers who first performed the pasticcio, analyzing their input with regard to the notion of ‘mobility’, which seems to be a crucial concept for the understanding of the pasticcio.

The libretto and its migration

The libretto, written by Francesco Silvani and originally entitled Il tradimento traditor di se stesso was first performed at the Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo in Venice in 1711 with music by Antonio Lotti. Silvani belonged to the group of reformers of Italian opera alongside such poets as Apostolo Zeno, Pietro Pariati, Antonio Salvi or Girolamo Frigimelica Roberti. In the years 1691-1716 he worked as a librettist for various Venetian theaters, and his career reached its peak between 1708 and 1714 when he collaborated with the most prestigious Venetian theater, the San Giovanni Grisostomo. In contrast to the usual practice of the times, he seems to have had at least some interest in – and respect for – intellectual property rights in the modern sense. In his preface to L’innocenza giustificata (1698) he elaborated on the fact that he would only put his own name on a libretto if he was the sole author of the entire piece. Conversely, he noted that if he collaborated on a libretto with another poet or if his work was subsequently changed by others, he would refuse to give his name to the printed version. Silvani’s approach to authorship is especially interesting in the context of the usual practices regarding the writing of operas in the period, and in particular with respect to pasticcios. Incidentally, while Silvani had a penchant for long descriptive titles, in subsequent editions of his works they were often changed, and typically replaced with the name of the main character. This happened also to Il tradimento traditor di se stesso, whose subsequent productions tended to use the title Artaserse.

9 The first opera by Vinci performed in the Teatro d’Alibert in Rome was Farnace (1724). In the same year, the Teatro della Pace produced Sarro’s Partenope, which likewise marked the composer’s debut in Rome. See Franchi, 1997.

10 The only surviving pieces by Porpora earlier than Artaserse are the complete score for Agrippina (1708, I-Nc, Rari 7.2.15) and the first and second act of Flavio Anicio Olibrio (1711, GB-Lbl, Add.14121). Both operas were written for Naples.

11 Saunders.
Silvani’s *Il tradimento traditor di se stesso* is set in the glamorous and sinister world of court intrigue. The main character, Artaserse, is the king of Persia. The opera opens with the celebration of his victory over his treacherous younger brother Ciro, who wanted to usurp the throne. Now Ciro is dead, but his widow Statira and her brother Oronte live at Artaserse’s court. Both Statira and Oronte are the bywords for honesty, loyalty and true love. Other principal characters are Artaserse’s favorite son Dario and another younger son called Ariarate. The cast also includes the beautiful maiden Aspasia, who used to be betrothed to Oronte. Artaserse initially wants to marry Aspasia himself, but then offers her to his son Dario. Dario is the villain of the story: rejected by Aspasia, who wants to remain faithful to Oronte, Dario tries to convince his younger brother Ariarate to murder their father. When Ariarate refuses, the evil Dario tells Artaserse that Ariarate had been plotting to kill him. His perfidious plots are thwarted thanks to the efforts of the noble Statira, Oronte and Aspasia, who manage to prove to Artaserse that his beloved son is in fact wicked. Confronted with the truth, Artaserse begs Ariarate for forgiveness and gives his consent to two marriages: now, Oronte can marry Aspasia and Ariarate Statira. In the Roman version the finale also includes a *deus ex machina* intervention which ensures a perfect happy ending – thanks to the last-minute intercession of the god Apollo, the villainous Dario is saved from execution.

After its premiere in Venice the opera was performed in Reggio in 1712 under the alternative title *La virtù trionfante dell’inganno*. It was subsequently reworked by Francesco Mancini, who composed new music for the prologue, *scene buffe* and selected arias. This version was performed in Naples on 1 October 1713 with the new title *Artaserse* as part of the celebrations marking the birthday of Emperor Charles VI. The later Roman production kept the Neapolitan title. The opera was also performed in Verona in 1715 and three years later during the carnival at the Teatro della Fortuna in Fano with the presence of James III Stuart, pretender to the English throne, whose court at that time was based in Urbino. From the surviving records that describe James’s visits to the theater we know that he listened to two operas with great attention. One was *La
costanza in trionfo, and the other Il tradimento traditor di se stesso. James III was so impressed with both operas that he ordered copies of selected arias.

The next version of the opera was performed in 1720 in Teatro del Falcone in Genoa. The Italian libretto database Corago notes that the music for this version was composed by Antonio Lotti, even though the libretto does not carry the name of the composer. This omission is just one of many questions connected to this production. In opera lore, it has always been associated with Lotti, but the scholarly sources on the composer’s life also contain the information that he did not compose any more operas after his return from Dresden in 1719. Thus, one or other piece of information has to be false: either Lotti composed at least one opera after his return from Saxony, or the traditional attribution of the 1720 production is wrong. However, it seems more probable that the 1711 score was used for various local productions of Il tradimento traditor di se stesso, and even if changes (such as replacing individual arias) were introduced to make the production suit the local tastes, Lotti was still considered to be its creator. The same question of attribution also pertains to the Roman pasticcio which premiered in the subsequent year and which is the focus of my article.

15 Relazione della venuta in Fano di S. M. Brittanica, e Diario della Sua Dimora; cf. also Battistelli, 1981, pp. 79-94.
16 I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Edward Corp, the noted expert on the history of the Stuarts in exile, for sharing with me his copy of the list of the arias copied for James III, held in the collections of Windsor Castle. The list tells us that James ordered as many as 14 arias to be copied from Il tradimento. Their titles are: “Aprimi il cielo” (Statira), “Asciuga sù quegli occhi” (Ariarate), “Mia virtù, ti vuò più forte” (Statira), “Padre, se reo foss’io” (Ariarate), “Se certo esser poss’io” (Oronte), “Parto si Idolo mio” (Ariarate), “Statira addio non sò” (Ariarate), “Vorresti disamar, mio cor quel volto” (Statira), “Non morrai volto adorato” (Statira), “Vado a morire” (Ariarate), “Qual Alcide anch’io vorrei” (Guerriero-Statira), “Tu sospiri? Di perche?” (Aspasia), “Se foste sì pietose” (Ariarate), “Vivi bersaglio eterno” (Statira).
18 Hansell/Termini.
The libretto of *Artaserse* (1721) and its relation to previous librettos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Incipit, 1721</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1713</th>
<th>1718</th>
<th>1720</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Vengo mio vago Amor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Alla vendetta ingrata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Mia virtù ti vuò più forte</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,12</td>
<td>Oronte</td>
<td>Posso morir, ma vivere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,14</td>
<td>Oronte</td>
<td>Empia morrò</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,15</td>
<td>Aspasia</td>
<td>Non parli più d’amor</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,18</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Comincio a consolarmi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,20</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>È gran pena aver nel petto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,20</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Nave son, che fra due venti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>Ariarate</td>
<td>Più limpida, e più bella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>Oronte</td>
<td>Sichè il perfido atterrato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Vorresti disamar mio cor quel volto</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,8</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Il mio sangue non difende</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,9</td>
<td>Aspasia</td>
<td>Spera sì, non dubitar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Placida auretta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,11</td>
<td>Oronte</td>
<td>Unisci in tanto (aria con eco)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,12</td>
<td>Codomano</td>
<td>Legge a’Amor tiranna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,14</td>
<td>Aspasia</td>
<td>Scende il fulmine dall’arco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,15</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Voglio straggi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,16</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Non morrai mi dice il core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>Ariarate</td>
<td>Vado a morire</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Già sento nel mio petto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Vanne, ò Bella, al tuo Diletto</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>Aspasia</td>
<td>Armatevi di vezzi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Oronte</td>
<td>Con lali del mio Amore [?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Aspasia, Oronte</td>
<td>Tù vuoi, ch’io parta</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Codomano</td>
<td>Dal valor del braccio invitto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Alla vendetta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Resta crudele a piangere</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Aspasia</td>
<td>Tu sospii di perchè?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,10</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Sempre sarò crudele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,11</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>Alme liete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above demonstrates that the arias which most often migrated between productions were the following nine:

1. “Mia virtù ti vuò più forte” (Statira)
2. “Empia, morrò” (Oronte)
3. “Non parli più d’amor” (Aspasia)
4. “Vorresti disamar mio cor quel volto” (Statira)
5. “Il mio sangue non difende” (Artaserse)
6. “Vado a morire” (Ariarate)
7. “Vanne, ò Bella, al tuo Diletto” (Dario)
8. “Armatevi di vezzi” (Aspasia)

Other frequently migrating pieces from the opera include the duet “Tu vuoi ch’io parta” (Aspasia, Oronte), and the choirs “Al suo Dio la Persia umile”, and “Chiaro viva al par del Sole” (the initial choir), as well as the final piece “Sovra gl’odii di già spenti”, sung by all the principal characters (see Appendix).

The Roman pasticcio also includes arias originating in other operas: in my opinion the aria “Al valor del braccio mio” comes from the Neapolitan pasticcio of Handel’s Rinaldo (1718), created by Leonardo Leo (the aria in question is Leo’s own composition). The first two lines of the aria and the rhyming structure of the whole piece make it very probable that the Roman pasticcio included Leo’s Neapolitan score for the aria.

**Rinaldo, Naples 1718**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aria</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al valor del braccio mio</td>
<td>Dal valor del braccio invitto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’empia soglia al suol cadrà;</td>
<td>Quella fera al suol cadra;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E dell’ombre il cieco Dio</td>
<td>Se l’Eroe vegghiam trafitto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaventato, dispierato,</td>
<td>Sù l’arena,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dall’Inferno fuggirà.</td>
<td>Ogni cor ne sentirà.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al valor &amp;</td>
<td>Dal &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two other arias, “Nave son, che fra due venti” and “Vengo mio vago amor” also originate in the same Neapolitan pasticcio of Rinaldo. Another aria, “Placida auretta”, comes from another production from Naples: the opera Ginevra, principessa di Scozia (1720) with a libretto by Antonio Salvi and music by Domenico Sarro.

Thus, the libretto of Artaserse incorporates pieces coming from at least three different sources: Salvi’s libretto of Il tradimento traditor di se stesso prepared for the Roman production by an anonymous adaptor, the pasticcio of Rinaldo and the opera Ginevra. The latter two sources come from Naples, which points to the fact that Neapolitan opera was beginning to gain a foothold in Rome.

**Artaserse – the music**

The score of Lotti’s Il tradimento traditor di se stesso does not survive, but Grove Music Online records that individual arias are held in Berlin (D-B) and Wiesentheid (D-WD). In the Wiesentheid collection, there are six arias and a duet from Il tradimento (1711), but only two of these pieces – the aria “Non parli piu d’amor” and the duet “Tu vuoi
"ch’io parta?" are also found in the Roman pasticcio. However, the arias which are listed in Grove Music Online and Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart as held in Berlin are no longer in that collection and should be considered lost. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris holds six arias and one duet titled L’Artaserse / Del Lotti / Opera Prima / D’Alibert 1721:

1. “È gran pena haver nel petto”, missing from the 1711, 1713 and 1718 versions (Artaserse)
2. “Vorresti disamar”, included in the 1711, 1713, 1718 versions (Statira)
3. “Il mio sangue non difende”, included in the 1711 version, missing in the 1713, 1718 versions (Artaserse)
4. “Già sento nel mio petto”, missing in the 1711, 1713, 1718 versions (Artaserse)
5. “Nave son, che fra due venti”, included in the 1711, 1713, 1718 versions (text incipit in the pasticcio version of George Frideric Handel’s Rinaldo performed under Leonardo Leo in Naples in 1718) (Dario)
6. “Vengo mio vago amor”, missing in the 1711, 1713, 1718 (I,2) versions (text incipit in the pasticcio version of George Frideric Handel’s Rinaldo performed under Leonardo Leo in Naples in 1718) (Dario)
7. Duet “Tu vuoi ch’io parta?” included in the 1711, 1713, 1718 versions (Aspasia and Oronte)

As many as four arias (numbers 1, 4, 5, 6) on the above list are pieces whose texts do not feature in any previous versions of Il tradimento. This suggests three possible scenarios: (1) they were either new pieces by Lotti, (2) they were adapted from other, later works by him or (3) they were newly written by other composer(s). I have managed to track two arias (nos. 5 and 6), which had previously appeared in the Neapolitan version of Handel’s Rinaldo already mentioned. Both were sung in Naples (1718) and in Rome (1721) by the same singer, Giovanni Battista Minelli.

20 MUCKE, 2004, col. 505. I established this during my research visit to the Berlin Staatsbibliothek and additionally confirmed that the arias are no longer in the collection in the course of correspondence with the librarians following my visit. When I made inquiries at the Staatsbibliothek as to the possible fate of the arias, the staff directed me to the Jagiellonian University Library in Krakow, but when I contacted the Polish library, the staff also replied that they do not have the arias in their holdings. They should therefore be considered as lost some time during or after the Second World War.
21 F-Pn, D.12720.
22 https://opac.rism.info/search?id=806930334&View=rism. The score of Handel’s pasticcio Rinaldo which was created and performed in Naples in 1718 by Leonardo Leo is held in Longleat House Old Library in Warminster, in the UK (GB-WMI), Music Manuscript 4. The 2018 revival performance was produced by the Italian musicologist Giovanni Andrea Sechi. In March 2019 the pasticcio was published in CD format by Dynamic, catalogue number CDS7831.03.
Giovanni Andrea Sechi, who was responsible for the 2018 revival of the Neapolitan version of *Rinaldo*, suggested that Lotti’s arias, which survive in the Paris collection, were in fact written by another composer and that the attribution is merely a copyist’s error. A plausible explanation is that the copyist attributed the arias to Lotti out of habit, because of the conventional association of this title with Lotti. Regrettably, it is impossible to settle this question conclusively. The puzzle of attribution is made more complicated by the fact that the Wiesentheid collection holds arias from the Venetian production of the opera in 1711. In that collection, only one aria, “Non parli più d’amor”, and to put it more precisely, only the text of part A (since the text of B section is slightly changed), matches the text of the Roman pasticcio. A characteristic feature of Lotti’s version are multiple text repetitions in part A of the arias with slight changes, which makes this version palpably different from the other arias in the Paris collection. Moreover, it should be noted that Lotti’s arias from the Wiesentheid collection are less demanding vocally than the arias from the Roman pasticcio.

The duet “Tu vuoi ch’io parta?” is, however, the same in both the Venetian version of 1711 and the Roman pasticcio of 1721. Minor differences between the two versions involve shortenings of the initial and middle ritornellos, and modification of one and a half bars in part B. These wide-ranging similarities seem to prove that it is indeed Lotti’s version of the duet (Examples 1a and 1b). However, since the arias in the Berlin collection must now be considered lost and are unavailable for researchers, the question of authorship of other arias described in the French collection as being by Lotti is impossible to settle definitely.

23 The suggestion was made during the discussion after the author’s paper during the 18th Biennial International Baroque Conference in Cremona 2018.

24 D-WD, entry 894. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Frohmut Dangel-Hofmann for making it possible for me to work on Lotti’s arias held in the collections of the Schönborn family in Wiesentheid.
Example 1a: Duet “Tu vuoi ch’io parta?” by Antonio Lotti from Il tradimento traditor di se stesso (Venice 1711).
Artaserse (Rome, 1721), Nicola Porpora’s First Pasticcio
Example 1b: Duet “Tu vuoi ch’io parta?” by Antonio Lotti in Artaserse (Rome 1721).
Despite the fact that Lotti’s work was very highly appreciated by his contemporaries and by subsequent generations of audiences and music scholars, his opera output is unduly neglected and so far has not been comprehensively studied. This is undoubtedly partly due to the fact that a large part of his operatic œuvre is now lost: out of 24 operas only eight survive in their entirety, and most of them date from a later period of his career, including as many as three composed during his stay in Dresden (1717-1719). Lotti’s sojourn abroad brought about significant changes in his style, changes related to the fact that in Saxony he had a highly talented group of court musicians and singers at his disposal. One more obstacle that prevents researchers from a comprehensive study of Lotti’s operas is the fact that his surviving output is now very much dispersed, with individual arias held in many different collections around the globe.

The prevailing opinion on Lotti’s theatrical style today is encapsulated in his entry in Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, which contains an assessment that he devoted much more attention to the voice and the vocal line than to the instrumentation which as a result was often basic, or even schematic and uninventive. An overview of his commissions for Venice (for which theaters he worked most often), reveals that Lotti mostly used string instruments and basso continuo, and occasionally also pairs of oboes

26 Achille placato (1707), Polidoro (1714), Foca superbo (1715), Costantino (1716), Alessandro Severo (1717), Giove in Argo (1717), Ascanio, ovvero Gli odi delusi (1718), Teofane (1719). Byram-Wigfield, 2016, p. 52.
and trumpets. However, my analysis of the material held in Wiesentheid, which contains arias from *Il tradimento traditor di se stesso* suggests that the prevailing opinion concerning Lotti’s work might be an oversimplification. The arias from Wiesentheid demonstrate a significantly larger diversity of instruments, including two flutes (“Zeffiretti che scherzate”), an oboe, a bassoon and a violetta (“Non parli più d’amor”). We can also see evidence of Lotti’s play with the timbres of the instruments thanks to his use of *violini sordini* (“Zeffiretti che scherzate”) and to using instruments in rotation: e.g. the oboe whose part is taken over by the first violin after six bars and the bassoon, whose part is taken over by the violetta in the same manner. Lotti also made use of the concerto technique (“Se soli soli sguardi”), where the oboe part uses characteristic triple rhythms juxtaposed to the *tutti* part. The composer also used dance motifs, e.g. the *siciliana* (“De vostri sguardi”). Finally, “Povero cor tradito” shows his masterful interpretation of the text of the aria, as the instrumental part uses dotted rhythms and falling intervals which highlight the character’s despair.

The ritornellos from the Wiesentheid arias are of varying lengths, but all of them are important, because they contain individual motifs which were used in the subsequent development of the arias. There are still many arias where the beginning of the vocal part marks the silence of all (or most) of the instruments with the exception of *basso continuo* (“Non parli più d’amor”, “Zeffiretti che scherzate”). However, in some arias the instruments accompany the singer throughout the aria (“Povero cor tradito”), even though the instrumental part might still be very basic. There are also arias that are practically devoid of coloratura (“Non parli più d’amor”) and arias in which coloraturas stretch to eight bars (“Asciuga su quegli occhi”). On the whole, the activity of the instruments is still quite limited and the vocal parts lack the virtuoso quality which we will find in Lotti’s more mature Dresden output. Still, the arias contain some charming and inventive fragments, especially when it comes to highlighting and showcasing the meaning of the lyrics by the instrumental part. 29

In Lotti’s later operas, the instrumental parts are more elaborate, and the motifs contained in the ritornellos become increasingly varied. Lotti is also more and more comfortable in his use of the orchestra, even though he still resorts to some conventional usages, such as motifs that are reprised sequentially through the development of an aria. His technical demands on the singers also increase – a process that can be traced in his two 1715 operas (*Foca superbo* and *Alessandro Severo*). 30

My analyses show that Lotti’s arias held in the Paris collection differ significantly from those written for Venice and Dresden. They seem simpler. In terms of instrumentation, independent parts for violins I and II appear rarely, mostly replaced by violins in unison, and the activity of the middle voices is limited. A good example of that situation is the aria “Già sento nel mio petto,” in which violins I and II play in unison, and violas play in unison with the bass. Due to this decision, what we hear in the aria are two instrumental parts and a vocal part. This aria is also an example of the use of a slow harmonic

29 See for example the arias “Povero cor tradito” or “Zeffiretti che scherzate”.
30 *Foca superbo*, D-Di, Mus.2159-F-1; *Alessandro Severo*, D-Di, Mus.2159-F-2.
rhythm. One of the arias (“Vengo mio vago Amor”) belongs to the type of senza basso – interestingly, despite Lotti’s Venetian roots, I could not find other arias of this kind in the composer’s surviving operas. Those arias are characterized by more sustained Baroque melodiousness, whereas the arias from the pasticcio tend to be more focused on individual motifs and rely on their reprises. They are also less elaborate and less demanding, both with regard to vocal and instrumental parts. Since regrettably we do not have a large corpus of Lotti’s arias, and since the surviving material from the Roman pasticcio is incomplete, it is a fair conjecture that apart from the duet, the remaining arias from Artaserse might not have been the work of Lotti but of other composers active in Rome or Naples around 1721.

In the Paris collection there is one aria composed by Domenico Sarro:

“Placida auretta”, aria for Dario, text by Antonio Salvi, taken from Sarro’s opera Ginevra, principessa di Scozia (Naples 1720); a copy of the aria, transposed to A major, is also held in the Library of Congress, Washington (US-Wc, M1500.S28 G5).

The aria is in E-flat major and in duple meter. It was written for violins I and II unison, viola and basso continuo. The aria opens with an eight-bar ritornello, which contains a motif composed of two eighth notes and a quarter note with a slur. The motif uses the interval of a minor second. The motif, reprised multiple times and transformed sequentially, will become the foundation of the entire development of the aria (both the vocal and the instrumental parts.) The singer’s voice is doubled by the violin throughout almost all of part A, and it gains melodic independence in part B which is, however, devoid of coloraturas, but which are present in some fragments of part A. The musical motif suggests a certain level of insistence which corresponds to the text of the aria, talking about the uncertainty and danger of sea travel. The aria requires the singer to display considerable technical skill, but its composition is not very inventive.

There are also four arias by Porpora:

1. “Mia virtù ti vuo piu forte”; (Statira)
2. “Comincio a consolarmi”; (Statira)
3. “Non morrai mi dice il core”; (Statira)
4. “Vanne o bella al tuo Diletto”, (Dario)

Additionally, one aria, “Resta crudele a piangere” (Statira), which is missing from the Paris collection, has survived in the holdings of the Library of Congress in Washington.31

Summing up the overview of the surviving music from Artaserse: altogether 14 arias are preserved consisting of five by Porpora, one by Sarro, one by Leo (?), seven by Lotti (?) and one duet by Lotti. That makes 15 musical numbers in total, which constitutes almost half of all the arias in the opera (30 in total). While, of course, it is not the complete score, as I mentioned before, nonetheless the Roman Artaserse is well worthy of study.
as it constitutes an interesting example of the coexistence of different styles presented in a single pasticcio. Arguably, pasticcio practice was well suited to such heterogeneity. We can also imagine that a pasticcio could have been used to test the public’s taste. The question posed by the impresarios of the time was whether the public was ready to accept a new style exemplified by Porpora’s and Sarro’s arias.

**Porpora’s music**

In this section of the article I am going to focus on the surviving arias by Nicola Porpora. There are five arias in total, and four of them are sung by Statira (Giovanni Ossi). The fifth aria is sung by Dario (Giovanni Battista Minelli).

1. “Mia virtù ti vuol più forte” (Statira)
2. “Comincio a consolarmi” (Statira)
3. “Non morrai mi dice il core” (Statira)
4. “Vanne o bella al tuo Diletto” (Dario)
5. “Resta crudele a piangere” (Statira)

The arias are relatively short, especially when we compare them to the arias that Porpora composed a mere two years later for *Adelaide* (1723). The arias from *Artaserse* are nonetheless markedly longer than the ones from his first opera, *Agrippina*. Most of them are about 40 bars long, and only “Vanne, o Bella, al tuo Diletto” composed for Minelli is 78 bars long. All arias are in *da capo* form, where part a2 is a little bit longer than a1, and part B is a little bit shorter than part A. Only the aria “Resta crudele a piangere” has the form of a1 rit. a2 rit. b1 rit. b2 da capo.

All the arias are in a fast tempo (*Allegro*) with an orchestra consisting of first and second violins playing *unisono*, violas and *bass* continuo. Only for “Resta crudele a piangere” there is no viola part. Four arias begin with an initial ritornello: in three of them the ritornello is four or five bars long, with the exception of “Vanne, o Bella, al tuo Diletto”, which opens with an eleven-bar ritornello. The only aria that does not contain the initial ritornello is “Resta crudele a piangere”, where this artistic choice is justified by the demands of the action and by the strong emotions displayed by the character. This short, fast aria is practically syllabic. In it, Statira reacts in a highly emotional way to the unfolding events. She vehemently states that there should be no pity for Artaserse who as a father had favored his evil son over the kind and innocent one, and sentenced the latter to die. Statira’s part is doubled by strings in unison. Following the model of arias *senza basso*, the bass is absent for long stretches of time, and only appears in the middle ritornellos and cadences. This is the most conservative and old-fashioned of all the arias.

In the arias the vocal part is emphasized, which is underscored by the fact that first and second violins play in unison and double the vocal line for long stretches of time. But it is also true that the instruments play an active role in the arias: the role of the violins in ritornellos is especially prominent in comparison to Porpora’s *Agrippina* (Example
2) as in the aria “Mia virtù ti vuo più forte”. The key words in the arias are rendered as coloraturas of varying length and difficulty, which, however, are rarely longer than three bars.

*Example 2: Active part of violins in the ritornello of the aria “Mia virtù ti vuo più forte” by Nicola Porpora.*

---

Four out of five arias are in major keys and one is in minor key. In the minor-key aria the harmony is more sophisticated, and in the major-key arias it is simpler, even though the harmonic rhythm is still faster than in Porpora’s later arias. In most arias, the bass line constitutes the harmonic foundation, though it does not engage in imitative, contrapuntal exchange with the violin. The aria “Comincio a consolarmi” has the richest texture as the voices are divided into two groups: first and second violin in unison with the voice, and violas together with basso continuo. Both groups use the same motif consisting of repeated notes, falling interval of a fifth and return to the initial sound (Example 3). In the latter part of the aria however, only two voices can be heard.
Example 3: The texture in the aria “Comincio a consolarmi” by Nicola Porpora.

The catchy melodies of the arias consist of short phrases which are rhythmically differentiated. There is a tendency to create symmetrical phrases, as demonstrated for example in “Comincio a consolarmi,” which also makes use of appoggiaturas and syncopation. Incidentally, Porpora also made frequent use of syncopation in his other arias. In “Vanne o bella al tuo Diletto”, he also uses many triplets and appoggiaturas, and dancing rhythms (Example 4).

This short description of Porpora’s arias demonstrates that the most innovative, new and vocally demanding aria is “Vanne o bella al tuo Diletto” written for Giovanni Battista Minelli (more on this singer below) whom the composer knew from different Neapolitan productions. Giovanni Ossi, who sung the important part of Statira was already well-known to the Roman audience. Being a student of Francesco Gasparini and a virtuoso of aristocratic Roman patrons, he was among the most important singers in the cast of *Artaserse*. Analysis of Ossi’s arias show, however, that his vocal abilities were lower than those of Minelli, not to mention Nicolini. It is puzzling that most of the arias dedicated to this singer (four out of five) have survived from the Roman pasticcio.
Example 4: Triplets, appoggiaturas and dancing rhythms in “Vanne o bella” by Nicola Porpora

Allegro

Violino I et II

Viola

Dario

Bc.

\[ \text{Example 4: Triplets, appoggiaturas and dancing rhythms in “Vanne o bella” by Nicola Porpora} \]
The singers

According to the custom of the time, the Roman *Artaserse* was performed by an all-male cast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Singer</th>
<th>No. of arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artaserse</td>
<td>Annibale Pio Fabbri</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Minelli</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariarate</td>
<td>Baldassar Lauretti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Giovanni Ossi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspasia</td>
<td>Domenico Tollini</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oronte</td>
<td>Nicola Grimaldi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codomano</td>
<td>Tommaso Ferrarini</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the *intermezzi Serpilla e Bacocco* composed by Giuseppe Maria Orlandini, Giuseppe Galletti sang the role of Serpilla and Domenico Manzi the role of Bacocco.\(^{32}\)

The Roman cast consisted of talented and highly regarded singers, who in all probability also contributed creatively to the pasticcio. One of them was Nicola Grimaldi, better known under his stage name Nicolini, who sang Oronte both in the Neapolitan production of *Artaserse* in 1713 and in the Roman pasticcio of 1721.\(^{33}\) It seems reasonable to assume that the aria “Empio morrò”, which he performed on both occasions was in fact the same piece. Another significant singer from the perspective of the history of the migration of arias could be Domenico Manzi, a bass singer who performed for James III in Fano in 1718 and then again sang the part of the same comic character (Bacocco) in 1721. My research points to the fact that another singer, who often performed in the same productions with Grimaldi, also played a crucial role in the creation of the Roman *Artaserse*. It was Giovanni Battista Minelli (1689-1762), already mentioned above.\(^{34}\)

This Bologna-born singer debuted in Rome in 1711 in *Anagilda*, an opera performed in a private theater that belonged to Prince Francesco Maria Ruspoli.\(^{35}\)

In 1718 Minelli sang in Naples in *Rinaldo*, the already mentioned pasticcio put together by Leo, in which Nicolini also appeared. Minelli sang the part of Argante, and, among other arias, performed two arias that later found their way into the Roman *Artaserse*: “Nave son, che fra due venti” and “Vengo mio vago amor”. In 1720 Minelli performed in Naples in Sarro’s opera *Ginevra, regina di Scozia*. Evidence suggests that

\(^{32}\) Orlandini’s involvement in the *intermezzi* suggests that the composer, who was originally from Bologna but had already been active in Rome for a long time, could also have been involved in composing the arias for the pasticcio. Cf. Franchi, 1997.

\(^{33}\) Desler, 2015, pp. 61-82.

\(^{34}\) Sechi, 2010.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.; Kirkendale, 2007, pp. 74n and 440.
from his part in that opera, Minelli brought to *Artaserse* the aria “Placida auretta”.

In the subsequent years Minelli managed to build up a successful career, performing on all the most important opera stages in Italy. One of the places where he worked was naturally Rome where, according to the surviving (though sadly incomplete) financial records of the Teatro d’Alibert, his salary increased from one opera season to the next. Thus in 1727, for example, for singing the title roles in Vinci’s *Gismondo, re di Polonia* and in Porpora’s *Siroe*, he received 800 scudi. In the same year, only Giacinto Fontana (Farfallino) could command a comparable fee. Minelli also received a similarly high salary in the following year.

Four out of six arias performed by Minelli have survived, which makes it possible to provide an overview of his vocal capability in the early 1720s. These arias are:

1. “Vengo mio vago Amor”
2. “Nave son che fra due venti”
3. “Placida auretta”
4. “Vanne, o bella, al tuo Diletto”

In the Teatro d’Alibert papers the singer is described as a “musico contralto”. His vocal range in the four arias covers g–e”. Minelli’s part often coincides with that of the first violin, and is characterized by coloraturas of varying length: from three bars (“Vanne, o bella al tuo Diletto”) to as many as ten (“Vengo mio vago Amor”, see Examples 5a and 5b). Minelli seems to have been a versatile performer, whose part includes coloraturas consisting of scale passages (e.g. “Placida auretta”), and leaps (“Nave son” and “Placida auretta”, see Examples 6a and 6b). The surviving arias also testify to Minelli’s ease in portraying varying emotions. The part of Dario, even though he is definitely the villain of the piece, still required the singer to portray a range of diverse emotions such as love, desire for vengeance, anger, jealousy, or struggle against the forces of nature.

---

36 Considering that this aria has survived in multiple other sources, it must have been very popular in its time, cf. e.g. I-Rc, 2222, and also US-Wc, M1500.S28 G5.
37 I-Rasmom, CT 422, p. 57.
38 Ibid.
39 I-Rasmom, CT 423, p. 56.
40 See for example I-Rasmom, CT 422, p. 46.
Example 5a: Coloraturas in Minelli’s arias – a short one in “Vanne o bella”.

Example 5b: Coloraturas in Minelli’s arias – a long one in “Vengo mio vago amor”.
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Example 6a: Scale passages in Minelli’s coloraturas, aria “Placida auretta” by Domenico Sarro.

Example 6b: Leaps in Minelli’s coloraturas, aria “Placida auretta” by Domenico Sarro.
Moving towards the conclusion, I would like to stress that there are still many questions regarding Artaserse that remain unanswered. The most important one (and also the most fundamental) is why the impresario of the Teatro d’Alibert decided to open the 1721 season with a pasticcio. Was it due only to economic considerations? Or was it a contingency measure taken in response to an emergency of some sort? Did the impresario commission a new opera which for some reason was not completed in time or could not be staged? Or perhaps the patron of the theater, James III Stuart, expressed his wish to listen again to Lotti’s work which he had enjoyed earlier when he saw the production in Fano? James III’s desire could also explain the stylistic diversity of Artaserse. We can assume that after his move to Rome James, who became an official patron of the Teatro d’Alibert and was the dedicatee of the Roman version, could have asked for Silvani’s libretto to be set to music again. It is also possible that some efforts were made to commission a new score from Lotti. Another important question involves the authorship of the pasticcio: who adapted Silvani’s libretto for the Teatro d’Alibert? So far, all these questions remain unanswered.

There are several reasons why Artaserse is an important work to study, in spite of the above-mentioned gaps in our knowledge, and in spite of its incomplete state of preservation. First of all, as I argued in the opening section of this article, Artaserse paved the way for other Neapolitan composers in Rome, and indirectly also in other Italian and European operatic centers. In other words, it is the forerunner of the fashion for the Neapolitan style, and the earliest example of the influence that the Neapolitan composers came to exert on Roman opera. It can also be treated as valuable material for the investigation of the role of singers in the transfer of arias and additionally, it makes it possible to study the vocal styles of singers who are now considered minor but were celebrated in their time, such as Giovanni Battista Minelli or Giovanni Ossi. Finally, it can be used to track the evolution of Porpora’s style as a composer, and to study the beginnings of his stellar journey through the Italian opera centers: after the success of Artaserse and Eumene, Porpora’s music was used in pasticcios staged in other operatic centers in Europe. It should also be noted that the 1721 Artaserse was not the last occasion when Porpora’s used material from Il tradimento traditor di se stesso. 21 years later, in 1742, he was commissioned by the Venetian Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo to write an opera entitled Statira, based on the old libretto by Silvani. The 1742 work preserved many of the recitatives from the original 1711 version, and as many as eight arias. In terms of text, only one of the arias (“Vanne o bella al tu Diletto”) exactly matches the text from the Roman pasticcio, and the style of the aria is markedly different. Thus, the comparison of the 1721 and 1742 versions sheds interesting light on Porpora’s development as a composer. Even though the opera landscape in the first half of the 18th century was very

---

41 I-Rasmom, CT 441.
42 Later records of the Teatro d’Alibert also mention Giovanni Santonio, Giacomo Buonacors and Filippo Leerz as librettists. I-Rasmom, CT 441; CT 422.
43 D-DI, Mus.2417-F-3.
much dominated by Metastasio’s librettos, Silvani’s *Il tradimento traditor di se stesso* proved to be an inspiring and frequently adapted work.

**Appendix**

**Opera numbers and their sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act, Scene</th>
<th>Incipit, 1721</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>Vengo mio vago Amor</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>Mia virtù ti vuò più forte</td>
<td>N. Porpora</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,15</td>
<td>Non parli più d’amor</td>
<td>A. Lotti</td>
<td>D-WD, entry 894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,18</td>
<td>Comincio a consolarmi</td>
<td>N. Porpora</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,20</td>
<td>È gran pena aver nel petto</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,20</td>
<td>Nave son, che fra due venti</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,6</td>
<td>Vorresti disamar mio cor quel volto</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,8</td>
<td>Il mio sangue non difende</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10</td>
<td>Placida aurette</td>
<td>D. Sarro</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,16</td>
<td>Non morrai mi dice il core</td>
<td>N. Porpora</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Già sento nel mio petto</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Vanne ò Bella, al tuo Diletto</td>
<td>N. Porpora</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,7</td>
<td>Tù vuoi, ch’io parta</td>
<td>A. Lotti?</td>
<td>F-Pn, D12720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Dal valor del braccio invitto</td>
<td>L. Leo?</td>
<td>GB-WMl, Music Manuscript 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9</td>
<td>Resta crudele a piangere</td>
<td>N. Porpora</td>
<td>US-Wc, M1500.S28 G5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources**

*Artaserse re’ di Persia*. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nel Real Palagio, nel di primo ottobre 1713. Giorno festivo per gli anni, che compie la Maestà Ces. e Catt. del nostro Invittissimo Imperadore Carlo VI. Dedicato a’ Sua Eccellenza il Conte Wirrico di Daun, Vice-Rè, e Capitan Generale in questo Regno di Napoli, &c., Naples 1713; libretto: I-Nc Rari 10.06.09/10, online: [http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0005473](http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0005473), 14.04.2020

Financial records of the Teatro d’Alibert in Rome, different books; I-Rasmom, CT 422, 423, 441.

Lotti, Antonio, Alessandro Severo; score: D-Dl, Mus.2159-F-2.

Id., *Il tradimento traditor di se stesso* (Venice 1711); aria collection: D-WD, entry 894.
Id., Foca superbo; score: D-Dl, Mus.2159-F-1.


Porpora, Nicola, Agrippina (1708); score: I-Nc, Rari 7.2.15.


Id., Flavio Anicio Olibrio, (1711); score: GB-Lbl, Add.14121.

Id., Resta crudele a piangere; score: US-Wc, M1500.S28 G5.

Id., Statira; score: D-Dl, Mus.2417-F-3.

Sarro, Domenico, Placida auretta; score: I-Rc, 2222; US-Wc, M1500.S28 G5 (amongst others).
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Artaserse (Rome, 1721), Nicola Porpora’s First Pasticcio


Singers of the Viennese Kärntnertortheater in the 1730s in the Light of Aria Substitutions and Pasticcios

JUDIT ZSOVÁR

In 1728, when two members of the imperial court theater in Vienna, the tenor Francesco Borosini, Handel’s first Bajazet in his Tamerlano (1724), and the ballet dancer Joseph Carl Selliers took over the direction of the theater at the “Kärntner=Thor”, the first public opera house of the imperial city was about to be established. The impresarios were initially only allowed to perform comedies with inserted musical interludes. From 1730 on, however, they succeeded in staging Italian pasticcios as well as abridged opera versions disguised as intermezzi musicali with six to eight new productions per year. In 1710, the Florentine tenor Francesco Ballerini had obtained from Emperor Joseph I a life-long exclusive privilege to perform operas outside the imperial court, but, for financial reasons, he did not manage to set up an opera house. After the death of Ballerini in 1734, when this exclusive privilege was no longer effective, the opera productions at the Kärntnertortheater were mostly offered in the usual three-act form of the Italian dramma per musica.

Right from the beginning, in 1728, Borosini and Selliers established a freely accessible singing academy directed by the concertmaster, composer and arranger Franz Joseph Carl Pirker. Its goal was to train native German-speaking singers in the Italian manner.

---

1 For a general introduction to the pasticcio practice at the “Theater bey dem Kärntner=Thor” see Reinhard Strohm’s study in the present volume, pp. 60-63.
3 Perutková, 2016, pp. 277f.
4 Sommer-Mathis, 2015, p. 152; Sommer-Mathis, 2019, pp. 76-99.
5 On Franz Pirker and his second wife Marianne see the article by Daniel Brandenburg in the present volume, pp. 271-283.
so that they could support their Italian colleagues who started to arrive in Vienna from 1730 onwards. Among them were Teresa Zanardi Gavazzi (soprano; Eumene, 1730), Vittoria Peruzzi (contralto; Eumene, 1730), Maddalena Salvai (soprano; Arminio and Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia, 1732), Maria Camati detta La Farinella (soprano; Eumene, 1730; Giulio Cesare in Egitto, 1731; Arminio, Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia, and another unknown opera, 1732), Dorotea Lolli (contralto; Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia, 1732) and Giuseppe Toselli (tenor; Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia, 1732). The German-speaking singers trained at the academy may have been those who sang together with the above-mentioned Italian artists: Josepha Pirker (soprano; Giulio Cesare, 1731, and probably Artaserse, 1732), Katharina Mayer called “Catterl” (soprano; Giulio Cesare, 1731; Arminio, 1732; Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia, 1732, also during the season of 1735/36; L’inganno tradito dall’amore, 1739; and Hypermnestra, 1741), Leopold Hager (tenor; Eumene, 1730; Giulio Cesare, 1731; and Arminio, 1732) and Maximilian (Massimiliano) Miller (bass-baritone; Giulio Cesare, 1731; Arminio, 1732; and Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia, 1732). The presence of foreign new singers who hardly ever spent more than one season in Vienna raised the number of ‘suitcase arias’ and necessary insertions. The aim of this study is to give a comprehensive overview on the practice of pasticcio creation and aria replacement by examining selected performances at the Kärntnertortheater during the 1730s. They may serve as examples for different types of this custom: 1. the ‘real’ pasticcio: the pasticcio after George Frideric Handel’s Giulio Cesare in Egitto (1731; most probably arranged by the house composer Francesco Rinaldi); 2. aria insertions in Rinaldi’s own operas: Eumene (1730) and Arminio (1732); 3. the ‘half-pasticcio’: an adaptation of Leonardo Vinci’s Il Medo (1728), performed as Medea riconosciuta (1735), with no less than twelve inserted arias.

The pasticcio version of George Frideric Handel’s Giulio Cesare in Egitto (1731)

The pasticcio based on Handel’s Giulio Cesare in Egitto (libretto by Giacomo Francesco Bussani, 1677, reworked by Nicola Francesco Haym, London 1724), was put together of arias mainly from three operas of the Saxon composer: besides the eponymous work (HWV 17, 1724) its sources were Rodelinda, regina de’ Longobardi (HWV 19, 1725) and Admeto, re di Tessaglia (HWV 22, 1727). Furthermore, the work contains several still unidentified arias and one aria each from Nicola Porpora’s Adelaide (Rome 1723), Tomaso Albinoni’s La fortezza al cimento (Milan 1729) and Antonio Caldara’s

---

6 Sommer-Mathis, 2019, pp. 142 and 150; Strohm, forthcoming 2021.
7 Perutková, 2016, p. 280. Regarding the cast of the singers of the Kärntnertortheater I have also relied on the research of Danièle Lipp.
Amalasunta (Jaroměřice/Jarmeritz 1726). The score (D-MEIr, Ed 129n) is one of the few sources which also provides the names of the cast. I have analyzed the arias from a musical and vocal point of view in order to explore more about the operatic practice at the Kärntnertortheater and about the vocal characteristics of its singers.

Cleopatra’s role in Vienna was taken over by the soprano Josepha Susanna Pirker, Franz Pirker’s wife, who himself may have been, according to Reinhard Strohm, Francesco Rinaldi, the house composer and orchestra leader of the theater and, as such, also the arranger of the pasticcios put on stage, including Giulio Cesare. Josepha, due to her status and experience, got the role of the prima donna. The sequence of her arias suggests that she felt more comfortable singing melodious arias: apart from “Venere bella”, other such numbers were insertions: “La mia speranza” (from Albinoni’s La for­tezza al cimento) and “Bella speranza che or mi conforti” (from Caldara’s Amalasun­ta, sung originally by Faustina Bordoni). Nevertheless, Josepha’s ambition and vocal agility pushed her towards a greater virtuosity. Correspondingly, she sang “Per te nel caro nido” from Porpora’s Adelaide, a mezzo carattere number combining phrases of syllabic manner with coloratura passages (see Example 1). Besides, “Da tempeste il le­gno infranto”, Cuzzoni’s virtuoso number originally belonging to the part of Cleopatra, was kept for Josepha; the end of part B, however, probably the most difficult section of the aria with fast repetitions, was cut. Her arias were usually of high range with long sojourns on a” which supports the assumption that her voice sounded particularly well in that high tessitura, making her a coloratura soprano.

Example 1: “Per te nel caro nido”, from Giulio Cesare in Egitto (Act III), upbeat to bar 44-75, vocal part.

Reinhard Strohm suggested that the presence of two Handel arias in the Viennese ver­sion of Leonardo Vinci’s Artaserse (1732) may point to Francesco Rinaldi (i.e. Franz Pirker) as arranger because of his predilection for the Saxon composer. Most likely his

---

9 This production and its sources have been thoroughly studied by Jana Perutková, who also has identified, as far as possible, its arias; ibid., pp. 114f.; see also PERUTKOVÁ, 2015, pp. 494-497. Recently, Reinhard Strohm revisited the manuscript and identified one aria each by Albinoni and Caldara. See STROHM, forthcoming 2021.

Letter by Georg Adam Hoffmann to Count Johann Adam von Questenberg, 3 January 1731. See PERUTKOVÁ, 2015, p. 197.

10 STROHM, forthcoming 2021.
One of them was Faustina’s lyric coloratura aria “Lusinghe più care” from Alessandro, the other was “Da tempeste” from the Viennese Giulio Cesare in Egitto production (1731), but with another text: “Vanne pur tra selve ircone”. Strohm’s strong argument for this hypothesis is that the Pirkers went to Italy in 1732, and after that no Handel arias appeared in the repertoire of the Kärntnertortheater anymore.

The part of Cornelia was given to the young Venetian soprano Maria Camati called “La Farinella” (born in 1710). She had made her debut at the Teatro San Moisé in Venice in Albinoni’s Filandro in January 1729 and was engaged at the “Teatro Privilegiato” at the Kärntnertor at the age of 20, from 1730 on. In the production of Giulio Cesare in Egitto in London in 1724 the role of the seconda donna had been interpreted by the contralto Anastasia Robinson who was more of a sensitive actress than a virtuoso singer. Not surprisingly, her arias were replaced without exception in the Viennese production. Camati had three arias: the anonymous coloratura number “Tu infido uccidesti”, the lamento “Ahi perché, giusto ciel” (Cuzzoni’s substitute aria from the revival of Handel’s Rodelinda in 1725), another demanding aria “E che ci posso far” from Admeto, and two most probably newly composed accompagnato recitatives, “Deh! Pensa ch’amor fanciullo” and “Cara ombra di Pompeo”. The presence of the accompagnati is remarkable and differs from Farinella’s numbers in the other three Rinaldi operas: it shows that the role’s original strong emphasis on acting has been preserved, presumably because the young soprano also possessed sufficient stage presence to embody the middle-aged mother figure authentically.

Her first number, “Tu infido uccidesti” (A major, Act I; see Example 2), is a particularly agile air with coloraturas reaching a’ regularly (bars 28, 30, 35, 41, 55, 71, 75, 87-88, and 110), with sixth jumps and syncopations. This movement, together with Cornelia’s last aria “E che ci posso far” (B major, Act III; see Example 3) with its a’ notes and octave jumps within coloraturas of high technical requirements (bars 21 and 22), made this role equivalent to that of the prima donna, Cleopatra, as far as vocal agility and high range were concerned.

The cast list of this production has unfortunately not been preserved; see ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.


Albinoni/Cassani, Filandro, p. 5.

Perutková, 2016, p. 280.

Later she performed in Venice, Naples and other Italian cities (1753), in Berlin (1741), Graz (1754), Dresden (1756) as well as with Giovanni Battista Locatelli’s troupe in the Russian Empire/St. Petersburg (1757).


Bars 39-47 were cut. See Perutková, 2012, p. 117.
Example 2: “Tu infido uccidesti” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto (Act I), upbeat to bar 28-42, vocal part.


The pathetic *aria di portamento*, “Ahi perché, giusto ciel” from Rodelinda, shows another side of Cornelia’s character. This lament in the tragic C minor mode was a perfect choice for a substitution piece since the figure of Rodelinda as the grieving widow who attempts to defend and comfort her son is in complete alignment with that of Cornelia.²⁰ “Ahi perché, giusto ciel” itself was originally a substitute aria for Francesca Cuzzoni (in place of “Se'l mio duol”) at the first London revival of Rodelinda, regina de’ Longobardi (with eight performances from 18 December 1725 to 11 January 1726).²¹ Moreover, musically it already contained recycled material from “Deh! lasciatemi il nemico” from Tamerlano (October 1724), Handel’s previous Royal Academy opera.²²

The *primo uomo*, Cesare, was embodied by a tenor named “Hager”, most probably Leopold Hager,²³ instead of an alto castrato, the original voice type of the role. This, of course, called for adjustments of the vocal lines. His first aria, “Va tacito, ed ascoso” (Act I), is in fact “Se l’arco avessi e strali” from Handel’s Admeto, a hunting aria with horns. The A2 section was cut and the text much altered by incorporating many verses from the aria it substituted: Cesare’s famous “Va tacito e nascosto” from Giulio Cesare.

²⁰ The text of the middle section was altered: instead of “Vieni, figlio, vieni oh Dio! col tuo pianto e con il mio […]” Cornelia sings “Vieni o morte, vieni oh Dio! Col mio pianto amaro, e rio [...]” since in this scene her son has already left the stage. Giulio Cesare in Egitto, Vienna 1731, p. 16.

²¹ BURROWS, 1994, p. 516.

²² DEAN/KNAPP, 1995, pp. 592f.

²³ There were two Hagers singing at the Kärntnertortheater successively in the 1730s and ’40s, Leopold and Christoph Hager. Reinhard Strohm suggests that they were related, likely father and son.
Whereas “Va tacito” requires a virtuosic solo horn, “Se l’arco avessi” features two horns with a regular level of difficulty. The intention of Rinaldi is clear: he wanted to preserve the original idea of a hunting aria with horns, only the hornists of the Kärntnertor-theater’s orchestra most probably lacked such solo capacities which “Va tacito” would have required. This is the only plausible explanation since the vocal parts of the two arias are practically on the same technical level.

The vocal part of the *accompagnato* recitative “Alma del gran Pompeo” from Giulio Cesare (1724) has been reshaped and adjusted for the tenor voice type, its key, however, remained unchanged.

Furthermore, Hager sang “Sen’ vola lo sparvier” (Act I; see Example 4), Antigona’s coloratura number, again from Admeto, this time without cuts but naturally an octave lower since it was originally interpreted by the soprano Francesca Cuzzoni. It has a wider range, between $c\#$ and $g’$. The demand for such an insertion must have come from the singer himself. “Dal periglio dell’onde” (Act III), another accompanied recitative which precedes the aria “Aure, deh per pietâ” (Cesare’s number from Giulio Cesare), is most probably a new composition by Rinaldi. This applies even more since it replaced the first of the two *recitativo accompagnato* sections Handel incorporated in the aria (bars 23-42) which was cut at the Kärntnertortheater’s production. The other *accompagnato* section, at the end of part B, however, was preserved. “Aure, deh per pietâ” (Act III, see Example 5) is a lyric, *Andante* movement in the pastoral key of F major with lullabyish, short and sweet patterns in the orchestra and melodic phrases with frequent chromatic notes for the tenor. Here too, by keeping the original key the vocal line became submitted to necessary octave breaks. As far as range is concerned, there is an interesting momentum in this number: although the A part generally has a high tessitura, in bar 40 (bar 62 in Handel’s original) it goes up to $a’\flat$ by changing the original $f’$. It is musically more logical than in Handel’s original setting: he wrote an $f’$ because no other instrument has it (except for the continuo which realizes it, naturally). On the other hand, a reason for this little, but significant change could be the wish to emphasize Hager’s high vocal range. That had no meaning in Handel’s original composition for the alto castrato Senesino because an $a’\flat$ belonged to his middle range. The last two arias show the lyric versatility of Hager and indicate a light and flexible tenor voice with a sweet tone.

*Example 4: “Sen’ vola lo sparvier” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto (Act I), upbeat to bar 18-44, vocal part.*
Hager had previously played the title role of Rinaldi’s *Eumene* (1730) and appeared as Segeste in his *Arminio* (1732) as well, the scores of which have fortunately been preserved, and so the vocal profile of his role as Cesare can be nuanced and defined further. In *Eumene*, two of his three arias had a compass between $c'$ and $g'$. One of them was “È prova del forte” (II,7), a large-scale coloratura number with horns and oboes, prominently placed to close Act II. In *Arminio*, a production realized in 1732, the year after *Giulio Cesare*, Hager sang in the role of Segeste “Quel teschio orgoglioso” (I,4) as his entry aria, a bravura number of the highest technical level and with a range of two octaves ($B$ flat to $b'$ flat) that contained definitely more extensive coloratura passages than those he had to demonstrate in the Handel pasticcio. Scales running from $f'$ down to $B$ flat were particularly remarkable. These scales, together with the trilled sustained note and further trills in the arias “Con quell’ampresso” in *Eumene* (I,2) and “Quant’empioté nei mostri”, a substitution aria in *Arminio* (II,4), further testify to a wide-compassed tenor voice with flexibility and agility of an uncommon kind.

At the Kärntnertortheater, the part of Tolomeo was likewise represented by a natural (non-castrato) voice, that of Massimiliano Miller. He is listed in the manuscript score as a bass, according to Steffen Voss, however, he was rather a baritone. This assumption goes back to the roles he sang in Vivaldi’s operas at the Teatro Sant’Angelo in Venice during the 1733/34 season: the title role of *Montezuma* (1733), King Admeto in *Dorilla in Tempe* (1734), and Aleandro in *L’Olimpiade* (1734). Voss further suggests that Miller had German or Austrian origins and identifies him as the composer Maximilian Miller. In the Viennese pasticcio *Giulio Cesare*, Miller’s two arias came from the original version of Handel’s opera in London: the first of them, “L’empio, sleale, indegno” (Act I), had been sung by the alto castrato Gaetano Berenstadt as Tolomeo. For adjustments, the same techniques were applied as described above: the key was not changed, but the vocal parts were transposed an octave lower and at some cadential places a bass formula, usually with an octave jump, was used instead (bars 30-31 and 43, see Example 6 and 7). It is intriguing to see that these cadences in the *stile di basso* were also applied in his second aria “Tu sei il cor di questo core” (Act II), an original bass number assigned to

---

24 Miller also appeared in the three other productions by Francesco Rinaldi performed at the Kärntnertortheater: he sang Varo in *Arminio* (1732), Lisarco in *Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia* (1732) and one can assume that he presented Antigene in *Eumene* (1730).


26 Ibid.
Achilla by Handel (bars 24 and 44; see Example 8 and 9). Both arias have a high tessitura. Interestingly, the one accommodated from the contralto voice, “L’empio, sleale, indegno”, has a bass-baritone range, spanning from F to e’ flat, while “Tu sei il cor di questo core” goes down only to A, on the other hand, it regularly hits f’. In Handel, f’ occurred so frequently (seven times in part A and once in the middle section) that in the Viennese production three of those spots as well as the d’-s at the end of part B were set down an octave (bars 21, 23, 43, and 63; see Example 10 and 11), revealing Miller’s voice being lower in comparison to the London baritone, Giuseppe Maria Boschi (as Achilla). Apart from the two arias, Miller also had a brief accompanied recitative, “Ah, traditore” (Act III), probably newly composed by Rinaldi.

Example 6: “L’empio, sleale, indegno” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto – London (Tolomeo, I,6), bars 29-44, vocal part.

Example 7: “L’empio, sleale, indegno” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto – Vienna (Tolomeo, Act I), bars 29-44, vocal part.


Example 9: “Tu sei il cor di questo core” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto – Vienna (Tolomeo, Act II), bars 21-28, vocal part.

Example 11: “Tu sei il cor di questo core” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto – Vienna (Tolomeo, Act II), bars 37-45, vocal part.

Finally, Sesto’s role in Vienna was taken over by Katharina Mayer called “Catterl”, a soprano who frequently played male roles en travesti. In Giulio Cesare, she had two arias, both possibly new compositions by Rinaldi: “Vado a morir da forte” (Act II) and “Non è si vago e bello” (Act III). The former has an unusual structure: it begins as a parlante number with frequent trills and fermatas, after that the vocal line starts to apply altered notes in the A2 section on the one hand (upbeat to bar 11, bars 14, 15, 21, 22, and 23) and three scales downwards at the words “barbaro traditor” (“barbarous traitor”) on the other (bars 17-19; see Example 12). The last of these passages goes from $g''$ to $c'$ (bars 18-19) after a jump of a tenth from $e'$ to $g''$ (bar 18). The B part applies the initial phrase of the A section, an upward scale in a syllabic manner, though this time in the relative minor key (A minor after C major) and this middle section has in fact real coloraturas, including two semiquaver downward scales in a row (bar 39). Katharina Mayer’s second air, “Non è si vago e bello”, is a simpler and more explicit parlante number. At the Kärntnertortheater “Catterl” took over other trouser roles, such as Ramise in Arminio (1732), Idreno/Idaspe in Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia (1732), and Tivame in L’inganno tradito dall’amore (1739); she also played Argia in Ignaz Holzbauer’s Hypermnestra (1741).27 Her arias consistently show a higher tessitura with frequent $a''$ notes, but with less or moderate virtuosity.

Example 12: “Vado a morir da forte” from Giulio Cesare in Egitto (Act II), bars 17-23, vocal part.

Insertions in other operas of Francesco Rinaldi

Eumene (1730)

The insertions in Eumene (1730, after a libretto by Apostolo Zeno from 1697; manuscript score in D-MEI, Ed 147p) are particularly connected to the soprano Maria Camati called “La Farinella” who sang the part of the seconda donna Artemisia. The 20-year old soprano had just arrived in Vienna in 1730, little more than a year after her Venetian debut, and Eumene was most probably her first opera at the Kärntnertortheater (it is assumed to have been performed in June that year). Her stage name “Farinella” could refer to the vocal agility and high range of her voice and perhaps also to a preference for the arias of the famous castrato Carlo Broschi Farinelli, albeit she did not achieve the same superiority he had among his peers. Most likely all of her arias in Eumene were baggage arias: insertions coming from Venetian operas performed in the 1728/29 and 1729/30 seasons which she might have brought with her to Vienna. Since Camati was a new singer she might have been given a greater freedom to choose her own arias.

It is also a happy coincidence that Camati debuted in the Venetian carnival season of 1729 when the greatest singers of the day, such as Farinelli, Senesino, Faustina Bordoni, and Nicolò Grimaldi, were present there – an extraordinary situation as the result of the dissolution of Handel’s first Royal Academy of Music in London in June 1728 which forced its members (i.e. Senesino, Faustina and Francesca Cuzzoni) to seek engagement elsewhere, starting with Venice.

As far as Camati’s preference for Farinelli’s arias is concerned, there is at least one trace of it: she sang the slower Andante aria “So che pietà non hai” (II,2) from Leonardo Leo’s Catone in Utica (II,3). Camati had most probably heard this aria interpreted by the castrato at the Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo, and possibly not only in Leo’s opera (premiered on 28 December 1728), but also in the pasticcio L’abbandono di Armida, put together by Antonio Pollarolo and premiered on 27 February 1729, where this number was used by Farinelli as an insertion (I,8). For this reason, the idea of its use in Eumene presumably came from Camati herself, together with another insertion in III,2, that of “Qual disarmata nave” from Giovanni Battista Pescetti’s I tre difensori della patria (first performed at the Teatro S. Angelo in Venice on 5 November 1729; II,4, sung by Anna Maria Peruzzi). In this case, the absence of the text of the aria in the printed libretto indicates that this insertion was made very late during the preparation process, perhaps even right before the first performance.

28 ZSOVÁR, 2019, pp. 43-45.
29 This aria has been identified by Reinhard Strohm. Leo/Metastasio, Catone in Utica, pp. 8 and 38.
30 Pollarolo/Boldini, L’abbandono di Armida, pp. 6 and 16.
31 This aria has been identified by Reinhard Strohm. See Strohm, 2008, p. 118. Pescetti/Morselli, I tre difensori della patria, p. 28.
It is also possible that Camati witnessed Farinelli on stage in Giovanni Antonio Giai’s *Mitridate* (premiered at the Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo on 26 December 1729) and that she chose a baggage aria from this opera as well.33 This time, however, it was not one of the castrato’s arias, but Aristia’s “Sai quando in mar più teme” (IV,8) sung by Francesca Cuzzoni which then served as Farinella’s entrance aria as the faithful lover Artemisia in *Eumene*. Belonging to the castrato-type of virtuoso arias, it has a relatively long orchestral introduction in A major which utilizes well-known vocal patterns like coloraturas, rapid scale passages (bars 21-23, 25-26, 46-47, 50-57 and 59), trills (bars 25-26, 38, 59-60 and 83), note repetitions (bars 43-45), *messe di voce* (bars 38-39, 60, 75 and 79-80) and arpeggios (bars 21-22, 25-28, 46-47 and 59) over the also typical drumming bass accompaniment (see Example 13 and 14).

**Example 13: “Sai quando il mar più teme” from Eumene (I,1), bars 42-48.**

**Example 14: “Sai quando il mar più teme” from Eumene (I,1), bars 49-63, vocal part.**

33 Giai, *Mitridate*, p. 58. The score of the opera is kept in GB-Lcm, shelfmark 209.
“Mi sento al cor discendere” (I,5; see Example 15) is possibly also an insertion aria with an altered text though the music is not identical neither with Vinci’s nor with Orlandini’s setting. It is a galant movement with Lombardic rhythms and drumming bass accompaniment. Vocally, those phrases are especially remarkable which show the wide range and flexibility of the singer’s voice: there are two scale passages downwards encompassing an octave and a half (upbeat to bar 25-30). The first one goes from $g''$ to $d'$ and after stopping on $e'$ the second one begins on $f''$ with a jump of a ninth. Furthermore, there is an octave jump down ($e''$-$c''$) and right after that up of a ninth ($c'$-$d''$; bar 36) at the beginning of the A2 section. From a melodic and dramatic perspective, the aria is chromatically colored by altered notes: its strongest distinguishing mark is the main motif (vocal part: bar 16, orchestra: bar 2), which regularly appears during the whole number. It consists of an accented raised fourth degree ($e''$ in B flat major) functioning as a leading note chromatically gravitating towards the fifth degree. After that the melody takes an octave jump down, thereby strengthening the future tonic, i.e. the dominant key, F major. Words like “discendere” (“to descend”; bars 16 and 36) and “misero” (“wretch”; bar 70) are stressed in this way, additionally “sdegno” (“rage”; bar 21) by a tritone ($f''$-$b'$), reflecting Artemisia’s feelings after she received terrifying news about her beloved Eumene.

Example 15: „Mi sento al cor discendere“ from Eumene (I,5), upbeat to bar 15-38, vocal part.

Farinella’s Act II insertion, Farinelli’s galant Larghetto “So che pietà non hai” (II,2) from Leo’s Catone is an important piece that proves her lyric talents and rhythmic versatility: it is marked by dotted rhythms (bars 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 25-30, 32, etc.), triplets (bars 58-60), demisemiquaver notes (bars 16, 18, 26-28, 32 and 53) and syncopation (bars 15, 22, 28, 42, 44, 46-49, 55, 57-61 and 86-92), completed melodically by chromatic nuances (bars 22-23, 46, 48-49, 54-57, 61, 81-83, 87-92 and 96-98) and fine dynamical shades. Vocally, due to its relatively high held notes, this music requires a stronger stamina (see Example 16).

“Sentirsi il petto accendere” was used in Vinci’s Gismondo (Rome 1727) and in Orlandini’s Massimiano (Venice 1731); in the latter it might have been recycled material from an earlier opera by Orlandini, as observed by Reinhard Strohm.
Example 16: “So che pietà non hai” from Eumene (II,2), bars 38-67, vocal part.

Additionally, “Aperto un core da stral d’amore”, Laodicea’s aria at the end of Act I sung by the Bolognese soprano Teresa Zanardi Gavazzi, was also replaced by “Sento che si consola colla speranza il cor” the text of which is also missing in the libretto. Both arias are lyric galant numbers with strong melodic traits, syncopation, chromatics and seventh portamento leaps. They both begin in C major and have their middle sections in minor keys: “Aperto un core” in E minor, “Sento che si consola” in the relative A minor. Both are tuneful and sweet cantabilearias. The second one could be performed slightly more lively and its tessitura is definitely a higher one (see Example 17): it reaches a” ten times, a” flat two times, in contrast to “Aperto un core” which offered an a” note only two times (all the numbers also include da capo repetitions).

Example 17: “Sento che si consola colla speranza il cor” from Eumene (I,6), bars 22-34, vocal part.

Arminio (1732)

The libretto of Rinaldi’s Arminio (score in D-MElr, Ed 147q) is based on the version of Antonio Salvi’s text for Milan, set to music by Johann Adolph Hasse in 1730. The music, however, is not identical with that of the Viennese performance. Therefore, it is possible that this is a completely new version by Francesco Rinaldi. There are, however, two substitution arias in the score, one is the already mentioned tenor aria “Quant’empietà nei mostri” (II,4), a coloratura number with trills and a range spanning from

35  RINALDI, Eumene, p. 10.
36  I-Mb, Racc.dramm.6040 006.
37  F-Pn, VM7-7694.C. 15 copies of single arias; none is concordant. STROHM, 1976.
c sharp to a” sung by Leopold Hager in place of “Inesorabile, qual mi rendete” as the libretto indicates.\textsuperscript{38}

Additionally, the Florentine soprano Maddalena Salvai as Tusnelda had a substitute aria in III,6.\textsuperscript{39} The libretto shows here the text of “Dolce rieda”, a simple dance movement in triple meter, the score, however, contains an additional aria as well.\textsuperscript{40} “Fra tante procelle scorge il nocchiero” (see Example 18) is a high-level bravura number with long coloraturas, including one eight-bar long agitated melisma, ironically at the word “calma” (“serenity”; bars 35-42). Salvai perhaps found the planned “Dolce rieda” too simple for her capacities and might have asked for a much more demanding aria in the last minute.

Example 18: “Fra tante procelle scorge il nocchiero” from Arminio (III,6), bars 34-42, vocal part.

\textit{Medea riconosciuta} (1735), an adaptation of Leonardo Vinci’s \textit{Il Medo} (1728)

\textit{Medea riconosciuta} (A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17945), based on Leonardo Vinci’s \textit{Il Medo},\textsuperscript{41} was performed at the Kärntnertortheater in December 1735, with no less than twelve substitute arias. Vinci’s original work had been staged for the first time in Parma in 1728 with Farinelli and Vittoria Tesi in the leading roles. Interestingly, Artace was sung by the contralto Dorotea Lolli who happened to be engaged at the Kärntnertortheater in 1732.\textsuperscript{42} The names of the cast are missing both in the libretto and the score of the Viennese

\textsuperscript{38} D-MEIr, Ed 147q; “Quant’empietà nei mostri”: fols. 76v-79r; “Inesorabile, qual mi rendete”, the text is given in the libretto, but missing in the score. RINALDI/SALVI, Arminius, pp. 28 and 30. The text “Quant’empietà nei mostri accolta” comes from CAPELLI/SILVANI/FRUGONI, I fratelli riconosciuti, Parma 1726; the music of this aria is different. US-Wc, ML48 [S1590], p. 6.
\textsuperscript{39} Besides performing in various Italian cities and e.g. in Kassel and Dresden (1719-20) in Germany, Salvai also sang with Handel in London: she played Polissena in the revival of Radamisto in December 1720, Fidalma in Muzio Scevola (1721) and Rossane in Floridante (1721). At the Viennese Kärntnertortheater she was engaged only in 1732.
\textsuperscript{40} D-MEIr, Ed 147q; “Dolce rieda”: fols. 143r-146v, “Fra tante procelle scorge il nocchiero”: fols. 137v-142v.
\textsuperscript{41} I-MC, 1-A-18/19/20.
\textsuperscript{42} She represented Arsace in Rinaldi’s \textit{Il contrasto delle due regine in Persia}. 
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production, but in his letter of 17 August 1735 Georg Adam Hoffmann reported on the ensemble of the Kärntnertortheater during the 1735/36 season (see Table 1).\textsuperscript{43}

Table 1: Comparison of the cast and aria lists of Vinci’s Il Medo (1728) and Medea riconosciuta at the Kärntnertortheater – insertions marked in bold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leonardo Vinci</th>
<th>Il Medo (1728 Parma)</th>
<th>Medea riconosciuta (1735 Vienna)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cast:</td>
<td>(presumed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea alias Enota</td>
<td>Vittoria Tesi (A)</td>
<td>Soprano (Livia Barbieri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giasone alias Climaco</td>
<td>Carlo Broschi detto Farinelli (S)</td>
<td>Contralto (“Castrat” or Dorotea Lolli?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteria</td>
<td>Costanza Pusterla (MS)</td>
<td>Soprano (Laura Bambini “Bambina”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medo alias Antinoo</td>
<td>Antonio Bernacchi (A)</td>
<td>Soprano (Katharina Mayer “Catterl”?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artace</td>
<td>Dorotea Lolli (A)</td>
<td>Soprano (unknown singer?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse</td>
<td>Giovanni Paita (T)</td>
<td>Tenor (“Joseph”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Act I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perse</th>
<th>O del giorno, o delle stelle</th>
<th>O del giorno, o delle stelle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antinoo</td>
<td>Quel fiume, che in mente</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enotea</td>
<td>Terra amica, che pur sei cara (F major)</td>
<td>Terra amica, che pur sei cara (G major): reduced to its A part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse</td>
<td>Oh dea, quanto in tuo nome (rec. accomp.)</td>
<td>Oh dea, quanto in tuo nome (rec. accomp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse</td>
<td>Tu del mio regno sei</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enotea</td>
<td>Se vedi il mare</td>
<td>Dal tuo gentil sembiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteria</td>
<td>Giurai d’amarti</td>
<td>Giurai d’amarti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antinoo</td>
<td>Taci, o di morte (F major)</td>
<td>Taci, o di morte (B major): middle section newly composed in triple meter and in parlante style for the singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artace</td>
<td>Bella luce dall’orrido grembo (D major)</td>
<td>Bella luce (F major): B section cut, the text of the B section is incorporated at the beginning of part A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climaco</td>
<td>Scherzo dell’onda</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteria</td>
<td>Onda del fiume altera</td>
<td>Che bella speranza lusinga: fewer and slower coloraturas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climaco</td>
<td>Cervo in bosco, se lo impiaga</td>
<td>Quel torrente, che orgoglioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse</td>
<td>Amanti, sì, credetelo</td>
<td>Amanti, sì, credetelo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Act II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enotea</th>
<th>Consolati, o mio cor (rec. accomp.)</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enotea</td>
<td>Quasi furia d’Acheronte (arioso)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enotea</td>
<td>Guarda, infido ingrato amante</td>
<td>Se infedel già fu il tuo amore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climaco</td>
<td>Sento due fiamme in petto</td>
<td>Mi fan guerra due pensieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse</td>
<td>Spietato vorresti</td>
<td>Spietato vorresti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteria</td>
<td>Tu mi ricerchi in volto</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{43} Perutková, 2015, pp. 201f.; Perutková, 2016, pp. 284f.
The first insertion belonged to Enotea (alias Medea), “Dal tuo gentil sembiante” (I,5; text derived from “Dal suo gentil sembiante” from Pietro Metastasio’s *Demetrio*), a typical galant *Andante* movement with demisemiquaver ornaments, dotted rhythms, syncopation with sixth jumps and with the compulsory drumming bass accompaniment. It has a comparatively wide mezzo-soprano range spanning from $b$ to $g''$ sharp (see Example 19). There was another insertion, “Il nocchier che troppo ardito”, in the third act (Scene 5; see Example 25). It is a typical shipwreck simile aria but with moderate technical demands. As far as Enotea’s original arias from Vinci’s *Il Medo* are concerned, they were sung by the famous contralto Vittoria Tesi in the Parma production while in Vienna the role was taken over by a soprano or mezzo-soprano. Therefore, “Terra amica” (I,3), for example, was transposed a tone higher (from F major to G major) and reduced to its A section in the Viennese performance, meaning that the longest coloratura, located in the middle section, was cut too. Together with other smaller adjustments of the vocal line, these changes are clearly referring to a singer of lesser vocal agility and a narrower range than Vinci’s original Enotea/Medea, the first-class singer Vittoria Tesi. At the beginning of Act II of *Il Medo* Enotea had a whole scene with (1) an *accompagnato* recitative, “Consolati, o mio cor”, (2) an arioso, “Quasi furia d’Acheronte”, and (3) an *aria agitata*, “Guarda, infido
In Vienna, the first two numbers were cut and the aria was replaced by “Se infedel già fu il tuo amore”, a sweeter, calmer and more melodious Andante number.


Climaco got four substitutions due to the difference of voice type since in Parma the role had been entrusted to the soprano Farinelli. “Quel torrente, che orgoglioso” (I,12; see Example 20 and 21) replaced the castrato’s famous showcase aria “Cervo in bosco, se lo impiaqa”. The text deals with the proud waves of the torrent threatening the shore that are finally tamed and quenched by the summer heat. The aria is characterized by instrumental-type coloratura sections with wide leaps, e.g. twice from the low a to d'' (bars 129 and 137), in semiquaver motion as well as a chromatic descending and ascending at the words “orgoglioso” (“proud”) and “premerà” (“oppresses”). Furthermore, “Mi fan guerra due pensieri” (II,2; see Example 22) was performed instead of “Sento due fiamme in petto”. This is most probably an insertion aria written by Giovanni Battista Costanzi for the revival of Domenico Sarro’s Partenope at the newly built Teatro Tordinona in Rome in 1734. In this case, the Viennese substitution aria is a much more interesting piece than Vinci’s original number, with a compass from low a to f’’, built on the contrast of wide leaps of longer notes in stile di basso and high-tessitura coloratura passages with downward scales (e.g. in bars 110-111, spanning from g sharp to b’) and repeated notes. These two types of sections are connected by syncopated and chromatic melismas. As a further coloring, the middle section brings a nice piano and amoroso switch to the tonic minor key, i.e. A minor, after the A major da capo part. The Viennese contralto Climaco also took over Artace’s aria “Vedeste dalla selva” (II,8) which required the same voice type; in this way no changes were needed. It is not impossible that Dorotea Lolli, the original Artace, played Climaco here since there is no trace of her until 1738 when she sang Partenope in Vivaldi’s Rosmira at the Teatro Sant’Angelo in Venice. The last substitution aria of this role, “Non lascierò d’amare”, has a dance character in 6/8 meter and is made of high-tessitura pastoral-like melodies in F major. As closing number of the second act (II,13), it represented a strong musico-dramatic shift in contrast to the aria it replaced, i.e. Farinelli’s other bravura movement “Navigante, che non spera”.  

44 I would like to thank Reinhard Strohm for sharing this important information with me. See also Corp, 2011, p. 268.
Example 20: “Quel torrente, che orgoglioso” from Medea riconosciuta (I,12), bars 60-88, vocal part.

Example 21: “Quel torrente, che orgoglioso” from Medea riconosciuta (I,12), bars 123-138, vocal part.

Example 22: “Mi fan guerra due pensieri” from Medea riconosciuta (II,2), bars 91-138, vocal part.

The seconda donna Asteria had three substitution arias. She sang the aria di mezzo carattere, “Che bella speranza”⁴⁵ (I,11), in place of “Onda del fiume altera”, a number with fewer and slower coloraturas (quaver motion in alla breve) than in the aria it replaced. “Se dal feroce” was substituted by “Sarebbe un gran diletto” (II,11) (originally sung by Farinelli as a replacement aria in Leonardo Leo’s Catone in Utica, as “Sarebbe un bel diletto”, and a whole tone higher, Venice 1729).⁴⁶ It is written in the soprano clef, but its compass (b flat to g”) rather indicates a mezzo-soprano. The structure is generally based

⁴⁵ Reinhard Strohm observed that the text of this aria appeared in the production of Vivaldi’s Orlando furioso in Bassano in 1741 (I,8, Medoro, sung by the Milanese soprano Regina Salvioni).

⁴⁶ This aria was identified by Reinhard Strohm.
on sequential repetitions. The vocal part has moderate coloraturas, but it demands agility because of the chiseled demisemiquaver rhythms, trills and wide jumps. Particularly interesting moments are the singer’s first entry with a rhythmically syncopated imitation of hunting horn signals (see Example 23) and chromatic alterations both in the A and B parts, the middle section’s explicit semitone ascending and descending at the words “affanno” (“distress”; bars 46-47), “goder senza penar” (“enjoyment without suffering”; upbeat to bar 60-62), and “inganno” (“deceit”; upbeat to bars 65, 68-69; see Example 24). These are the same chromatic scales as in Climaco’s “Quel torrente, che orgoglioso” (I,12; see Example 20 and 21) and they are not the only elements corresponding to other insertions in the opera. A series of jumps of a seventh-octave-ninth-tenth downward from $f''$ (bars 38-39), describing terror and fear, represents a sharp contrast to the chromatic drags. Remarkably, a similar violin-idiom phrase appears in Enotea’s aria in Act III, “Il nocchier che troppo ardito” (bars 52-53; see Example 25), though inversely: it goes up from the third to the seventh and its pedal point in $e'$. Asteria’s last insertion was the aria parlante “D’amor mi parli ingrato?” (III,6) from Luca Antonio Predieri’s Eurene (Parma 1734, sung by Catterina Visconti)\(^{47}\) in 2/4 time, with pauses, exclamations and fermatas at words like “ah!, guarda” (“look”), “crude” (“cruel”), “spietato” (“ruthless”) and “ingrato” (“ungrateful”) which point to the emphasis on gestures and acting as important complementary tools for an effective performance of this aria. As a contrast, it contains, however, a real coloratura passage on the word “amante” (“lover”).


Example 24: “Sarebbe un gran dilettto” from Medea riconosciuta (II,11), bars 35-72, vocal part.

---

\(^{47}\) This aria was identified by Reinhard Strohm; it is also preserved as an anonymous aria in D-RH, Hs.803 (cf. RISM), in the same key as in the Viennese score (D major).
The tenor Perse’s only replacement aria, with a similar content to that of Climaco’s “Quel torrente, che orgoglioso”, was a mezzo carattere number with slower melismas and a chromatic middle section. “Fiume ondoso, che orgoglioso” (II,7) corresponds to “Mira l’onda furibonda” from Andrea Stefano Fioré’s Sesostri (Turin 1717), with an altered text. It had also been interpreted by the German bass Johann Gottfried Riemschneider as “Come l’onda furibonda” in Handel’s pasticcio Ormisda in London in 1730.

The various insertions in Medea riconosciuta are connected by some strikingly coinciding compositional characteristics: (1) wide leaps, (2) violin idioms of ever wider leaps falling back to the same pedal-point note and (3) ascending and descending chromatic drags. Although it is clear that all these arias are from different composers, their selection proves the taste and musicality of the arranger who tried to create an organic, but versatile and up-to-date style for his production.

Since singers frequently changed at the first public opera house of Vienna several commonly used methods were applied to accommodate newly staged works to their voices: they could either bring their own baggage arias, previously sung by them personally or by their famous colleagues, or demand more suitable or virtuoso numbers; in case of a different voice type than in the original role, there was the possibility of transposition, but the arrangers seem to have preferred to keep the original key of the aria and adjust the vocal line. The house composers tended to pay attention to keep the pasticcio operas as homogeneous as possible by a careful selection of stylistically harmonizing arias. Not only the singers’ preferences, but also Rinaldi’s predilection for Handel’s music influenced the opera productions. In the special case of the Kärntnertortheater, the insertion practice had also to do with the institutional structure of the theater, because the staging of pasticcios and intermezzi allowed the impresarios – despite the lack of a court privilege – to perform Italian operas alongside comedies. Therefore, the pasticcio per-
Performances filled with popular arias of the day from all over Europe, the co-existence of Italian and German-speaking singers and the manifold ways their roles were adjusted to their individual vocal and musico-dramatic capacities, point to a process to find the most successful way of offering opere serie to the general public in Vienna.
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The Book of Pasticcios

Listening to *Ormisda’s* Material Texts

CARLO LANFOSSI

Composers did not write music: printers and copyists did. The agency we are prone to assign today to composers of the early modern era was a quite intricate one: as we acknowledge the importance of assembling musical ideas for the purpose of arranging a performance, we tend to forget about the material conditions of possibility for such musical assemblages to circulate and to be performed. These musical assemblages were the result of an intricate network of labor which involved not only composers, but also copyists, printers, singers, impresarios, and so on. Printed and manuscript scores were objects of collaborative work and participated in a marketplace that was not that different from the thriving literary one. As scholars in the field of the ‘History of the Book’ have long noted, the purpose is to understand how “ideas were transmitted through print and how exposure to the printed word affected the thought and behavior of mankind during the last five hundred years”.\(^1\) If we transfer this same concept to the realm of musical performances and its material configurations, we can go back to our original statement: composers did not write music, printers and copyists did.\(^2\)

So, what happens when we investigate a musical genre, the operatic pasticcio, which inherently requires composers to write little to no music? This article traces some of the material configurations of one of the early pasticcios in which George Frideric Handel was (to a little degree) involved in London, *Ormisda* (King’s Theatre, 1730): by focusing on a variety of musical sources (printed and manuscript) produced in the years around the premiere of the pasticcio and after, I aim to provide a fresh view of the operatic culture in London during the early decades of the 18\(^{th}\) century, in light of the role played by the social life of musical objects in the context of pasticcio-making. Moreover, by showing how copying habits of Italian music were the result of a peculiar

---

1 Darnton, 1982, p. 65.
2 The sentence is a reformulation of a famous concept elaborated by Chartier, 1994, p. 10: “[A]uthors do not write books: they write texts that become written objects, which may be hand-written, engraved, or printed”.
culture of listening, I analyze the way such musical artifacts contributed to the very process of both creating and attending a pasticcio, rethinking it as a form of listening inscription.

**Ormisda and the culture of song printing in London**

*Ormisda* was produced by Handel and Johann Jacob Heidegger during their new joint venture at the King’s Theatre, after the failure of the Royal Academy of Music in 1729 and after travel to Italy for the recruitment of new singers. First performed at the King’s Theatre on 4 April 1730, *Ormisda* was an adaptation of a libretto by Apostolo Zeno that was first set to music in Vienna in 1721 by Antonio Caldara, and a year later by Giuseppe Maria Orlandini for a reprise in Bologna. According to Strohm, the London pasticcio *Ormisda* was partially assembled as a collection of Italian music that Handel and Heidegger either listened to or physically gathered during their travels, and much of the music collected during these trips was later to be used in several of the other pasticcios. Handel and Heidegger were provided with the subject and some arias already in late 1725 by their agent in Venice Owen Swiney, who in March 1726 complained to the Duke of Richmond:

> “Im’e very Sorry to find that the Academy is likely to receive any damaage from the opera Ormisda’s not arriving in London in due Time: The badnesse of the roads having occasioned its delay, above 35 days, more than the usual time, between Venice and Amsterdam […] The music is excellent: the Book [the libretto] a very good one: and Senesino’s and the Cuzzoni’s parts are very considerable ones.”

The Academy initially decided not to use the music sent by Swiney at the time of its arrival in 1726. Instead, it was put on hold until 1730, when the pressure of putting on two new operas every year demanded a faster achievement, a pasticcio. John Roberts has questioned the possibility of Handel being involved in the creation of *Ormisda*, given that there is no trace of Handel’s intervention in the conducting and harpsichord scores (held respectively at the British Library and at the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek “Carl von Ossietzky” in Hamburg), nor that the style of the newly composed recitatives matches Handel’s. Whether Handel was directly involved or not, *Ormisda* was a

---


4 Strohm, 1985, pp. 172f.

5 Owen Swiney to the Duke of Richmond, Venice, 11 (22) March 1726 (Hcd, vol. 2, pp. 36f.).

6 Roberts, 2016. My own investigation into the primary sources for *Ormisda* has also left me with the sense that there is no trace of Handel’s handwriting in either the conduct-
prominent show for the new operatic enterprise by him and Heidegger, being even more successful than the previous pasticcio Elpidia, with a total of 18 performances between the first run (4 April-14 May 1730) and a reprise at the beginning of the next season (24 November-8 December 1730).  

The new pasticcio was widely publicized in local journals, and the presence of the royal family at most of the performances was constantly noticed. On 20 April, The Daily Journal’s usual advertisement for the performance of Ormisda on the next day featured an additional line: “Ormisda Having Twelve Songs chang’d”. This was the sixth performance since the initial run of the show. Changing songs in the middle of a set of performances was not unusual and was part of the typical operatic instability that informed much of baroque spectacles. What was unusual was the advertising of the change in the newspapers, as if the actual replacement of songs was of public interest. This speaks even more to the impact that Ormisda likely had on the London public sphere, and its role in the development of the ‘song culture’ of the 1720s-30s.

During the early 18th century, London was at the center of a printing boom. Both for economic and more practical reasons (the large width of the city, the insularity of the country, urban population growth), the printing and publishing markets were by far some of the largest enterprises to be found in early modern England. After the lapse of the Printing Act in 1695, and the subsequent freedom from prepublication censorship, the efflorescence of printing was tangible throughout England, and in particular in London. If newspapers undoubtedly consisted of the majority of periodical publications in Georgian Britain, it should be remembered that its “spectacular rise” was not exclusively made of news. Instead, a panoply of literary journals, scientific publications, and entertainment sheets increasingly flooded the streets of London during the first decades of the 18th century. These publications entered the modern capitalist market by relying on the placement of advertisements next to actual local news and announcements, thus giving the London newspaper its peculiar layout in which, for instance, next to the notices of the evening shows throughout the city one could find advertisements for publications related to the same shows. Newspapers, to sum up, were a periodical publication made of discrete content conceived to produce other periodical press and products.

The period from 1680 to 1720 is today considered a “revolutionary” one for music printing and publishing in London. Due to new copyright laws, the rise of printers and

\[ \text{GB-Lbl, Add.31551} \] or the harpsichord score (D-Hs, M A/1036), unlike what claimed by Clausen, 1972, p. 184.

8 See the various reports on ibid., pp. 354-358.
10 See Bianconi, 1987, pp. 190-204.
growth of potential buyers of publications, the market was a flourishing and quite an exceptional one.\(^{15}\) Engraving and the use of pewter plates and punches soon replaced the letterpress technique, thus leading to the possibility for publishers to retain the ownership of copper and pewter plates. This meant a faster and more affordable way to reprint editions, fashioning a labor model in which the job was outsourced to freelance engravers or apprentices.\(^{16}\) This potential for music books to be easily reprinted, I argue, had a deep impact not only on the circulation of music, but also on its production and composition. The high degree of repeatability of these musical collections affected the musical community on different levels: for publishers, it meant not only a more efficient economic model, but also an increased interest in obtaining music to copy, possibly to be included in collections; for consumers, it directed the attention towards musical singles, in turn creating a demand for musical collections; for composers and producers of music (such as opera house impresarios, singers, and musical agents) it meant creating or obtaining music that fit this peculiar printing model. It should be remembered that this was a peculiar model of music printing, as – unlike continental Europe – the practice of printing opera songs was almost exclusively an English accomplishment. In Italy, there was no model for opera printing until the late 18\(^{th}\) century, while in France opera was printed in full and mostly for the purpose of courtly display of magnificence.\(^{17}\) There was no equivalent to the flow of song collections in England during the early decades of the 18\(^{th}\) century. I argue that the history of song collections in England is relevant to the development of the pasticcio as a format not only because of its pervasiveness, but also because of the material aspects of music transmission (copying practices, reading conventions, and collecting habits) that allowed for the pasticcio to be considered as a viable model of listening experience through its materiality, through this ‘single song’ culture.

To go back to Ormisda, only two years before its premiere, John Gay’s The Beggar’s Opera inaugurated in January 1728 a tradition of ballad operas that was – among other things – one of the outgrowths of the peculiar song and print culture of early 18\(^{th}\)-century London.\(^{18}\) In a way, it can be said that the new insistence on pasticcios on behalf of the new operatic venture by Handel and Heidegger was a response to the massive popularity of the ballad opera, and to the consequent spinning of song circulation through songbooks and playtexts with music. As noted by Mary Pendarves (later Mary Delany, one of Handel’s friends and a strong supporter of Italian opera)\(^{19}\) after she attended a rehearsal

\(^{15}\) Hunter, 1991, p. 647.
\(^{16}\) Hunter, 1989, p. 333.
\(^{17}\) “Apart from the minor exception of operas by Jean Baptiste Lully published by the Ballards in Paris and Estienne Roger in Amsterdam, opera circulated in manuscript form. London became the site of the first significant, extended effort at printing operatic works.” Hunter, 1991, p. 649.
\(^{18}\) The bibliography on ballad opera is vast and heterogeneous. For the specific relationship between ballad operas and Handel’s music, see Joncus, 2006.
\(^{19}\) On Mary Pendarves, see Harris, 2014, pp. 181f.
of *Ormisda*: “Operas are dying, to my great mortification. Yesterday I was at the Rehearsal of a new one, it is compos’d of Several Songs out of Italien [sic] Operas, but it is very heavy to Mr. Hendells.” By comparing *Ormisda* to a usual “Mr. Hendell’s” opera, Pendarves is opposing *Ormisda* to the popular success of the ballad operas. A few months before, she confessed to Anne Granville her distaste for the phenomenon of ballad operas: “The Opera is too good for the Vile tast[e] of The Town […] the present Opera is dislik’d because it is too much Studied and they love nothing but Minuetts and Ballads, in short the *Beggars Opera* and *Hurlothrumbo* are only worthy of applause.” Mary Pendarves’s acknowledgement that *Ormisda* was “compos’d of Several Songs out of Italien [sic] Operas” reflects the wider concern over the status of opera in relation to its materiality, that of its composition as an assemblage of songs taken “out of” something else. *Ormisda* was a “new one”, but it was already assembled to be dismantled. Hence, the advertisement in the *Daily Journal* highlighting the change of songs (see supra).

The performance of *Ormisda* on 21 April, the one featuring “twelve songs chang’d”, has been traditionally identified as a ‘benefit’ performance for the *prima donna* Anna Maria Strada del Pò. Recently, this identification has been put into question, given that the only source claiming this performance as a benefit was a handwritten note found in a copy of the *Ormisda* libretto held at the British Library (on which see infra). The manuscript annotation reports: “This was first performed for the Benefit of the Prima Donna Sig.a Anna Strada del Pò”.

For a genre inherently concerned with multi-authoriality such as the pasticcio, it comes as no surprise if copies of librettos of this pasticcio were annotated in various ways: users of these items were, in a way, compelled to engage with them to disentangle its work of assemblage. The pasticcio, because of its meta-theatrical nature of staging music already staged, seems to call for a direct involvement of audiences. In the case of librettos, the material traces of such reading and listening activities are to be found in manuscript annotations. And this is where we start with our investigation into the sources of *Ormisda*.

**Reading the *Ormisda* librettos**

So, let’s start with *Ormisda’s* libretto. More precisely, the librettos, since the presence of at least three different versions has created issues in terms of *Ormisda’s* textual status. Colin Timms’s article on the two copies of the *Ormisda* librettos at the Library of Bir-
While carefully attempting the reconstruction of the three different textual versions of the play based on two different sets of additional pages to be found in each copy, sometimes stumbles over the difference between “copy” and “version,” obscuring the very possibility of bibliographical stratification over time. Given that all the Ormisda copies of the libretto have an identical layout and content, it cannot be ruled out that only the “Additional pages” might have been printed after the first batch of performances, and later bound with the librettos by their collectors. To be more precise:

- the Birmingham copy B/44, which Timms identifies with the “original” version, is a copy with no additional pages, which does not mean it could not have included additional pages at some point in its textual life;
- the British Library copy (11714.aa.20/1) has six unnumbered pages of “Additional Songs to the Opera of Ormisda, both in Italian and English”; it is an identical copy to the Birmingham B/44, with twelve additional songs over eight unnumbered pages bound with it;
- the Birmingham copy B/40 has the same identical layout of the other two, but it has four pages at the end, numbered 73-76, containing different replacement songs.

In sum, all three copies seem to be the same version of the libretto, with additional pages that may refer to different versions of the play, but of which the actual textual reconstruction seems a misinterpretation of the relationship between the bibliographical status of the sources, their “social life” as objects, and their performance textualization. Printed librettos prompt performances, of which their ‘text’ is by definition irrecoverable; the textualization of a performance is not exclusively recorded nor fixed in a printed item. If these copies acted and participated in the material life of the pasticcos (and more generally in London’s reading culture), the most important feature to focus on is the recurrence of handwriting annotations over them. The British Library copy, as a matter of fact, is extensively annotated by an anonymous “English eighteenth-century hand” who carefully marked not only the name of each singer next to the arias, but also referenced the presence of songs and even instrumental parts “in the score”. The score referred to is the conducting score in the British Library, a manuscript copy originating in the copyist workshop of John Christopher Smith which bears traces of several adjustments, refoliation, additions, and lacunae. The reader of the British Library libretto of Ormisda was cross-referencing with the conducting score for the presence of songs. Readers

---

25 GB-Bp, A782.12, Plays B/44 and Plays B/40. See Timms, 1984, pp. 147-149.
26 “Social life of objects” is a famous formulation by Arjun Appadurai, and it refers to the practices and values attached to objects as they circulate; see Appadurai, 1986.
27 Strohm, 1985, p. 284. The indication of instrumental parts clearly rules out the possibility that “the score” referred to could be the compilation of songs printed as The Favourite Songs in the Opera call’d Ormisda (on which, see infra).
28 GB-Lbl, Add.31551. The manuscript has been codicologically described by Clausen, 1972, pp. 184-187.
of the pasticcio librettos seem to be particularly attracted by the identification of songs, their material inscription in printed or manuscript form, and by the very act of re-reading the text by going back and forth between the available scores and the libretto. This form of visual indexing is even more explicit in this copy of the libretto, since the annotator has sequentially numbered each song, including the additional ones.

But who, in the 18th century, could have had access to the conducting score of *Ormisda*? The performing scores were in Handel’s possession throughout his lifetime, only to be passed over to Smith junior after his death. This collection was then kept in the Smith family up until the 1850s, when it was sold by auction and ended up as the foundation to two important collections at the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek “Carl von Ossietzky” in Hamburg and at the British Library, the latter being the so-called “Marshall collection” offered to the Royal Music Library and hosted in the British Museum and the British Library (and which includes the score of *Ormisda*).\(^{29}\) This means that our alleged 18th-century reader must have consulted the conducting score directly from the Smith circle. On p. 4 of the annotated copy, a long comment makes explicit reference to the various versions of the opera:

“This was first performed for the Benefit of the Prima Donna, Sig.a Anna Strada del Pò. There is neither the writer’s, nor the Composer’s name mentioned. It was frequently played. It came out April 4th, and on April 21st there was a change of 12 songs. The performance was under the direction of Handel. The Drama of Ormisda, says Burney, was written by Apostolo Zeno, and originally composed for Vienna by Caldara in 1722.”

The reference to Charles Burney’s *General History of Music* – where *Ormisda* is cited by the English music historiographer in connection to the rest of the season – dates this annotation no earlier than 1789, the year of the first edition of Burney’s complete four volumes.\(^{30}\) It is actually even more likely that, given the physical proximity of the annotated printed libretto and the conducting score in the British Library for comparison purposes, this annotation could only have been written while the items were already physically in the same place. Thus, it seems very unlikely that this hand could be of actual 18th-century origins. Rather, it seems as if our pasticcio reader was a 19th-century collector who was prompted to make sense of such an opera due to its intrinsic indexical nature. The same exact handwriting can be found on the partially autograph copy of Handel’s *Te Deum* (RM.20.g.4), in which there is a remark: “*This is all Mr Smith’s writing, except | the name of Bayly*”),\(^{31}\) This handwriting has been attributed to Michael Rophino Lacy (1795-1867), an English violinist and composer who helped the Handel

---

31. This manuscript is among those digitally scanned and available to the general public on the British Library website: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=R.M.20.g.4, 26.11.2019.
historian Victor Schoelcher to research and identify Handel’s manuscripts during the 1850s. More confirmation of Lacy’s handwriting comes from confronting some of the manuscripts of Handel’s music that Lacy had transcribed, such as Add.31555 held at the British Library (GB-Lbl, Add.31555, fol. 2r).

Finally, we can identify our pasticcio reader. A mid-19th-century musician with a passion for cataloguing, Lacy was also actively involved in the performance of Handel’s music, whether organizing a series of “Handelian Operatic Concerts” in London in 1847, or by reusing Handel’s music in his own operas (such as The Israelites in Egypt, 1833, with music by both Handel and Rossini). On top of that, he helped the Handel scholar Victor Schoelcher in his research for his book The Life of Handel (1857), an enterprise during which Lacy had to read and confront hundreds of librettos and scores, including those of the pasticcios. Lacy was reading, confronting, attributing, indexing, and finally re-appropriating music more than a century after the performances of the pasticcios. We do not know if any of the music from the pasticcios was performed during the 19th century, but it was certainly read and – in a way – listened to, at least in Lacy’s head. The social life of an object such as the British Library copy of the Ormisda libretto reveals the peculiar affordance of the pasticcio as a genre, its indexicality and the demands its reading makes.

In sum, Lacy is not to be considered a reliable first-hand source for attribution. Yet, Clausen, Strohm, Timms, have all used his annotations to reconstruct the hypothetical three versions of the text of Ormisda that should correspond to the premiere, to the new version of 21 April, and to the next season reprise. I propose a different hypothesis: the “Additional Songs” printed at the end of the copy in the British Library, without any page number, seem more likely to have been printed in a rush during the April 1730 performances, and they actually contain twelve songs, as the advertisement makes clear. The four, numbered pages of substituted arias found in the Birmingham libretto (B/40) might have been printed for a new issue of the libretto for the following season. Timms’s main point about identifying the British Library’s “Additional Songs” with the November 1730 performances is that three arias were from Orlandini’s Adelaide, an opera in which Senesino was originally cast. But the score of Adelaide could have been available to Handel, Heidegger, and Smith even without the help of Senesino. Instead, one of the arias included in the Birmingham substitution pages, “Parto, non ho costanza,” was an aria from Capelli’s Venceslao (Parma, 1724). This aria was mentioned by Owen Swiney in the same 11 March 1726 letter to the Duke of Richmond quoted before: “Nothing is lost by bringing on Venceslao first: the Faustina has her part and will be ready to go on the stage, as soon as her cloaths can be made: Senesino has two of the

---

33 Ibid.
34 Schoelcher, 1857, p. xxii, acknowledged that “he [Lacy] was who made those musical examinations of the manuscripts at Buckingham Palace, and of the scores which Handel himself used when he conducted his own works”. See also King, 1997b.
35 Timms, 1984, p. 147.
finest Songs I ever heard: viz. Parto non ho costanza &c of Capelli — & Date parto &c. of Orlandini.”

This letter makes clear how Swiney was already assembling music while in Venice, putting together the best music he could find in Italy, and then sending his musical proposals to the academy. Roberts believes that this is how three pasticcios (Elpidia, Ormisda, Venceslao) were devised, possibly with little or no intervention by Handel. In any case, it seems clear that Ormisda featured a song that was initially conceived for Venceslao, “Parto non ho costanza,” to be sung by Senesino (as prescribed by Swiney) but not originally sung by him. Capelli’s Venceslao, in fact, was never performed by Senesino. When Swiney writes that he has “heard” the song, we probably do not have to take him literally, as he was likely referring to the act of hearing while copying the song for the Academy, with the voice of Senesino in his mind. The pasticcio came into existence as the product of an encounter between the aural imagination and the act of copying and transcribing.

Listening to Ormisda’s musical sources

One of the questions that has arisen from the present discussion is the relationship between musical performances and their material reconfigurations. Musicologists tend to apply the same language, philological methods, and degree of reliability to both realms. Musical sources themselves call for different evaluation and treatment depending on whether they are printed or manuscript items. The role of these sources in the production and reception of the baroque repertoire stems from different apparatuses of technological knowledge; they involved different people, skills, and labor practices; and their agency in building the text’s affordance was different. In sum, a printed libretto and a manuscript score contribute to our understanding of the ‘opera text’ and the ‘performance text’ in different ways, and they should be treated as such, keeping in mind that “dramatic writing and stage performance are modeled by the relationship between tools and technologies […] suggesting a mobile, reciprocal relationship between the work writing might perform as symbolic action and the scene of its affordance, as equipment for living in the changing technology of the stage.”

36 Owen Swiney to the Duke of Richmond, Venice, 11 (22) March 1726 (HCD, vol. 2, p. 37). This letter implies that Orlandini was responsible for composing a Venceslao, too, but there is no trace of any Venceslao with his name in repertoires or contemporary commentaries.


38 The terms refer to David Levin’s differentiation between “opera’s agitated and multiple signifying systems – for instance, the score, the libretto, stage directions – prior to performance” (the “opera text”) and “opera in performance […] as it] takes up a position relative to the opera text.” Levin, 2007, p. 11.

Ormisda reveals the problematic relationship between opera text and performance text when one attempts to reconstruct its different versions with the aid of different sources. For example, Ormisda had a single aria that was printed separately from the usual Favourite collection of songs. This was not unusual in London at the time, as arias from operas recently performed circulated, in a few cases, as individual items. Many copies of a collection of eleven songs from Ormisda survive today, but what has gone unnoticed by Handel scholars (but reported by Smith in his catalogue of Walsh’s editions) is the presence of An Additional Song. Sung by Sig.r Senesino in Ormisda bound with the rest of the song collection in a single copy preserved at the National Library of Scotland. The aria is “È quella la bella” from Act II, a song that was inserted at a later time in the score and that is part of the “Additional Songs” listed in the copy of the libretto at the British Library. If my previous hypothesis of the three different versions is correct, it means that this aria should be one of those included during the 21 April 1730 version with twelve songs changed. The title of this print, though, makes clear that the song was interpreted by Senesino, and not Bernacchi (the singer of the 21 April performance). Yet, given that this aria is the only one among the four for the character of Cosroe that does not feature a substitution in the Birmingham libretto (referring to the November 1730 performances with Senesino), it could still be that the song print of “È quella la bella” refers to Senesino’s performance, with the aria being first introduced and sung by Bernacchi and only later interpreted by Senesino.

In other words, we can consider this single print as a sort of ‘song request’ to inscribe the memory of Senesino’s performances of such arias, even though it was initially inserted in the production prior to his arrival. Walsh must have worked in tandem with John Christopher Smith to obtain the permission and the manuscript from which to copy and prepare the print of the aria “È quella la bella.” “Sung by,” in this case, is not only a way to refer to a recent performance of a singer — somehow inscribing his voice over the printed page — but also a way to point in the direction of previous performances (that of Adelaide, in which this song was sung by Senesino).

In this sense, Ormisda faces ‘intertheatricality’ as its own mode of being. Not only does it reference previous Italian performances of Orlandini’s Adelaide, but also recent performances of Handel’s own Lotario (premiere 2 December 1729). The libretto of this

40 The Favourite Songs in the Opera call’d Ormisda (London: Printed for and Sold by I. Walsh servant to his Majesty an ye Harp and Hoboy in Catharine Street in the Strand, and Joseph Hare at the Viol & Flute in Cornhill near the Royal Exchange, [1730]). Copies consulted in GB-Lbl, Music Collections I.49.(2); GB-Lfom, nn. 1085, 1087, 1088.
41 Smith, 1970, p. 42.
42 GB-En, BH.72.
43 “Intertheatrical” is a term coined by William West to refer to the “shared memories of actions that can be called up to thicken present performances. […] By evoking another performance, intertheatrical moments in early modern plays call on their audiences to witness for them, making the audiences, as it were, responsible for elaborations or explanations that the plays omit” (West, 2013, pp. 155 and 161).
play, in fact, was based on Antonio Salvi’s *Adelaide* (1722), which was also the one set to music by Orlandini. The arias taken from *Adelaide*, though, had their text changed, possibly to avoid a direct connection between the two operas. But the assemblage of such similar productions constitutes a true case of intertheatricality that was exploited through its material interlacing. Even more explicitly – and something that has not been noticed by Handel scholars – the *Ormisda* aria “Si si lasciatemi” contains the same music as the aria “Amor deh lasciami” in *Elpidia*, the pasticcio mounted by the Royal Academy of Music five years earlier. The two arias are musically identical, both being scored for tenor voice (in *Elpidia* for Luigi Antinori, in *Ormisda*, Annibale Pio Fabri). The text of “Amor deh lasciami” has to be determined from the score, though, as the aria was inserted at a later stage than the premiere on 11 May 1725 (and so it does not appear in the printed libretto), possibly for the November 1725 reprises, given that it appeared in print as part of *The Quarterly Collection of Vocal Musick Containing the Choicest Songs for the last Three Months October November & December [1725] being the Additional Songs in Elpidia*. There, the song was published with the title “Sung by Sigr Tenori [sic] in Elpedia [sic]”. The appearance of the same aria (albeit with different wording) in *Ormisda*, which was initially prepared around the same time as *Elpidia* (only to be dropped due to the late arrival of Faustina Bordoni in London in 1726), means that the producers of the two pasticcios had initially planned to have an identical song (with only the textual incipit modified) to be heard by the same audience at a distance of only a few months. The history of the pasticcios went in a different direction, and *Ormisda* would only see the light in 1730. Would audiences have been aware of such a return of the same music? And, if so, what meaning would have been attributed to it? No answer can be given with certainty. The interesting fact about this aria is that the textual incipit, although slightly different (“Amor deh lasciami” vs. “Si si lasciatemi”) still contains words that sound very similar (“lasciami” “lasciatemi”). In a way, it was as if the producers were at the same time trying to cover the possibility of recognizing the song while making it even more obvious by using similar words over exactly the same music. Considering this, and the fact that “Amor deh lasciami” was printed as part of the *Additional Songs in Elpidia*, thus circulating among the London elites (the song

44 See Dean, 2006, p. 140.

45 *Ormisda*’s conducting score (GB-Lbl, Add.31551) features the aria at 86v-89r, while *Elpidia*’s conducting score (GB-Lbl, Add.31606) has it at 22r-24v. This aria was originally featured in the 1718 version of Orlandini’s *Lucio Papirio* in Bologna in a scene where the protagonist is addressing the Senators in the form of a political speech (in terms of the music, this *Lucio Papirio* had nothing to do with the one used by Handel for the Royal Academy performances in 1732). The music for both Orlandini’s Bolognese setting and the London pasticcio *Ormisda* was the same: a manuscript copy of the aria preserved at the Conservatoire Royal de Bruxelles gives the header “Aria S.r Orlandini” and contains the same music as the conducting score of the pasticcio (B-Bc, ms.4448).

46 *The Quarterly Collection*, pp. 13f.

47 Roberts, 2016, p. 175.
even made it into a keyboard commonplace book),\(^{48}\) it must be taken into consideration
the possibility that there was a deliberate choice on behalf of the producers to have the
audience recognize a song that was still being played and in circulation.\(^ {49}\)

The interdependence between recent and contemporary productions was reflected
in the way Ormisda’s music circulated either in printed or manuscript form. In some
cases, songs from Ormisda would be physically bound or at least associated with
operas at the King’s Theatre. Partenope, the opera with which Ormisda shared the cast
for the 1730 season, was an obvious candidate. If the printing of songs was a matter of
inscribing the singer’s voices, then putting together Partenope and Ormisda was a way
of remembering the sound of an entire cast. The desire for collecting and indexing the
music of Handel led an anonymous copyist to assemble two manuscript volumes of the
almost-complete arias from six operas by Handel (Radamisto, Flavio, Sosarme, Teseo,
Poro, and Partenope). These two volumes, today held at the Gerald Coke Collection
in London (ms. n. 388), are visually and formally extraordinary. The transcriber has
managed to fit six operas into 286 pages, sometimes adding English lyrics (the kind
one could find in ballad operas) in red ink.\(^ {50}\) Each volume has a careful and vertiginous
index on the front end-paper, with the name of the singers listed for each song. The
volume referring to Partenope has a small section dedicated to the “Additional Songs”.
These additional songs, though, are not all from Partenope, as some are taken from Or-
misda. They comprise a small selection of four arias (“Pupillette vezzosette,” “Infelice
abbandonata,” “Timido pellegrin,” and “Se mi toglie il tuo furore”) that were already
circulating in printed form as part of the Favourite Songs collection. Ormisda is here
clearly appended as subsidiary, an appendix to Partenope of which there was no need
to signal its different provenience. The songs, copied with miniscule handwriting, are
amassed over each other, carefully including every single detail of the print from which
they were copied. The songs were not copied for the purpose of future performances, but
exclusively with the aim of collecting what was perceived as Handel’s output (Ormisda
included, evidently). Once again, the pasticcio participated in the indexing of the sounds
of the operatic enterprise at the King’s Theatre.

Walsh and Hare did not limit themselves to the printing of song collections. After
the first release of the Favourite Songs, The Country Journal announced, on 11 July
1730, the printing of Partenope’s songs in a reduction for flute “[t]o which is added, the
most favourite Songs in the Opera of Ormisda; the whole fairly engraven and carefully
corrected”.\(^ {51}\) The publication clearly states Handel’s paternity over Partenope’s music,


\(^{49}\) Roberts, 2016, p. 179, also points out that a few musical numbers in Ormisda were taken
from the 1709 pasticcio Clotilda: these pieces had “enjoyed some continuing popularity”
thanks to their publications in print.

\(^{50}\) This copyist has been described by Dean/Knapp, 1987, p. 257; see also Burrows/Keynes,
2012.

publication is Parthenope for a Flute. The Ariets with their Symphonys for a single Flute
but leaves *Ormisda* as a sort of separate musical surplus. The volume has a clear index, “A Table of the Song Tunes contain’d in this Book,” at the bottom of which is included “A List of all Mr. Handel’s Operas Transpos’d for a Flute which may be had where these are sold”. The list is completed with most of Handel’s operas performed up until 1730. Flute transcriptions of opera songs were a popular item for music publishers in the 1720s and the 1730s and song collections from a specific drama would usually have flute transcriptions at the end of each aria. But in the 1730s there seems to have been a new desire for publications exclusively devoted to flute transcriptions, the song culture being so pervasive that users wanted to play tunes without the burden of Italian words. And the struggle with transcribing a foreign language was evident in the way the titles of songs were printed in these kinds of publications, where words were used only for the sake of indexing rather than performing. A look at the index of *Parthenope for a Flute* highlights two different approaches to the transcription of songs from *Partenope* and from *Ormisda*: the latter, in fact, are mostly misspelled, while the ‘real’ opera has carefully transcribed titles. Even more problematically, the titles at the top of the musical renditions (mostly transposed to keys that would suit the flute) are misspelled in a way that reveals a sort of copying habit. The first song from *Ormisda*, “Pupillette vezzosette”, transcribes the title as “Pupil-lette vezzosette,” adding a hyphen exactly where it would be found as a syllable divider in the printed version of the aria in the *Favourite Songs*. “La speranza lusinghiera” becomes “Laspe ranza lusinghiera”, “Infelice abbandonata” becomes simply “Infe lice”, while “Tacerò se tu lo brami” becomes “Tacero setulo”.

These mis-transcriptions were the result of copying practices that attempted to recreate a much-too-faithful copy of the ‘original’ inscription, the one to be found in the printed *Favourite Collection*. Even though assembled in the same workshop – Walsh’s printing shop – the pasticcio songs (unlike the ones that were officially branded as being Handel’s) were treated in their copying process as being copies that attempted not only to reproduce the content, but also the sound of their performance. The flute transcriptions carried the Italian language as a form of listening inscription, because they did not have to be sung again. This is even clearer by looking at how a song such as “Tacerò se tu lo brami” is reproduced in various printed and manuscript collections. Already misspelled as “Tacero setulo” in both the index and the content of the *Parthenope for a Flute* collection, the song is also to be found in another publication which included flute transcriptions, *The Modern Musick-Master or the Universal Musician* by Peter Prel-

---

and the Duet for two Flutes of that Celebrated Opera Compos’d by M.r Handel. To which is added the most Favourite Songs in the Opera of Ormisda. The Whole Fairly Engraven and carefully Corrected. Price 2s (London: Printed for and Sold by John Walsh Musick Printer and Instrument maker to his Majesty at the Harp and Hoboy in Catharine Street in the Strand. and may be had at Joseph Hare’s at the Viol and Hoboy in Cornhill near the Royal Exchange, [1730]). Copy consulted in GB-Lfom, n. 2521.

52 On such publications, see DELLA LIBERA/LOPRIORE, 1994.
This collection of treatises on various musical subjects, printed in 1731, includes a few tunes to be used for practicing on instruments such as the flute, the German flute, and the harpsichord. The section on the German flute contains several songs transcribed from Handel hits, including three from *Ormisda*. In the index of the music contained in all the volumes, “Tacerò se tu lo brami” is listed as “Tacero tacero setulo”. The page with the musical transcription will have the song transposed a tone higher than the version in *Parthenope for a Flute*, given the different instrument, but without the textual incipit at the top (only “A Favourite Air in Ormisda”). The double repetition of the first word (“Tacero tacero”) creates a linguistic conundrum that makes no sense in Italian. Yet, these are the words as they are sung in the aria and printed in the *Favourite Songs*, as a sort of photocopy ante litteram. The circulation of Italian music in London reflected the printing practices of people who were not trained in the Italian language and whose primary purpose was to “carefully engrave” every detail of the songs, including the sonic transcription of Italian words as a form of re-materialization. As part of this process, private collectors would then replicate in their own manuscripts the same printing features. A miscellany titled *German Flute / June 27th, 1734*, part of the Gerald Coke Collection in London, contains some of the same songs to be found in the flute treatises previously described: among the various songs, “Tacero tacero setulo” makes its appearance as an exact reproduction of the one to be found in *The Musick-Master*. The copyists, here, have basically attempted to create a facsimile prior to the actual development of facsimiles. In the context of baroque opera, this makes even more sense if we think of the very act of copying as a condition of possibility for opera itself, with the pasticcio as a form of externalization, of self-referential unveiling of such listening-inscription practices. But if baroque opera, especially Handel’s and those created around his circle, was already a form of repetition (by borrowing and self-borrowing previous music), it follows that all baroque opera was a sort of pasticcio, and its production was the result of a multitude of tendencies, the material aspects of which were among the predominant ones. In 18th-century England, copying was not only a form of reading, but also a form of knowledge production. Moreover, by positioning the pasticcio music as being outside the realm of normative operatic production, the circulation of Italian arias affected the way Handel himself was perceived not only as a composer, but also as an arranger and producer of other people’s music. In a way, Handel became a ‘composer’ (in the literal sense of ‘composing’ as putting together) after experiencing writing and reading practices, copying techniques, and listening habits through the peculiar genre of the pasticcio.

53 Prelleur, 1731. The edition was advertised as early as 14 November 1730 on the *Fog’s Weekly Journal* (HCD, vol. 2, p. 388), only ten days before the reprise of *Ormisda*. Copy consulted in GB-Lbl, Music Collections d.40.
54 GB-Lfom, n. 1598.
55 Ellen Harris has noticed how “the active circulation of Handel’s music in print and in manuscript, among both performers and collectors, was not just an effect of his fame, but also to some extent its cause” (Harris, 2013, p. 112).
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Borrowed Voices
Legal Ownership of Insertion Arias
in 18th-Century London

Maik Köster

1. Introduction

Practices of pasticcio or musical borrowing were immensely common in London’s theaters throughout the 18th century, including both the Italian and English opera genres. “Borrowed Music can be found in about three out of four operas after 1762”, 1 or “An opera without some borrowed material was a rarity in 18th-century England” 2 are judgments one can easily find in musicological studies on opera in London. One of the preconditions for this practice is the absence of a strictly enforced legal restriction, for example by copyright law. Such enforcement obviously did not exist, although Britain did have the earliest copyright legislation in the Statute of Anne (1710). But unlike later copyright laws, the Statute of Anne did not at all regulate performance rights. 3 Furthermore, even the status of musical prints as objects being protected by copyright was unclear before being officially recognized in 1777 by Lord Mansfield’s famous ruling of Bach v. Longman. 4

This may suggest that the law’s influence on opera has been negligible, but operatic performance and music publishing were not completely disparate worlds: anthologies of Favourite Songs from current productions were a popular format throughout the century, purchased as luxury items and for amateur home music making. 5 For performance and publishing businesses alike, it might be said that single popular arias were crucial for attracting and satisfying customers, making them valuable commodities in both their

2 Girdham, 1988, p. 471.
3 Small, 2011, p. 382.
immaterial and materialized forms. But who, legally speaking, owned them? After all, effective arias often happened to be borrowed material, often transported by singers from various sources. And even the production of arias in general is a plane of cooperative agency between, at a minimum, the “voices” of the composer, the librettist and the singer.

This paper will attempt to examine how these questions of authorship and cooperation were handled in the negotiation of legal ownership. It has been the merit of Curtis Price’s contributions to call attention to two lawsuits, both of which directly concerned the copyright over single insertion arias performed at the King’s Theatre and sold to publishers: Storace v. Longman & Broderip (1788-1789) and Skillern & Goulding v. Longman & Broderip (1792-1794). Their importance for the history of musical copyright might yet be vastly underappreciated in scholarship, perhaps due to misunderstanding. After providing some context to the development of copyright in the 18th century, this paper will critically re-examine these cases and the interpretations that have previously been drawn from them in hope of reaching a better understanding of the history of intellectual property and London opera, as they uniquely intersect in the question of legal ownership over operatic arias.

2. Intellectual property and music lawsuits before 1777

The Statute of Anne, authorship and intellectual property in cooperative situations

As aforesaid, the Statute of Anne had not been applied to music before 1777 and it was conceived as a ‘booksellers’ bill. Music sellers, due to the economic particularities of their market, considered it to be irrelevant. Music’s status under the law consequently remained a legal gray area for several decades until composers themselves took actions to clarify it, reacting to an increased sense of injustice. Meanwhile, literary copyright and its relation to authorship was subject to sophisticated legal and cultural debates in and surrounding cases like Millar v. Taylor (1769) and Donaldson v. Becket (1774). Mark Rose has shown how the interpretation of the law has shifted its focus from the interests of booksellers to those of authors, thereby expanding from material copies of books to immaterial texts, which later became intertwined with ‘romantic’ conceptions of authorship as an expression of an individual’s originality or personality. The legal

---

7 Strohm, 2002.
9 Small, 2011, p. 262; Kretschmer/Kawohl, 2004, p. 27.
12 Rose, 1993, pp. 91, 127-129.
difference between material and immaterial ownership may have originated in *Pope v. Curll* (1741), distinguishing the receiver of a letter, who owns the object from the sender, who owns the words.\(^{13}\) The concept of intellectual property is a relatively recent legal invention and its conceptualization in 18th-century England was strongly influenced by John Locke’s “Labour Based Theory of Property”, formulated in Chapter V of his *Second Treatise on Government* (1690):

> “Though the Earth, and all inferior Creatures be common to all men, yet every Man has a Property in his own Person: this no body has any right to but himself. The Labour of his Body, and the Work of his Hands, we may say, are properly his. Whate’er then he removes out of the State that Nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his Labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his Property.”\(^{14}\)

The reasoning that an individual’s labor creates a private domain may be applied to intellectual property by considering either language itself or ideas as a kind of commons which may through mental labor be brought into a complex arrangement that belongs to its author. Locke himself did not extend the theory to the realm of ideas,\(^{15}\) but it subsequently became extremely influential for the theory of intellectual property. Its individualist conception of authorship is still at the core of modern copyright and makes situations of joint authorship appear as problematic exceptions.\(^{16}\) When two or more agents contribute their labor to a work, each of them has a claim to it but no one would be entitled to individually profit from the whole. This problem has to be somehow negotiated, for example by clarifying the nature of the property and reducing it to an object shared between the collaborators and defined by law, cultural norms or contract.

**Copyright lawsuits relevant to opera before 1777**

There have been very few actual legal disputes involving music before 1777. Amongst them, however, we find a few singular cases related to opera, which, although not leading to definitive judgement, illustrate the problem of joint authorship in pasticcio practices.

One example would be librettist Isaac Bickerstaffe’s unsuccessful attempt to claim copyright over the musical parts of his popular ballad opera *The Maid of the Mill* (1765). He sued against instrumental arrangements of arias in *Bickerstaffe v. Thorowgood* (1765). “As Thorowgood noted in his answer, however, Bickerstaffe himself was not a composer but an author; in fact, Bickerstaffe did not have the rights to the music, since it was written by over 20 different composers and was very likely printed without their
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\(^{13}\) ROSE, 1992, p. 215.

\(^{14}\) LOCKE, 1690, §27, cit. after ROSE, 1993, p. 5.

\(^{15}\) ZEMER, 2007, pp. 157-161 makes the case that mental labor was already implicit in Locke's theory.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 188.
consent.” In later lawsuits surrounding *The Padlock* (1769), Bickerstaffe bought the rights to the music from the composer.

A remarkable earlier case is *Holt v. Lowe and Arne* (1752), featuring the composer Thomas Augustine Arne, tenor Thomas Lowe and the librettist Thomas Holt. Judith Milhous and Robert Hume summarize: “At the heart of this particular ruckus is a conflict concerning literary and musical copyright. Indeed, this lawsuit is an exceptionally early contribution to the gradually escalating dispute over property rights in artistic compositions […]” The three of them had collaborated on the unsuccessful opera *Henry and Emma* (1748) and the librettist subsequently objected to Arne’s reuse of an aria from it in *Don Saverio* (1750). Arne stated that the aria had been inserted by request of a performer and that “this was done much more on Account of the music than of the words.” It was a quarrel between the librettist’s wish to be compensated for his labor while Arne and Lowe negated the value that his contribution added, “had it not been for the Addition of the Musick the Audience would never have suffered the same to have been Acted at all.” Holt proposed a contract, which remained unsigned and was described as “revolutionary” by scholars for being so distant from common practice. “Holt and Arne would have received performance royalties, something unheard of at the time.”

This exceptional case demonstrates the great potential for complex legal struggles if cooperating agents are unable to find agreement on property rights. However, it appears to have been an almost universally accepted part of common practice that a composer may publish or reuse his arias along with the librettist’s words, without needing explicit consent. And if a composer did decide to sell a manuscript to a publisher, he would do so in exchange for a single payment. Performance rights and royalties were generally no concern for the law throughout the century.

For printed music, musical copyright gained official recognition in 1777: Because Johann Christian Bach partly based his Chancery lawsuit against unauthorized reprinting of a harpsichord sonata on the *Statute of Anne*, the King’s Bench was brought to finally clarify music’s status under the law. Lord Mansfield emphatically certified that music be considered “writing” under the act. On the basis of *Bach v. Longman* (1777), composers could now pursue copyright lawsuits with confidence that the law applied to their work and thus felt more encouraged to do so. For the first full case after 1777 in which a composer directly used the *Statute of Anne* to assert his copyright as an author

---

18 MILHOUS/HUME, 1997, p. 52.
19 Ibid., p. 61.
20 Ibid., p. 63.
21 Ibid., p. 57.
22 SMALL, 2011, pp. 318f.
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25 SMALL, 1985, pp. 528f.
to an operatic aria against practices and contracts of an institution, we need to look at *Storace v. Longman* (1788-1789).

### 3. *Storace v. Longman & Broderip* (1788-1789)

*Storace v. Longman* pertains to the King’s Theatre’s 1787 production of Giovanni Paisiello’s *Il Re Teodoro in Venezia*. The case’s main protagonists are the composer Stephen Storace, his sister and soprano Nancy Storace, publishers Longman & Broderip and the copyist Leopoldo De Michele. Interestingly, Paisiello had originally written the role of Lisetta for Nancy Storace, but the *prima buffa* could not perform it at the Vienna Burgtheater (1784) due to illness.  

The siblings returned to London in early 1787 and were important figures for music migration between Vienna and London, for example by bringing compositions by Mozart to the British capital. Stephen Storace also acquired the score of *Il Re Teodoro* for the London performance upon the manager’s request. Once the music went through the adaptation process and into rehearsal, Nancy objected to an aria, and suggested a replacement be produced by her brother, who had no official employment at the theater at the time. The text to the jealousy aria “Care donne che bramate” was provided by the house librettist Carlo Badini. The aria was inserted into the production and was well received:

> “Her [N. Storace] obligato song, in the second act, of *Care donne che bramate* was executed in style of brilliancy and taste hithero unparalleled; the rapidity and articulation with which she executed the different arduous and masterly divisions, forced them on the imagination. This song is a charming composition by her brother and was encored una voce.”

The lawsuit arose because Stephen Storace decided to register and self-publish the popular aria while the house copyist, Leopoldo De Michele, made use of his customary privilege to sell a copy of the entire score, now including the inserted aria, to Longman & Broderip, who consequently put a rival edition on the market. Storace’s authorship is undisputed, but both parties claimed the sole ownership over the copyright and lay out their case in their respective affidavits.
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26 Villinger, 2000, p. 104.  
29 *The Times*, 17 December 1787. See the compilation of reviews in Petty, 1980, pp. 251-253.  
30 Nex, 2011, pp. 27f.  
31 Both can be found in Girdham, 1988, pp. 585-587.
nor his sister in the affidavit. He simply argues that he has composed and registered the song, thereby becoming the sole owner according to the law, and published it. The defendants later did the same without his permission and hence injured his property. 32 Broderip and De Michele instead based their case on the common practice of the theater, which would grant them exclusive ownership over the composition:

“The Usage and Custom of the Proprietors of the said Theatre has been that all Musical pieces or Compositions introduced and performed […] became and were the property of said Proprietors and under them the Copyist for the time being who has always been considered to have an absolute and exclusive power of disposing of the Copy right thereof it being part of his salary[.]” 33

The song in question thus, by being inserted into a production of the theater, was said to have automatically become the property of the theater. The arrangement between manager and copyist gave De Michele a powerful business opportunity: he effectively held a monopoly for Italian operatic music in London, making him a central figure for music circulation both within and outside of the theater. The deal was a win-win situation, but one that could only be sustained on the premise that composers would not have the motivation and means to lay claim to the products of their labor. Longman & Broderip also argued that they legally acquired the copyright to the words from Badini and registered the publication at the Stationers Company after having bought the music from De Michele. 34

The different kinds of ownership claims give rise to an array of legal questions: can the aria become the property of the house by becoming a material part of the production? Does the manager own the labor of singers commissioning or otherwise acquiring a new aria from outside the theater? Is the copyist allowed to sell the manuscripts as products of his own labor even if the copyright is unclear? Can their ownership of the words give Longman & Broderip publishing rights over the aria? Besides the common practice argument which the plaintiffs had focused on, there were some potential lines of reasoning available in favor of the plaintiffs: for instance, by Lockean appeals to the ‘value added’ by the house through providing the context in which the aria gets performed and advertised to the public. After all, the demand that the printed aria had as a commodity on the music market was almost entirely generated by the song’s exposure in the opera house.

The court evidently did not follow any of these arguments and instead upheld Storace’s authorial ownership over the customary agreements of the King’s Theatre, a quite significant affirmation of composers’ rights. “The judge established that a composer retained ownership of his composition until he chose to dispose of it himself.” 35

33 Affidavit signed by Leopoldo De Michele, Charles Francis Badini, and Francis Broderip, in reply to Storace’s deposition, dated 31 January 1788. GB-Lpro, C31/247/81.
34 Ibid.
35 Girdham, 1988, p. 166.
judgement was later referenced in *Clementi v. Golding* (1809) as “Lord Kenyon said, […] that the statute vests the property in the author; and that no such private regulation could interfere with the public right.”⁴⁶ Meanwhile, the court had corroborated the common practice that composers can publish or sell their arias along with the librettist’s words: they confirmed that Longman & Broderip lawfully owned the copyright to the words, but that did not entitle them to print Storace’s music. Storace won the case in July 1789 and was awarded the injunction against Longman, a token compensation and legal costs.³⁷

Price interprets Storace’s outcome as an emphatic affirmation of musical authorship, going so far as to conclude that later contractual agreements over copyright were now “technically illegal”,³⁸ because they did not account for the author’s right to his or her composition. This would apply to the 1790 signed contract of Gasparo Pacchierotti that Price reproduces in the appendix:

“[…] And further that in case he the said Gasparo Pacchierotti shall at any time during his attending the Operas introduce any New Music in any performance the Copy right of all such productions and all Emoluments to arise therefrom or from the sale thereof shall from the time of the same being respectively brought forward be and become the sole Right and property of the said Robert Bray O’Reilly his Executors Administrators […]”³⁹

The contract refers to the singers’ practice of substituting arias, the possibility of which is being recognized but not explicitly guaranteed by contract. The contract makes sure to transfer the copyright to said “New Music”, a rather (perhaps purposely) vague term, to the manager. Michael Burden in a recent study sets justified doubt on the feasibility of this automatic transmission of property: “it seems wholly improbable that singers of the statute of Mara […] would accept a situation in which their subsequent use of their own suitcase arias was restricted by the Opera House, an institution that was merely that season’s employer.”⁴⁰ It is true that suitcase arias were valuable pieces of property, sometimes singers even made financial investments to commission them.⁴¹ We must, however, keep in mind that the transfer of copyright cannot lead to loss of future performance rights. The singers could still use the aria in their later engagements and perhaps even profit from selling it to printers outside of London. Also, some crucial details have gotten mixed up regarding the case:⁴² Stephen Storace was not in fact the house com-
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³⁷ *Nex*, 2011, p. 27; *Girdham*, 1988, p. 166.
³⁸ *Price*, 1989, p. 94.
poser of the King’s Theatre while composing the aria. This post was held by Joseph Mazzinghi and Storace was able to assert in court to have received no payment from the manager for the composition. The situation may have been very different if Storace had been an employee, and had himself taken part in a contractual agreement which would relocate the property rights to his work. Through a second copyright case, we may examine the hypothesis that this kind of private agreement would have been valid, while a ‘third party contract’ would not.

4. Skillern & Goulding v. Longman & Broderip (1792-1794)

Skillern v. Longman was based on a somewhat similar constellation: Elisabeth Gertrud Mara inserted a rearrangement of Paisiello’s duet “Nel cor più non mi sento” as a solo aria into Sarti’s Idalide in her benefit on 17 April 1791. The words were changed to “Ah che nel petto io sento” and a new accompaniment with harp and winds was added. She also sang the aria in Arne’s Artaxerses (1791) with English words (“Hope told a flattering tale”) written by Peter Pindar. Mara sold the now popularized piece to Longman & Broderip while the King’s Theatre had an exclusive publishing contract with Skillern & Goulding, who then sued their rivals over injunction of sales.

The authorship is not as clear as in Storace v. Longman: it is a melody by Paisiello to which a new arrangement has been produced through unclear circumstances, which was then further edited by the house composer. In his discussion of the case, Price frames the property over the copyright as a question of authorship: “whether the beguiling accompaniment was the work of Mazzinghi, who supported the plaintiff’s rights to the song, or Madam Mara, who had originally claimed to be co-author.” Basically, he understands the case to be an affirmation of the authorship stance that the court took in Storace v. Longman, but presumes that the complicated situation led the court to (unjustly) affirm Elisabeth Mara, who ‘plagiarized’ the aria from Paisiello, as an author and thus the owner of the copyright.

The volume The Pantheon Opera and Its Aftermath 1789-1795 features a more detailed account of the case, quoting extensively from multiple interesting sources and witness accounts, e.g. about how Mara ordered the scores to be brought back to her dressing room after each performance or how she hosted a private rehearsal of the aria, leading to collective composition of the initial sketch she provided. But the authors still frame the legal case itself under the same narrative as the earlier papers, namely that the arrangement of Paisiello’s music “had evidently shifted copyright to the person responsible for the adaptation – the question was whether that person was Mara or  

44 Ibid., p. 94; for a musical analysis of the aria, see: Milhous et al., 2001, pp. 486-493.
47 Ibid., pp. 458, 491.
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Mazzinghi. They also needed to admit that the reasoning behind the judgement seems rather “tenuous”, which was mainly explained by the court’s incompetence. It is indeed plausible that the court had significant difficulties in dealing with this matter due to the lack of precedent with musical matters and the peculiar constellations of cooperation that they uniquely entail. However, the alleged tenuousness of the reasoning may also hint at the possibility that scholarship has not yet found the appropriate way to interpret the case. In other words, there may be a misalignment between what scholars and what the historical agents themselves deemed relevant to the case.

Confusion of authorship and ownership

The premature equation of authorship and ownership is a frequent cause of such situations in scholarship. This has been convincingly demonstrated for the almost contemporaneous case of Haydn’s sale of piano trios by Ignaz Pleyel, which Haydn legally ‘owned’ due to them being ‘authored’ by Pleyel during his apprenticeship with the former:

“The real issue in Forster’s lawsuit […] was not Pleyel’s authorship but Haydn’s ownership of the copyright. […] In other words, the most sensational aspect of the case today was barely an issue at the time of the lawsuit. This reflects a mistake that is commonly made by historians and biographers in their discussion of copyright cases, that is, the confusion between authorship and ownership.”

We indeed need to be mindful of the difference between the musicological question of authorship and the legal question of ownership, and it might very well be that this problem also deeply permeates previous readings of the cases, and may obstruct our view from a simpler, more consistent explanation for the sources, which would not have to rely on the notion that the courts were incompetent and inconsistent in their handling of the case. Price’s discussion of Skillern v. Longman focusses largely on Mara’s “plagiarism”, and he appears to be bewildered and outraged that the court did not take this fact into account:

“The law is an ass, you will say. The Court was in effect upholding the right of a performer to introduce arias and then sell them, even when authorship was uncertain or, as in this case, plagiarism had been admitted. […] The case is also interesting because it raised but failed to tackle the moral question which lies at the heart of pasticcio process. Is it right to take other people’s arias, make cosmetic alterations, insert them into an alien dramatic context, then pass the whole thing off as one’s own,

48 Ibid., p. 460.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid., p. 493.
often for considerable profit? [...] Madam Mara was, by her own clumsy admission, trying to deceive; she had stolen Paisiello’s intellectual property and was covering her tracks.”

We should keep in mind “that we should not judge actions that were permissible and legal in the past by the standards of our day (or indeed to confuse the standards of our day with universal moral principles).” If the goal is to faithfully reconstruct the legal conditions and cultural preconceptions that surrounded these legal disputes, we need a keen awareness of how our modern concepts of intellectual property and their influence on aesthetics and economics may direct our focus to the wrong aspects.

In light of this issue, the following re-evaluation will not proceed from the vastness of archived claims and depositions, which lends itself to selective reading, but instead methodologically limit itself to the reporting that the London *Times* dedicated to the case. *The Times* “Law Reports” can be treated as containing largely reliable information and for this particular case we have the privilege of an unusually extensive reporting, even featuring quotes and details from within the courtroom. These texts will be read closely under the general assumption that what was written follows a somewhat consistent legal logic and would have made sense to a lawyer at that time, who would have read these “Law Reports” to gain insight on the judge’s reasoning on the key legal questions of a case. The goal of this hermeneutic process is precisely to bring light into the questions that the case attempted to find an answer to.

**Law Report 1: 18 December 1793**

*The Times* dedicated two “Law Reports” to the case,\(^{55}\) one dated 18 December 1793 and a much more extensive one spanning two entire sections, starting on the 10\(^{th}\) and concluding on the 13\(^{th}\) of February 1794. It is remarkable that such large public attention was dedicated to this case. The first report from December 1793 was already relatively lengthy, taking as much space in the column as the three other non-musical cases contained in the report combined, part of whose discussion was postponed to later issues as a result: “[We shall give a fuller statement of these causes the first opportunity.]”\(^{56}\) This report on *Skillern v. Longman* first relates the circumstances of the case and the plaintiffs’ desire to recover the penalty and in the second half outlines the critical points. The first point was the plaintiffs’ claim, which seems to revolve around how the nature of the contract determines the issue of copyright:
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“Mr. O’Reilly by his engagement with Madam Mara and that gentleman [Mazzinghi], secured himself to all the property in any musical composition that should arise in consequence of that engagement: and as this song constituted a part of that property, the plaintiffs, as assignees of Mr. O’Reilley [sic], laid claim to it.”

It then goes on to elaborate the question of ‘new music’ on which the case apparently depended. It also credits the composition of the main accompaniment not to Madam, but to Mr. Mara.

“It appeared in evidence, that the melody of the first part of this song was composed by Signior Paesiello, and the accompaniments were the composition of Mr. [sic] Mara. Madam Mara gave this Song in this state to Mazzinghi, who altered some of the harp accompaniments; and the question was, Whether the alterations so made by Mazzinghi were such as to make this a piece of new music, and to entitle the plaintiffs to maintain an action against the defendants for publishing it? On hearing the whole of the case the Court and Jury were of [sic] opinion, that the plaintiffs could not recover in this action.”

We can fortunately unravel these aspects of authorship, originality and contract law in the more extensive second report.

**Law Report 2: 10 and 13 February 1794**

The reporting from February 1794 fleshes out the case with direct and indirect quotations of court proceedings and gives more detail to the legal arguments and considerations. It begins with an elaborate account of the rhetoric brought forward by the plaintiffs’ counsel Mr. Erskine: he opens by considering the concept of music as property, because “the Gentlemen of the Jury might be apt to imagine they were assembled there to decide on what may be thought a fugitive property.” He motivates the relevance of the aria in question for being a “song of Madam Mara’s” and emphasizes the function of notation as a form of permanent, commercially relevant manifestation: “the written score; which, after the sound, that was transitory, was lost, being recorded, the eye of the musician could communicate it to another […]”. A reference to *Bach v. Longman* (1777) solidifies that music is ‘writing’ under the *Statute of Anne*.

This shows that the idea of an aria as an object of property was still quite a novel concept at the time. Due to lack of case law, the reference to *Bach v. Longman* will remain the only mention of a music related case in this report. From this general address, he transitions to the circumstances of the case by stating that O’Reilly “knew the value of musical composition” and thus engaged Mazzinghi and Mara with generous salaries.

57 Ibid.
58 Ibid.
In return he “secured to himself all the property in any musical composition that should arise in consequence of that engagement.” The point being that the contract that Mara has consented to financially compensates her for surrendering the copyright of new music to the manager, so that after having received that “large sum of money […]” she was to recommend by her voice that musical composition which became Mr. O’Reilly’s property by virtue of his engagement with her.60

**Originality**

Being certain of the validity of the contract, Mr. Erskine goes on to argue for the composition’s newness, which apparently has to be given for the piece to qualify as the manager’s property. He does so by making the point that nothing is ever truly original, thereby anticipating objections of the defendants:

> “by the same rule it might be said that neither Pope, Swift, nor Milton, were originals, since they talked about the sun, moon, and stars, all of which were to be found in Homer. […] it was impossible at this day for any man to produce a work that could be called perfectly original. […] This song was not Signior Pazziello’s [sic], in as much as the accompaniments were perfectly new. He should be glad to see a song in which there was nor a crotched or a quaver which was to be found in some other song.”61

While clearing up the first basic facts of the case, Lord Kenyon obviously accepts the presuppositions of the plaintiff’s case. It becomes abundantly clear in multiple statements that the court takes the theater’s contracts very seriously, so we may discard the view that such contract had been completely ‘illegal’ in the aftermath of *Storace v. Longman*. The issue of originality does, however, present some challenge to the court. The concluding part of the law report starts with the Lord of the Rolls contemplating the concept of originality in music:

> “Lord Kenyon – The question here is, Whether this is fairly an original work? The eight notes in music, which constitute the gamut are as much the property of every man as the alphabet is, as much as the mechanic powers, or the nine digits and cypher in arithmetic. Human genius must be exerted in producing various combinations and arrangements of these simple elements before any thing can arise that is useful or entertaining to mankind, and of course, before there can be any thing like exclusive property. […]”62

60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
This demonstrates that Kenyon was assuming a Lockean view of intellectual property, wherein the basic elements of music are understood to be a common property out of which an exclusive property may be formed through mental labor. This, however, needs to be qualified by the degree to which considerable effort, or “genius” has been exerted. The term “genius” in this context is to be understood in relation to labor as it was used in contemporary pamphlets, such as William Enfield’s *Observations on Literary Property* (London 1774), as “not the natural organic genius that would later be celebrated by Romantic theory, but the mechanical skill of putting together a new sequence of ideas gleaned from ‘the continued exertion of mental abilities’”63 Originality enters as a qualification for property: the question is not who authored and thus owns the property, but if the arrangement is sufficiently different from Paisiello’s original to become someone’s property in the first place. The case now revolves around the concept of “New Music”, which of course links back to the contracts.

Taken broadly, “New Music” may include any piece of music that gets added to a production. Then, all *arie di baule* would automatically become property of the house by virtue of being new in relation to the music already part of the work. But this was what has been claimed in *Storace v. Longman* and was denied by the court. We must therefore follow a narrower interpretation that takes the problem of authorship into account, namely, that the contractual clause, which is cited as “any new musical composition that should arise in consequence of that engagement”,64 implies only original compositions created by employees for the theater. The choice of the word “arise” implies a novel creation65 and the “in consequence of that engagement” a direct relationship to the labor arrangement. This interpretation appears to be the most consistent with the evidence.

**Authorship**

In the report, we can clearly observe that the judge and the plaintiffs’ counsel treat Mazzinghi and Mara identically, because they have the same contractual relationship to the house.

“Mr. Erskine – ‘We will show that Madam Mara is the original author of the harp accompaniments.’

Lord Kenyon – ‘That is another thing. You have a right to take her and Mr. Mazzinghi together, as they both agreed with the manager to let him have all the new music that should be produced.’”


64 In the “Law Reports” of *The Times*, 18 December 1793 and 10 February 1794, the same wording is used.

65 Kenyon also uses the phrase “new music that should be produced”, see “Law Report”, in: *The Times*, 13 February 1794.
If the plaintiffs can also “claim through her [Mara]”, authorship cannot be the central issue. It seems to be erroneous to assume that the plaintiffs argue for Mazzinghi’s authorship while the defendants would claim Mara’s, implying that whoever purchased the composition from the actual author is the true proprietor of the aria. Instead, if the plaintiffs can show that any combination of Mara’s and Mazzinghi’s labor has produced the accompaniment in question and that it is original enough to constitute a new composition, they would win. If this is correct, Mara, contrary to what Price believes to have found in other sources,⁶⁶ would be well advised to ‘not’ call attention to her own authorship if she wants to help the party that she has sold the aria to. Because her status as author would, instead of securing ownership, lead to her automatically losing her status as owner over the composition due to her contract.

This only seemingly paradoxical situation is consistent with the logic of the statute itself: the author is defined as the first owner of the copyright, allowing him or her to freely sell it to another. If she was not the author, she would never have had the copyright in the first place, and thus could not have relinquished it to the theater. In any case, there would be no scenario in which claiming authorship would help Mara. Thus, at least in the “Law Report”, she does not make that effort, and instead claims in her final testimony that the harp accompaniment was created by her husband, and only slightly altered by Mazzinghi.

The defendants’ lawyer’s few reported statements also follow the strategy of proving that someone outside of the theater is the main author of the aria: Mr. Mingay speculates that Mazzinghi may have copied from another composer, and attempts to claim “Paisiello’s music, which the defendants have sold for many years”, taking the side that the arrangement does not constitute a new composition. In fact, it seems to have been one of the major advantages of the defendants that Mara’s authorship did not seem to have significantly entered the discussion. The plaintiffs were proposing to prove it, but the accompaniment only gets described as something that has been ‘delivered’ by Madam Mara. This leads Kenyon to doubt their case:

“One of my [Lord Kenyon] difficulties with regard to the plaintiff’s case is, that they claim the whole accompaniments for the harp, whereas Mr. Mazzinghi has said, that there was a harp accompaniment to the score delivered to him by Madam Mara, and that he only altered a part of that accompaniment. In patents, if they go beyond the part invented, they are absolutely void. No man shall be permitted to hold a terror over the heads of others not to do what they have a right to do.”⁶⁷

⁶⁶ His allegations of Mara’s plagiarism appear to be overstated, according to MILHOU S et al., 2001, p. 492: “Amidst the claims and counterclaims, nobody – not even Mara herself – disputed that Paisiello’s duet had formed the basis for the aria, though Mara had certainly omitted to tell either Mazzinghi or any of the other musicians about the original setting during those early rehearsals.”

Accompaniments and Mazzinghi’s contribution

This aspect put the plaintiffs in a difficult position: now they had to argue that Mazzinghi’s alterations were by themselves enough to be qualified as an original composition. And the court was already quite skeptical about new accompaniments being sufficient in general, disagreeing with the opinion brought forward by a “Professor of Music”:

“[John Calcott] perceived, that if he were to take the air of “God save the King,” and to publish it with new accompaniments; that would be his property.

Lord Kenyon – ‘I am not at all of that opinion. The alteration would not be sufficient to entitle it to be called a new piece of music. Every composer of music wishes to give a right of property as extensive as he can.”

The case features some interesting discussion about the nature of accompaniments as having elements of both craft and creativity, or, as Mara had put it: “At the same time Accompaniments in general were the effect of a mechanical operation, and had more or less merit according to the mind and genius of the person who wrote them.” The implication seems to be that if accompaniments were derived from melodies by the application of a basic mechanical process, it would not be fair for them to constitute exclusive property of a single individual. The labor applied would need to qualify as being at least partly ‘creative’ in nature. This mirrors Rose’s analysis of the literary discourse of authorship: “Both in the literary-property debates and in Young’s Conjectures the task was to differentiate true authorship from mechanical invention and to mystify and valorize the former.” The plaintiff’s main argument was based on the analogy between accompaniments to a preexisting melody and annotations written to a classic text. The latter was accepted by Kenyon as a type of textual relationship that relates to a pre-text while still being original, so the annotator “will certainly have a right to his notes.” But Mara’s testimony relegated the house composer’s changes to be mere application of craft.

Because the judge believed the testimony brought forward by Mara, he ruled in favor of the defendants. An interesting procedural side note is his appeal to a Mr. Bearcroft: “will you please relieve me from difficulties and adjust this business between the parties? You are the only one in the court who can do it.” Adding, after Bearcroft raised procedural concerns, “I feel my incompetency in the strongest degree.” Bearcroft likely had a musical background. The reported judgement ends with reference to him:

68 Ibid.
69 Ibid.
70 Rose, 1993, p. 119.
72 Mr. Bearcroft is Edward Bearcroft, King’s Counsel. As son of Philip Bearcroft, Preacher, he may have had some musical training. His name can also be found on the subscription
"Lord Kenyon – I confess the very strong bent of my mind is, that this cannot be called an original composition. According to the evidence of Madame Mara, there have been only some small alterations made in the original accompaniments. And I have a whisper from my friend (Mr. Bearcroft) which is of more use to me than all the knowledge I should ever acquire on the subject. Plaintiffs nonsuited."

This little twist at the end speaks to how difficult it was for the court to decide on musical matters of this sort. Since the plaintiffs were ruled nonsuited in their claim of exclusive property, both editions had to continue to coexist on the market.

5. Conclusions

The freely available sources examined here tell a drastically different story from what has been previously drawn from this case: Mara was not awarded authorial copyright for having adapted the aria. It was decided that the whole “cannot be called an original composition” and Mara instead successfully convinced the court that neither she nor Mazzinghi had claim to authorial rights over the adaptation. If Mara had authored the aria herself, her contract would have caused her to automatically surrender her ownership over the composition to her contractor and ultimately entitled the plaintiffs. In future research, this new perspective on Skillern v. Longman should of course be tested and improved against all evidence to be found in the Public Records Office. Unless the Times’ reporting was completely faulty, it would not be surprising if many previously confusing elements would appear to make more sense in light of the precepts here proposed. We are also invited to reconsider the case as an interesting source for the treatment of derivative works, revising the following conclusion:

“However tenuous the basis of this judgement may seem to a modern reader, the lawsuit illustrates an important aspect of contemporary thinking on musical composition in general and opera in particular. Adapting existing works did not depreciate their value and was in fact considered a genuine creative act.”

In fact, the considerations given by the legal agents in the report do not show any signs of a culture that assigns work status and protection to any minor adaptation. Instead, they appear to be rather mindful while trying to qualify the conditions “before there can be any thing like exclusive property.”

—
list for Charles Burney’s A General History of Music (p. xii) as “Edward Bearcroft, Esq. Lincoln’s Inn.”, indicating at least a casual interest for music.
74 Milhous et al., 2001, p. 460.
75 See n. 62.
This reading was supposed to address the conditions of legal ownership. There is no claim made here regarding the factual authorship of the arrangement: it is possible that Mazzinghi did make a more significant contribution. It might also be the case that the court too uncritically trusted Mara’s and her husband’s perhaps coordinated testimonies.\textsuperscript{76} Another question that this paper has to leave open is to what extent these legal factors have influenced operatic practice.

How do we answer the question of who legally owned insertion arias at the King’s Theatre? From \textit{Storace v. Longman} we see that for much of the century, the management successfully laid claim to all music circulating within the theater as their property and enabled the copyist to sell copies as a lucrative side-business. This absolute claim was denied by the court in that case. Now, arias would in theory have had to be treated separately depending on the circumstances of authorship: through contract, the theater could still make exclusive property claims to new compositions by their own employees,\textsuperscript{77} but they could not claim pieces from outside of the theater. This is the end-result of \textit{Skillern v. Longman}: Since the adaptations made from within the theater were judged insufficient to constitute a new piece of music, the aria had the same status as the old aria of Paisiello. It is correct that the case is a confirmation of \textit{Storace v. Longman}, but in a different way from what was previously thought. The author who is functionally equivalent to Storace is not Mara, but Paisiello. The same principle as developed in \textit{Storace} applied: the opera house could not claim to an aria by an external composer as exclusive property without the author’s consent.

The legal status of insertion arias from external composers is fittingly described as “borrowed”, in the sense that they get used and circulate among different agents without any transfer of exclusive property taking place.

\textbf{Sources}

Affidavit by Leopoldo De Michele, Charles Francis Badini, and Francis Broderip, 31 January 1788; GB-Lpro, C31/247/81.
\textsc{burney, charles}, A General History of Music, London 1776.
The Times (London, England), Issue 2908, Monday, 10 February 1794.

\textsuperscript{76} \textsc{milhous et al.}, 2001, pp. 492f.
\textsuperscript{77} We may have to reconsider the notion that these legal cases have contributed to freeing composers from the theater’s contractual ‘stranglehold’, as argued by \textsc{price}, 1989, p. 95 and \textsc{milhous et al.}, 2001, p. 460.
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Local Conditions of Pasticcio Production and Reception
Between Prague, Wrocław and Moravia

JANA SPÁČILOVÁ

From the 1720s, the Lands of the Bohemian Crown (the Czech Lands) became one of the most important hubs of Italian opera seria north of the Alps.\(^1\) Opera was performed both in the provincial capitals of Prague, Wrocław/Breslau and Brno/Brünn, and at the Moravian castles of Jaroměřice/Jarmeritz, Kroměříž/Kremsier, Výškov/Wischau and Holešov/Holleschau. The preserved librettos are evidence that almost two hundred operas were produced over a short period of time (the largest concentration of operas falls within the single decade 1730-1740) and in a relatively small area (the Moravian castles in particular are only a few dozen kilometers apart). One can only surmise as to the causes of this phenomenon: in the absence of a royal court, the increased need for self-presentation of the local aristocracy, and coincidence seeming to play a role. An important stimulus was in all probability Fux’s festa teatrale Costanza e fortezza, staged at a monumental open-air theater for the coronation of Charles VI in Prague in 1723.\(^2\)

The first records of Italian operas in Prague date back to between 1702 and 1705, when the impresario Giovanni Federico Sartorio briefly worked there.\(^3\) The systematic reception of Italian opera begins, however, only in 1724 when the company of Antonio Maria Peruzzi and Antonio Denzio started to operate in the theater of Count Sporck. Denzio put on 57 operas here between 1724 and 1734, with the works of Antonio Vivaldi playing a significant role in his repertoire.\(^4\) Peruzzi left in the spring of 1725 with some of the singers for Wrocław, the capital of Silesia. Opera was performed there up

---

1 The study is an output of a research project financially supported by the Faculty of Arts, Palacký University Olomouc (FPVC2019/10).
2 For the latest contribution, see VÁCHA et al., 2009.
3 The following four operas have been identified: La Rosaura, Il Gige fortunato, Libussa and La rete di Vulcano. ROMAGNOLI, 2006.
until 1734. The main protagonist of the Silesian opera diaspora was Antonio Bioni, a composer and impresario. The period repertoire list reports 41 operas. Opera was played in Brno from 1732 to 1740, and in 1733 it was moved to the newly adapted municipal Teatro della Taverna. The most important director of Brno opera was Angelo Mingotti; the librettos document a total of 23 operas.

In addition to the capital cities of the Czech Lands – Bohemia, Silesia and Moravia – Italian opera was also cultivated at Moravian castles. The year 1723 saw the first records of opera in Jaroměřice. Count Johann Adam von Questenberg, a prominent music enthusiast and supporter, only needed a few years to build up a stable artistic ensemble, which consisted of his subjects headed by Kapellmeister Franz Anton Míča. Operas were put on here several times a year, even during the 1740s after musical life subsided in the nearby centers. The Olomouc/Olmütz bishop Wolfgang Hannibal von Schrattenbach had operas performed at his castles in Kroměříž and Vyškov between 1727 and 1737. As a former Neapolitan viceroy, he employed a number of Italian musicians in his ensemble and contributed significantly to the promotion of Italian oratorio. The last Moravian center of Italian opera from 1733 to 1739 was the castle in Holešov belonging to the estates of Count Franz Anton von Rottal.

The Czech Lands thus had two different forms of opera overlap in terms of operating conditions, namely the teatro impresariale in municipal theaters and private opera performances, conditioned by the personal engagement of the aristocratic patron. This had an impact on the staff (professional soloists hired for one or more seasons vs. a permanent music ensemble, in which – particularly at smaller courts – musicians were also often servants) and, naturally, on the repertoire. The existence of the dual form of opera within such a closely concentrated time and place provides excellent, ‘laboratory’ conditions for researching opera pasticcio on its transalpine journey.

Similarly to other parts of Europe with comparable conditions, an essential part of the opera repertoire in the Czech Lands was pasticcios in the original meaning of this word, i.e. new operas composed of arias by a variety of composers. Pasticcio in the wider sense, however, also includes repeats of operas adopted from other places, as

---

5 Impresarios preceding Bioni included Antonio Maria Peruzzi (1725), Ludwig Wussin (1726/27), Santo Burigotti (1727/28 with Giovanni Dreyer, 1728/29) and Antonio Panta-leoni with Francesco Darbes (1729/30).
6 Mattheson, 1740. A list of 26 librettos identified to date is available in Spáčilová, 2016a.
7 Havlíčková, 2012.
8 For more on opera in Moravia, see Spáčilová, 2021b. Other impresarios: Filippo Neri del Fantasia (1736/37, 1738/39, 1739/40), Alessandro Manfredi (1737/38).
9 Perutková, 2015.
10 Spáčilová, 2018a.
11 Jurášková/Spáčilová, 2019.
12 See Siegert, 2016, for the latest definition of “pasticcio”.
these would undergo a number of adjustments as *opere impasticciate*. As the present study lacks the capacity to deal with all the manifestations of the production and reception of pasticcios in the Czech Lands of the time, a few examples demonstrating the diversity of this phenomenon in the researched environment will follow below.

**Pasticcio in municipal opera houses**

The basic source for researching pasticcio in the Czech Lands is the printed libretto. The musical aspect of operas can only be guessed at, mostly based on a comparison of librettos with collections of arias in various libraries. Data can also be obtained to a lesser extent from secondary sources such as correspondences.

The fact that music by multiple composers was used in librettos is pointed at by a variety of indications. The usual symbol indicating inserted arias, i.e. the *stelletta* (a small asterisk), is rare, for example in *Venceslao* by Giuseppe Boniventi (Prague 1725), where asterisks indicate inserted arias by Antonio Guerra, or in the anonymous *Achille in Sciro* (Prague 1727). The authorship of music was more typically accompanied by the phrase “excepting several arias inserted upon the request of soloists”, which is found in almost all the Brno librettos and in *Gli amori amari* from Prague (1732). Unusual references to multiple authors are found in the librettos *L’innocenza giustificata* (Prague 1725) and *La costanza di Griselda* (Wrocław 1728), where the names of the composers are printed for each aria separately. This solution is highlighted in the period Wroclaw journal *Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier*.

Printed *arie aggiunte* are found only in the libretto *Teodorico* (Brno 1737), which is also an interesting proof of the gradual genesis of pasticcios in municipal opera houses. It was the first opera of Alessandro Manfredi’s *stagione*; music was to be composed “eccetto alcune arie” by the new composer of the company Matteo Lucchini. The arias

---

13 See Polin, 2011, for more on *opera impasticciata*. I thank Anna Ryszka-Komarnicka for kindly drawing my attention to the study.
14 Since Denzio’s *impressa* in Prague has been comprehensively covered by Freeman, 1992, and Jonášová, 2013, the examples below apply primarily to other sites.
15 This is how part of the music of Vivaldi’s *Argippo* (Prague 1730) was identified in a pasticcio of German provenance, see Macek, 2013.
16 For example, the letters of Count Sporck claim that recitatives and selected arias in the Prague version of Albinoni’s *Lucio Vero* (1725) were composed by the singer Antonio Guerra, cf. Freeman, 1992, p. 119.
17 Freeman, 1992, pp. 240, 247.
18 “[…] especially since the authors of the arias are mentioned in the opera booklets in every case, therefore such a work really deserves the curiosity of this city […]” (“[...] zumahlen in denen Operen-Bücheln die Authores von denen Arien jederzeit vermercket seyn, ein- folglich ein solches Wrecck die Curiosität der allhiesigen Stadt würckl. verdienet […]”) Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier, no. 98, 17 June 1728.
inserted upon the soloists’ requests were probably not known by the time the libretto was printed, which is why the simple word “Aria” is printed in the text in many places and the respective musical numbers are printed separately and attached at the end of the libretto. Two of the insertions are borrowed from Metastasio’s librettos, namely Adriano in Siria and Temistocle.

The rare macaronic arias – i.e. arias in local languages inserted into Italian librettos – were a curiosity. The Czech language is recorded in only one case: in the aria Jsme veselí a zpíváme sung by the Venetian Teresa Peruzzi in Il confronto dell’amor coniugale (Prague 1727). German arias feature for instance in Bioni’s Endimione (Wrocław 1727), and were composed by Daniel Gottlieb Treu. Several arias in German were also included in the opera Dafni by Emanuele d’Astorga (Wrocław 1726), according to Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier. The newly identified libretto of the opera, however, does not bear the name of the composer of the German arias.

The traveling of soloists and the repertoire

Italian opera companies in Prague, Wrocław and Brno were closely connected through their personnel. Data about singers-soloists, deduced from librettos, correspondence and

19 New sheet A1-A4 [fols. 49r-52v], title page: “arias to be included in the opera Teodorico at the place where ‘Aria’ is printed” (“Arie da contenersi nell’ opera di Teodorico in lugo [sic] dove sta stampoto [sic] Aria”). A total of ten arias are printed with references to the act, scene and libretto page. The relevant text is only absent in the case of Teodorico’s aria in scene I,10.
21 Noteworthy is the Italian transcription of the Czech words “nie” (“gnitz”) or “život” (“ghsciouot”). In addition to Czech, the opera also included parts sung in French. Libretto: CZ-Pu, 65 E 4750/3, fol 28’, cf. Freeman, 1992, pp. 124f.
22 A total of three arias, of which two bore the note “by Herrn Daniel Fedele” (“Von Hrn. Daniel Fedele”) (libretto: PL-WRu, Yv 983/2). Music for these arias has been preserved in D-SWl, Mus.4716, nos. 7-9. The notes on another copy in D-B (Mus.ms.autogr. Agricola, J. F. 1, no. 10 and 11) specify the name of the soloist: “Sung by Signora Spinola under the name of Aurilla” (“Recitata dalla Sign. Spinola sotto il nome Aurilla”).
23 “[…] it must be added that a number of arias will be sung in German so that everyone is able to understand them” („[…] deme noch beytritt, daß auch etliche Arien werden teutsch gesungen werden, damit jedermann etwas davon verstehen könne.”) Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier, no. 147, 16 September 1726.
24 Only two Italian arias have survived (D-B, Mus.ms.autogr. Agricola, J.F. 1, nos. 12 and 13). They can be attributed to the Wroclaw performance thanks to the names of the artists “Alberti” (= Giuseppe Nicola Alberti, originally written “Pinetti”, crossed out) and “Vivoli” (originally “signora Alberti”, probably the composer’s wife Anna Maria – for more on her, see Spáčilová, 2016b, p. 262). More on Dafni in Spáčilová, forthcoming 2021a.
meagre records in the parish registers demonstrate that once an Italian artist dared to seek happiness north of the Alps, he or she mostly stayed for several seasons or came back repeatedly. This was the case of Matteo Lucchini of Venice, who worked as a singer and composer in Dresden, Prague, Wrocław and Brno, or Giuseppe Nicola Alberti of Padua, who returned to Italy after working in Prague and Wrocław, only to set out beyond the Alps for the second time in 1733 and apart from singing in Brno, worked as the “Directore der Operen und Music” with Count Rottal in Holešov (see Table 1). Although aristocratic ensembles were more self-sufficient in terms of personnel, they also hired guest artists. This is especially true of Holešov, where Italians employed in Brno performed on a regular basis, joined in 1737 by soloists from Vienna.  

The communication network of several dozen traveling artists had a significant influence on the circulation of the repertoire, both in terms of individual arie di baule, and librettos and entire operas. Table 2 shows the repertoire links between Prague, Wrocław and Brno. One of the facts it indicates is that although Wrocław is usually considered an “operatic colony of Prague”, some of the operas had in fact been put on here before they were staged in Prague.

The relationship between Prague and Brno is much more important in terms of relationships of filiation. Although the only known place of work of Angelo Mingotti, before he arrived in Moravia, is Vicenza, according to the Brno city deeds he came there from Prague. Antonio Denzio, who was in deep financial trouble at the time (which ultimately sent him to a debtor’s prison in August 1734) left Mingotti with most of the singers, including the composer Antonio Costantini. Prague became, with a few exceptions, the source of Mingotti’s repertoire as well. Some of the pieces were circulating throughout Central Europe at that time – in addition to Prague and Brno, Lucio Vero and Didone were performed in Wrocław, and the former was performed later in 1736 in Graz. A much weightier argument than the use of the same librettos with new music proves that the Brno repertoire depended on the Prague one: Mingotti used the German translations from Prague in all his librettos, for both recitatives and arias!

25 For a comprehensive view of Italian soloists in Moravia, see Spáčilová, 2016b. For Prague opera singers cf. Freeman, 1992, pp. 295-359, and for Wrocław singers, see Borcherdt, 1910, pp. 45-47.

26 For a complete comparison of the repertoire in the Czech Lands, including Moravian castles, see Spáčilová, 2018b.

27 Freeman, 1992, p. 74.

28 The minutes of a city council meeting from October 1732 refer to him as “ein Prager Operist”, cf. Havlíčková, 2012.

29 Cf. Spáčilová, 2016b, pp. 258f.

30 Of the eleven known operas Mingotti produced in Brno, only three were adopted from other cities (Argenide from Venice, Antigona in Tebe and Arianna e Teseo from Wrocław).

31 Translations were sometimes shared elsewhere (La fede tradita e vendicata, Prague 1727 – Wrocław 1729 or Artaserse, Kroměříž 1731 – Holešov 1733), but replaced arias were always newly translated.
Since the operas were staged in Brno with numerous modifications and with the music of other composers (see Table 3), the German translation disagreed in many cases with the Italian original. As it is unlikely that the Brno audiences had any deeper knowledge of Italian, and the audience in all likelihood followed a text based on the German translation, this finding raises the question of the authenticity of the dramatic situation. The fact that the theater managers were not all that concerned with the comprehensibility of the story can be demonstrated, for example, by the fact that when an aria that had not been performed in Prague was inserted in Brno, no efforts were made to have it translated into German. A simple note “Aria” was added instead.\footnote{This is the case of the opera \textit{Gli amori amari} (Brno 1733), scenes II,6 and II,8.}

**Mingotti’s Brno pasticcios and their relationship to the Prague versions**

Surprising conclusions can be drawn when examining pasticcios performed in Brno by Angelo Mingotti and their relationship to their Prague versions. The first example is the opera \textit{Gli amori amari}, played in Prague at the carnival of 1732 and a year later in Brno. The music was composed in both cases by Antonio Costantini “with the exception of a few arias inserted upon the request of soloists”,\footnote{Libretto by Aurelio Aureli, music by Giuseppe Maria Buini. The aria “Come il mar da doppio vento” was later borrowed by Giacinta Spinola for the opera \textit{Costantino riconosciuto} (Brno 1739).} who were: Cecilia Ramis (Flavio), Antonio Denzio/Laura Bambini (Lotario), Giovanni Michaeli (Ugone), Anna Cosimi/Margarita Flora (Emilia), Giacinta Spinola Costantini (Guido) and Margarita Flora/Domenico Battaglini (Lamberto). Three of the Prague soloists sang the same roles in Brno; Margarita Flora sang the only female role Emilia instead of Lamberto, captain of the royal guards. Emilia was left, due to the change, with only three music numbers from the Prague version. The new arias included “V o solcando un mar crudele” from Metastasio’s \textit{Artaserse} and “Come il mar da doppio vento” from \textit{Amore e gelosia} (Bologna 1729).\footnote{Libretto by Aurelio Aureli, music by Giuseppe Maria Buini. The aria “Come il mar da doppio vento” was later borrowed by Giacinta Spinola for the opera \textit{Costantino riconosciuto} (Brno 1739).} The arias are also altered for the roles of Lotario and Lamberto, which were sung by new soloists from Venice. The roles of Ugone and Flavio, however, performed by the same artists, were also changed! Thus, although the two operas were produced only a year apart, and the author of the music and four soloists out of six remained the same, almost half of the musical numbers were replaced (cf. Table 3).

The least similar to its Prague version is another opera of Mingotti’s first \textit{stagione} in Brno, \textit{Argippo} by Antonio Costantini (again “with the exception of a few arias”).\footnote{Prague/Brno cast: Giovanni Dreyer/Margarita Flora (Argippo), Antonio Denzio/Giovanni Michaeli (Tisifaro), Anna Cosimi/Giacinta Spinola Costantini (Zanaida), Giustina Eberhard/Laura Bambini (Osira), Marianna Manzi/Domenico Battaglini (Silvero).} The only numbers it shares with the 1730 setting of Antonio Vivaldi are the two choirs
and the aria “Chi un dolce amor condanna” (Argippo, II,2, originally from Metastasio’s *Catone in Utica*), which was played in Prague in a textual paraphrase as “Chi quel timor condanna”. It is much closer to the untitled pasticcio preserved in Darmstadt reportedly staged in Frankfurt am Main sometime after 1730 by the ensemble of Antonio Maria Peruzzi.\(^{36}\) It shares the same arias “Se la bella tortorella” (formerly an inserted aria in Siface, Prague 1729) and “Che gran pena trafigge il mio core” (originally from Hasse’s *Tigrane*).\(^{37}\) The Brno *Argippo* is consequently a true pasticcio; 14 arias of 16 are borrowings.\(^{38}\) Interestingly, when *Argippo* was later produced by the ensemble of Pietro Mingotti in Graz in 1738 under the name *L’innocenza difesa nell’inganno*, all that was left of the musical numbers were the two choirs again, while some of the arias were sung in the opera *Innocenza riconosciuta* produced in the very same season.\(^{39}\)

The production which most resembles the Prague version is *Orlando furioso* staged at the Brno carnival in 1735.\(^{40}\) The Italian version of the libretto names Vivaldi as the author “with the exception of a few arias” (“à riserva di alcune arie”), while the parallel German version incorrectly mentions Domenico Sarro as the composer.\(^{41}\) The same applied to *Tullo Ostilio* performed at the end of the carnival, where not more than three arias can be attributed to Vivaldi.\(^{42}\) *Orlando furioso* is nearly identical to the Prague version, except for a few deleted scenes (I,1-5, II,9, III,1). It is the only Brno opera which adopted all the arias from Prague.\(^{43}\) *Orlando furioso* staged in Kuks/Kukus and Prague in 1724 is reportedly authored by Antonio Bioni, although it was probably an adaptation of a work of the same name by Antonio Vivaldi (Venice 1714, partially with the music by Giovanni Ristori). No agreement as to the degree to which each of the composers

\(^{36}\) The Frankfurt production is reported by Pegah, 2011, another possibility is Regensburg 1733, where the local Thurn und Taxis library houses a collection of arias from this opera, cf. Macek, 2013.  

\(^{37}\) Arias are in different places in the two operas and are part of different roles. “Se la bella tortorella” is sung in the German pasticcio by Silvero (III,5) and in Brno by Argippo (I,5), while “Che gran pena trafigge il mio core” is written for Zanaida (II,1) and in Brno for Osira (I,6).  

\(^{38}\) Strohm, 2008a.  

\(^{39}\) Müller 1917, Anhang II, nos. 76, 78 (pp. CVI-CX), cf. Spáčilová, 2013.  

\(^{40}\) Prague/Brno cast: Antonio Denzio/Giuseppe Nicola Alberti (Orlando), Anna Maria Gius- ti/Teresa Peruzzi (Angelica), Anna Catarina Negri/Anna Cosimi (Alcina), Barbara Bianchi/Chiara Orlandi (Bradamante), Lorenzo Moretti/Carlo Dardozzi (Medoro), Paolo Vida/ Margarita Flora (Ruggero).  

\(^{41}\) The German version of the libretto reprinted the composer’s name from *Didone* produced on 26 December 1734 (*Orlando* premiered on 18 January 1735).  

\(^{42}\) Cf. Spáčilová, 2008.  

\(^{43}\) Libretto from Prague: CZ-Pu, 52 G 19, German libretto from Kuks/Kukus: D-W, Textb. 321. *Orlando furioso* was also produced in Wroclaw in spring 1725 and in carnival 1734. The librettos have not been preserved.
contributed to the music of the opera has been reached.\textsuperscript{44} The Brno libretto, explicitly naming Vivaldi, could thus testify to his authorship in retrospect.

The last example is Sarro’s opera \textit{Didone}, which opened the 1734/35 carnival season in Brno. The libretto and its German translation, again adopted from Prague, is based on a completely different version of the opera, namely on Metastasio’s adaptation for Albinoni (Venice 1725).\textsuperscript{45} The music is based on Sarro’s revision of \textit{Didone} for Venice in 1730, as is evident from, for example, the aria “Tu mi guardì, e ti confondo”, which appears only in Brno and in the Venetian libretto, and as \textit{aria aggiunta} in the score preserved in Naples.\textsuperscript{46} As Mingotti used the Prague libretto, itself based on the revised Albinoni version of 1725, the text of the recitatives was naturally in discord with Sarro’s version. Efforts to make the maximum possible use of Sarro’s music led to the situation in which arias sometimes did not match the scenes in the version produced by Mingotti. The Brno version only had three aria insertions. The first of them, “Mio cor non sospirar”, is logically located at the place where Sarro’s score did not provide the needed music (III,4),\textsuperscript{47} and the second “Son qual nave frà più venti” is found where the sources (i.e. score and libretto) regarding the 1730 Venetian version differ from each other (II,7).\textsuperscript{48} The third borrowing “Anime tormentate” (II,9) is from the opera \textit{Nel perdono la vendetta}, and Anna Cosimi singing Selene performed it already in 1732 in Prague in Costantini’s pasticcio \textit{Gli amori amari} (this aria was replaced by another in the 1733 Brno production).\textsuperscript{49}

\section*{Sources for the research of pasticcio in Wrocław}

While the pasticcio in Prague and Brno can only be studied on the basis of librettos or occasional written testimonies, a wide range of other types of sources is available in the case of Italian opera in Wrocław. The first is a period repertoire list published in 1740 in Mattheson’s \textit{Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte}, based on a report from the local organist Johann Georg Hoffmann, the second harpsichordist of the Wrocław opera company.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. Strohm 2008b, pp. 139f.
\textsuperscript{45} Libretto Prague 1731: CZ-Pu, 65 E 3207. The opera was produced for the first time in the Czech Lands in Wrocław in 1726 (libretto: US-Wc, ML48 [S90]).
\textsuperscript{46} I-Nc, Rari 7.2.5 (RISM ID no.: 850009015). The libretto was arranged for Sarro’s setting for Venice 1730 by Giovanni Boldini, and the author of the inserted arias was allegedly Baldassare Galuppi, cf. Strohm, 1976, vol. II, p. 220.
\textsuperscript{47} The scene is only in the Venice 1725 libretto, and in none of Sarro’s settings. On this aria cf. also the article by Angela Romagnoli, in the present volume (pp. 367f.), and Berthold Over’s research results in Albrecht-Hohmaier et al., 2020.
\textsuperscript{48} The Venetian libretto includes “con stelletta” “Sento che il cor mi langue”, while the score contains Metastasio’s original, “Tacerò se tu lo brami”.
\textsuperscript{49} Spáčilová, 2014a.
\textsuperscript{50} Mattheson, 1740.
The report provides valuable information about operas which have not been preserved (e.g., *Merope* from 1728, with recitatives by Bioni and arias by Alberti, Bioni, Caldara, Dreyer, Finazzi, Lotti, Meneghetti, Porta, Vinci and Vivaldi) and in some cases it specifies or corrects information in the librettos. One of these is the opera *Ariodante* (1727), where the libretto merely states “music by multiple authors” (“La musica è di più autori”) while Mattheson names both the original composer Pollarolo and the authors of the inserted arias.51 Another is *Il Demetrio* staged in 1732 “with various arias by the best masters” (“mit vermischten Arien der besten Meister”) while the libretto refers to Bioni as the only author.52

Another major source is a collection of arias from the opera *Antigona vendicata*, stored at the Czech Museum of Music.53 The printed libretto itself suggests that Orlandini’s original opera (Venice 1718) was interpolated for the Wrocław 1728 production with the music of the local singer and composer Giovanni Dreyer, whose name is printed besides the inserted arias. The collection of arias not only names another composer, Filippo Finazzi (also one of the soloists), but it also testifies to a much larger share of changed arias. According to announcements in Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier, several new arias were inserted into the opera during the repeats (see below). The surviving source is probably the latest version of the opera, which reflects both the changes made during the preparation of the production and after the premiere.54

The aforementioned Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier is an extremely valuable document, complementing data from librettos, scores, and from Mattheson, and providing remarkable insight into the period’s aesthetic evaluation of pasticcios.55 Records of arias newly inserted during the repeats involve the opera *Antigona vendicata* by Orlandini


52 Libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.5385; PL-WRU, Yv 986/1.

53 Other music materials from Wrocław are Bioni’s *Issipile* (1732, complete score in A-Wgm, IV 27740 [Q 1214]) and *Andromaca* by the same composer (1730, collection of arias in PL-KÓ, BK 1669).

54 Spáčilová, 2018b.

55 The journal was published twice a week in Wrocław between 1708 and 1741; regular reports on Italian opera are part of the local news. Not all volumes have been preserved, unfortunately, cf. Spáčilová, 2016a.
(1728).\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Dafni} by d’Astorga (1726), \textit{Filindo} by Antonio Bioni (1728),\textsuperscript{58} etc. The wording clearly indicates that new music was not perceived as contaminating the existing opera, but as an enrichment or enhancement, a means of reviving waning public interest.\textsuperscript{59} The opera \textit{La costanza di Griselda} (1728), for example, conceived as a pasticcio from the very beginning, is positively evaluated for its diversity of taste.\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} “Nota bene. To all lovers of music shall be announced how the wonderful opera \textit{Antigona}, the one work most worthy of being seen which has ever presented on this stage, will be performed today: amongst the arias several changes will be made […].” (“NB. Allen Liebhabern und Liebhaberinnen der Music wird zu wissen gethan, welcher gestalten die schöne Opera Antigona heuth vorgestellet wird, so das sehenwürdigste Werth [sic] ist, so auf diesem Theatro aufgeführt worden: Man wird in denen Arien verschiedene Veränderungen vornehmen […].”) \textit{Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier}, no. 167, 18 October 1728.
\item \textsuperscript{57} “It shall be announced obediently to all lovers of music how one had the quantity of new arias composed by the two composers and mixed them in the ongoing opera that make the work more \textit{consummate} [emphasised by J.S.]: just as diversity and variety in music seems to be the most pleasant thing, so one cares for a numerous audience that one will hope to satisfy particularly.” (“Es wird allen Liebhabern und Liebhaberin [sic] der Music gehorsamst zu wissen gethan, welcher gestalten man in der noch fortwehrenden Opera die Menge neue Arien von denen zwey Hn. Hn. Compositoren hat componiren, und ein-mengen lassen, die das Werck desto \textit{vollkommener} machen werden [emphasised by J.S.]: gleich wie nun die Diversität, und Abwechselungen in der Musiqve das Angenehmste zu seyn scheinet, also versiehet man sich einer zahlreichen Besuchung, die man besonder zu contentiren verhoffet.”) \textit{Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier}, no. 153, 26 September 1726.
\item \textsuperscript{58} “[…] during the ongoing wool market the beautiful opera will be presented daily with particular changes of the arias.” (“[… bey fortwehrendem Wollmarck die schöne Opera mit besonderer Veränderung der Arien alle Tag die Wochen durch praesentiret wird.”) \textit{Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier}, no. 77, 13 May 1728.
\item \textsuperscript{59} “[…] today changes of the arias will be heard again for serving the audience with diversity” [emphasised by J.S.] (“[… an heuth wieder Veränderungen in denen Arien werden zu hören seyn, um das Publicum \textit{mit der Diversitaet zu bedienen} [emphasised by J.S.]”), concerning the opera \textit{Antigona vendicata}. \textit{Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier}, no. 165, 14 October 1728.
\item \textsuperscript{60} “[…] but this opera contains a peculiarity which has never been seen here because it has not been set to music by a single \textit{Kapellmeister} as it happens normally and as all the previous operas have been produced here. But the impresarios had the idea to have sent the most beautiful arias by the greatest and most renowned men from all Italy, to collect them, to choose the best and most appropriate and to put them into this opera. They did it in this way that every aria is made by another master; therefore, the \textit{difference of taste} [emphasised by J.S.] and the strength of such various compositions should inspire necessarily a particular pleasure […].” (“[… diese Opera hat aber eine Besonderheit in sich, welche alhier noch niemenal gesehen worden, massen solche nicht von einem Capell-Meister in die Music gesetzt worden, wie es ordinari geschiehet, und wie man alle vorherige Operen alhier pro-
Pasticcio in private theaters at Moravian castles

Pasticcios tend to be more difficult to identify in private aristocratic venues, compared to municipal theaters. An exception is Bambini’s opera *Partenope*, where arias by the local composers Johann Georg Orsler and Ferdinand Seidl are ‘asterisked’.\(^{61}\) Further examples are the *arie aggiunte* in Vinci’s *Didone abbandonata* (Jaroměřice 1736), where analysis of both the libretto and the preserved correspondence of Count Questenberg with his Viennese agent Hofmann reveals further extensive modifications to the opera.\(^{62}\) In other cases, pasticcios or *opere impasticciate* are identified only following a detailed analysis of the libretto. Research shows that each of the Moravian castles had different working traditions, and pasticcio practice was different in each place.

The only ‘pure’ pasticcios in the repertoire of Bishop Schrattenbach’s castles were operas played in the early days of the local theater in the late 1720s. The librettos do not tell the names of their authors, and the Kroměříž Piarist chronicle indicates that the works were composed with the help of arias borrowed from older operas produced in Italy.\(^{63}\) The names of the composers began to be printed in the librettos starting in 1730, although none of the operas produced in Kroměříž and Vyškov were played here in their original form. The local *opere impasticciate* typically had the inserted arias re-texted, maintaining the original meaning to the greatest extent possible, despite the potentially different verse structure. In operas based on Pietro Metastasio’s librettos adapted for the particular music setting, the efforts to preserve the original meaning went to such an extent that Metastasio’s original lyrics were paraphrased in the inserted arias instead of

---

\(^{61}\) “The music is by Sig. Eustachio Bambini except the arias signed with a * that are partly by Sig. Orseler and partly by Sig. Saitl.” (“La musica è del Sig. Eustachio Bambini eccetto quell’ arie segnate con * che sono parte del Sig’r Orseler e parte del Sig’r Saitl.”) Libretto: CZ-Bu, ST1-0019.303.

\(^{62}\) Libretto: CZ-Pn, Nové Hrady Chateau Library, 1437. Borrowings included “Non lascia il ben, che brama” from Metastasio’s *Siface*, “Il suo crudel martire” from Giai’s *Demetrio* (Rome 1732), “Non voglio, non sento” (in Fini’s version of *Didone*, Rome 1732). One of the *arie aggiunte*, “Dal tuo real favore”, is from Hasse’s *Euristeo* (Venice 1732). For more details on the opera genesis based on Questenberg’s correspondence, see Perutková 2015, pp. 543-545.

\(^{63}\) It is evident from the statement concerning the local Piarist composer Jan Kopecký, celebrated for his ability to write opera “without the support of Italian parts” (“sine subsidium partium italicum”), cf. Spáčilová 2018a, p. 116.
the ones in the model operas. An example is *Catone in Utica* by Leonardo Leo (Venice 1728/29) with a revised ending by Metastasio and further revisions, most probably by Domenico Lalli. In its Kroměříž production, the aria “Al vento che la scuote” (III,4) was replaced by the aria “Quel dolce amore, che poco accende”, which was a paraphrase of Metastasio’s “Quell’amor che poco accende” written for the original version of *Catone in Utica* (Rome 1728). Yet another case was Hasse’s *Demetrio* (Kroměříž 1732), where “Se cresce in vigore” was sung in scene I,9 (there is no aria in Hasse’s original setting), created by paraphrasing Metastasio’s text “Se seconde, e vigoroso”. This concern, unusual for the period, to preserve dramatic unity is perhaps explained by the large number of native Italians in the Bishop’s court (including the court librettist Giovanni Battista Catena).

While mostly re-texted arias were inserted in the operas produced in Kroměříž and Vyškov,64 those produced in Holešov present the opposite extreme. The local librettos are marked by a noticeable amount of textual (and probably also musical) borrowings, probably due to the hiring of soloists from Brno-based Italian ensembles. A typical example is the classical *aria di baule*, where the same interpreter sings the same aria in different operas. Laura Bambini sang the aria “Scende dal monte” in the pasticcio *Lucio Vero* (Brno 1734). Two years later she performed the same aria in *Cesare in Egitto* (Holešov 1736). In both cases it was a male role; the aria is part of the original libretto *Cesare in Egitto*.65 Similarly, Domenico Battaglini used the aria “Frà speme, e timore”, which he had sung a few months earlier in *Artaserse* (Holešov 1733), in *Lucio Vero* (Brno 1734). The text was slightly altered in connection with the new dramatic situation, but the music probably remained the same. The influence of the Brno opera is also evident in arias, originally sung by Italian soloists, which were now performed by local artists in Holešov. An example is “La ragion, gli affetti asconda”, sung by Cattarina Personè in *Teodorico* (Brno 1737) and by Rosalia Holzbauer in *Amore e fortuna* (Holešov 1739). The aria is originally from Metastasio’s opera *Adriano in Siria*.

Jaroměřice is the only one of the locations studied where a larger number of scores have been preserved. More than 40 scores have been identified from the music collection of Count Questenberg to date. Productions have, however, been documented only for some of them.66 The most interesting pieces given the topic of the present study are *Demofoonte* (Giuseppe Ferdinando Brivio, 1738) and *Alessandro in Persia* (Domenico

64 According to the current state of knowledge, there are only three ‘pure’ borrowings (i.e. borrowing which contain both textual and musical elements) in Kroměříž and Vyškov operas. They are “Quando saprai chi sono” (*Didone abbandonata*, Naples 1724, sung in Kroměříž in anonymous *Merope*, 1727), “Care dell’idol mio luci adorate” (*Venere placata*, Venice 1731, used in Giacomelli’s *Lucio Papirio*, Kroměříž 1732) and “Luci belle voi piangete” (*Attalo, rè di Bitinia*, Naples 1728, used in Porpora’s *Ezio* 1732/33).

65 The aria was part of the 1728 original setting of *Cesare in Egitto* by Luca Antonio Predieri and of the 1729 Pesaro version, from where the opera was adopted for Holešov. It was then inserted in *Lucio Vero*.

66 Perutková, 2015, pp. 547-570.
Paradies, 1740). The Demofoonte score contains ten inserted arias, made by various Jaroměřice copyists. The insertions are fitted in the score; Brivio’s original music is preserved. The aria “T’intendo, ingrata” (I,6) was identified as an aria from Leo’s opera Farnace thanks to the title “Napoli 1737” and the original text “Pensi l’iniquo figlio” (Mitridate, II,9). Another borrowing, “Non odi consiglio”, is from Caldara’s Demofoonte (Vienna 1733). The licenza “Il ciel sereno” was written by Kapellmeister Miča.

Only Acts II and III of the opera Alessandro in Persia have survived. The final note “Fine L. D. D. V. M. 1738 in Lucca” suggests that the source is linked to the premiere. The score contains four inserted musical numbers written on different paper and by a different copyist. The original music is preserved. Two insertions share text with the replaced arias “Al tuo merto” and “Vorrei del perfido”. The other two – the aria “Deh qual mai propizia sorte” and the duet “In questo ampesso” – were taken, text included, from Pampani’s opera Anagilda, the score of which Questenberg also had in his possession. Although this opera was never staged in Jaroměřice, it became the basis for the anonymous pasticcio Anagilda produced in Brno in 1737 (15 musical numbers out of 23 were adopted from Pampani). Anagilda was produced in Brno by the impresario Filippo Neri del Fantasia, who was in close contact with Questenberg.

Pasticcios were highly popular in Jaroměřice, as is evident from, in addition to the examples above, one of the copies of the libretto of Conti’s Issipile, stored in the Nové Hrady Chateau Library. Luckily, it seems to be a copy used for adapting the opera for yet another production, as is evidenced by special pencil inscriptions pointing to a new text or a whole new aria, or to an aria’s transposition or its transfer to a different place.

Conclusion

These examples demonstrate that pasticcios and opere impasticciate, which one would expect predominantly in municipal theaters, were also often performed in the Czech Lands in private aristocratic venues. The pasticcio practice was so widespread that it began in the mid-1720s to penetrate other genres such as the oratorio and the Latin mo-

67 Other preserved scores documented to have been produced thanks to the libretto include: Amalasunta (Caldara, 1726, autograph), L’amor non ha legge (Caldara, 1728, autograph), L’origine di Jaromeriz (Miča, 1730, only 1st and 2nd act), Pirro (Hasse, 1734) and Merope (Broschi, 1737). Productions without preserved librettos: La contesa de’ numi (Vinci, after 1733) and Issipile (Bioni, 1737).

68 Score: A-Wgm, IV 27698 (Q 20883).

69 Score: A-Wgm, IV 27708 (Q 20949).

70 The opera is listed under the name of Riccardo Broschi despite the fact that he only composed the overture. Cf. Perutková, 2015, pp. 531-534.

71 He wrote the libretto Il delizioso ritiro scielto da Lucullo, console Romano (1738) for the Count. Ibid., p. 245.

nastic play. The oldest example is the oratorio *Fides, spes, charitas* consisting of arias by George Frideric Handel, produced at the Prague Knights of the Cross in 1725.\(^{73}\) Interpolating oratorios with opera arias was popular at the court of Bishop Schrattenbach, where a number of pasticcio oratorios with music by famous Neapolitan composers were created in the 1730s.\(^{74}\) Arias by Italian composers were identified in the oratorio *La vittima d’amore* by Joseph Umstatt (Brno 1741)\(^{75}\) and in the anonymous Latin carnival play *Facetum musicum* from the Osek/Ossegg Cistercian monastery (1738).\(^{76}\)

The reasons for the insertions or for new music-dramatic pieces in the form of pasticcios were probably quite diverse. The traditional reason for pasticcios – the demands or requests of music stars – is reflected in the references to arias inserted “upon the soloists’ request” in Brno and Prague librettos or in the (randomly, to date) identified arias traveling between Prague, Brno and Holešov.\(^{77}\) The use of pre-existing music allowed for a significantly cheaper and faster rehearsing of new operas, which is the reason why it was also advantageous for theater managers. Private venues, where singers were mostly the subjects of the patron, were probably much less willing to lend an ear to their requests. Nor did they suffer from such circulation of personnel and audiences as the municipal theaters did, and so it was not advisable to recycle too much music. The issue of soloists is also related to a certain difference between the share of borrowed arias, including the text (prevalent with professional traveling ensembles), and compared to re-texted arias (more typical for private theaters).

Musical adjustments, due to the technical limitations of the singers, were more likely to take place in private aristocratic venues where it is possible that local artists may not have been as skilled as their Italian colleagues. This is, nonetheless, only partially true, for example with Schrattenbach’s court opera, where female roles were sung (at least in the initial phase) by boys from the Kroměříž Piarist vocal seminary.\(^{78}\) In Jaroměřice, on the other hand, score analysis and works composed directly for local singers testify to their excellent interpretive abilities.

What all the venues shared, however, were changes made for practical reasons. Arias were replaced or at least transposed due to the different voice types of the new cast or

---

74 Spáčilová, 2014b. Inserted arias are found in the oratorios *Morte, e sepoltura di Christo* (Brno 1730, score: D-B, Mus. Ms.2720, music by Caldara, inserted aria by Porpora) and *Cristo nell’orto* (Brno 1731, score: A-Sm, RaraHs Fux 2, music by Fux, inserted arias by Vinci and Giacomelli), for example. On the other hand, two arias from Porpora's oratorio *S. Giovanni Nepomuceno* (Brno 1732) were used in the opera *Nitocri* (Vyškov 1735).
75 Arias by Caldara, Feo, Hasse, Leo, Pescetti and Porta, see Voss, 2018, p. 266.
76 Arias by Handel, Lotti and Vivaldi, see Spáčilová/Macek, 2011.
77 A comprehensive approach to the traveling aria would require a detailed analysis of the librettos of all Central European opera centers.
78 Numerous simplifications (deletions in coloraturas, breath rests, etc.) were made, for example, in the score for the Brno version of Porpora’s oratorio *S. Giovanni Nepomuceno* (D-B, Mus. Ms.17781).
instrumentation demands. It should be noted that the opera orchestra was far from being standardized at this time, and some instruments requested by the score might not be available at the venue at all. The practical reasons also included the period customs regarding the acquisition and circulation of music scores. It was certainly easier (and cheaper) for traveling impresarios and artists to deal with separate arias, compared with the full scores of complete operas.

Music-aesthetic and commercial reasons definitely had a major impact on the form of the repertoire. Conforming to the audience’s tastes was vital for the theater director, particularly in the smaller cities like Wrocław or Brno, where the audience inevitably lost interest quickly. This struggle for attention and entrepreneurial success was not always easy, as is evident from the above-mentioned financial problems of Antonio Denuzio and the fluctuation of impresarios in Wrocław (where the city council confiscated stage decoration sets due to debts). The aesthetic aspect was also important in private theaters supported by a noble patron. Questenberg himself was an active musician, personally intervening in the final shape and rehearsals of the productions. While living in Italy, Schrattenbach saw the best of contemporary opera, and logically expected his private ensemble to deliver high-quality and modern music. They and their guests must have appreciated the productions.

The true reason for composing pasticcios was therefore the effort to revive or modernize an existing musical work. The need for self-presentation of local composers also played an important role, as can be seen in the stubborn mentioning of the names of the authors, be it with the whole operas (only a small number of the librettos under study are truly anonymous), or with ‘asterisked’ arias. On the other hand, the creation process of the pasticcio is marked by the ‘very best of’ principle – i.e. the involvement of high-quality, established music by renowned Italian composers, whose names served as the ‘label’ and guarantee of success. Local authors were tasked with carefully balancing this local pride with the interest in new music from abroad.

In short, the reasons for the instigation of creative efforts concerning pasticcio ranged from those of prestige through practical and aesthetic reasons to those of public demand. Italian opera was highly popular in the Czech Lands, as is evidenced by the growing presence it gained across musical genres (besides the oratorio, the opera aria

79 This is why e.g. the aria “Fiume altier và pur con l’onde” in Giacomelli’s opera *Lucio Papirio* (Kroměříž 1732) was replaced, requesting trumpets in the original version, as well as aria “A dispetto d’un volto amoroso” with the obligato French horns in Gasparini’s opera *Bajazet* (Kroměříž 1728).

80 Cf. Borcherdt, 1910, p. 36.

81 An example is Bononcini’s opera *Astarto* (Rome 1715), where all the arias with basso continuo, considered outdated by then, were replaced for the 1730 Kroměříž production, cf. Spáčilová, 2018, p. 219.

82 Such misattributed pasticcios include *L’Olimpiade* and *Cesare in Egitto* (Holešov 1736), labelled “Hasse”, and “Vivaldi’s” *Tullo Ostilio* (Brno 1735).
also enters the church loft as part of liturgical music). The method of creating new operas using pre-existing music was therefore perceived not only as fully legitimate but also as aesthetically valuable.

*Translation: Eva Černinová*

**Appendix**

*Table 1: Soloists traveling between Prague, Wrocław and Brno (Holešov)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the artist</th>
<th>PRAGUE</th>
<th>WROCŁAW</th>
<th>BRNO</th>
<th>HOLEŠOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuzzi, Ottavio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1738/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambini, Laura</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733, 1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battaglini, Domenico</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733, 1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianchi, Barbara</td>
<td>1724-26</td>
<td>1727-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianchi, Francesco Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1733/34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajo, Bartolomeo</td>
<td>1729-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733-36, 1738-40</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosimi, Anna</td>
<td>1729-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733-36</td>
<td>1734, 1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costantini, Antonio (composer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1733/33, 1738/39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costantini, née Spinola, Giacinta</td>
<td>1731/32</td>
<td>1725-27</td>
<td>1732/33, 1738-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danese, Veneranda</td>
<td>1738/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1737/38, 1739/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreyer, Giovanni</td>
<td>1730/31</td>
<td>1725-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eberhard, Giustina</td>
<td>1730/31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733/34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia, Rosalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1734/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora, Margarita</td>
<td>1729-32</td>
<td>1733/34</td>
<td>1732/33, 1734/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galetti, Filippo</td>
<td>1729/30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1735/36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giusti, Anna Maria</td>
<td>1724/25</td>
<td>1725/26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1736/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gualandi, Diamante Maria</td>
<td>1725/26</td>
<td>1726/27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucchini, Matteo</td>
<td>1726-30, 1734/35</td>
<td>1731/32, 1733/34</td>
<td>1732/33, 1736-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonis, Girolama</td>
<td>1729-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1737/39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mareschi, Marc’Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1729-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1739/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzoli, Giuseppe</td>
<td>1738/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1736/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaeli, Giovanni</td>
<td>1731/32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732/33, 1734/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monti, Cecilia</td>
<td>1729-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733-36, 1734, 1735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2: Repertoire links between Prague, Wroclaw and Brno

Table data order: Year of production/impresario (initials in square brackets – no preserved libretto), composer (according to the libretto)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the artist</th>
<th>PRAGUE</th>
<th>WROCLAW</th>
<th>BRNO</th>
<th>HOLEŠOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monza, Margherita</td>
<td>1732-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monza, Maria</td>
<td>1732-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moretti, Lorenzo</td>
<td>1724-26, 1728/29, 1733-35</td>
<td>1727/28</td>
<td>1735/36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moretti, née Gualandi, Margarita</td>
<td>1728/29, 1733-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1735/36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negri, Giovanni Domenico</td>
<td>1732/33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negri, Marina</td>
<td>1724-27</td>
<td>1728/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlandi, Chiara</td>
<td>1727/28</td>
<td>1725-27, 1728/29</td>
<td>1733-36</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personé, Catterina</td>
<td>1738/39</td>
<td>1733/34</td>
<td>1737/38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruzzi, Teresa</td>
<td>1725-27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1733-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramis, née Delfini, Cecilia</td>
<td>1731/32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732/33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taselli, Domenico</td>
<td>1738/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1737/38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vida, Paolo</td>
<td>1724/25, 1726/27</td>
<td>1725/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>PRAGUE</th>
<th>WROCLAW</th>
<th>BRNO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armida al campo</td>
<td>1728/AD, Guerra</td>
<td>1726/LW, Bioni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La costanza combattuta in amore</td>
<td>1728/AD, Porta</td>
<td>1725/AMP, Porta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La fede tradita e vendicata</td>
<td>1727/AD, Gasparini</td>
<td>1729/SB, Bioni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filindo</td>
<td>Regensburg 1733/AD</td>
<td>1728/[SB+GD] Bioni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teseo in Creta</td>
<td>1729/AMP+FD</td>
<td>1734/AM (Arianna e Teseo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Severo</td>
<td>1733/[AB], Bioni</td>
<td>1740/FNF, Lucchini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigona vendicata</td>
<td>1728/SB, Orlandini</td>
<td>1736/AM, Orlandini (Antigona in Tebe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulisse</td>
<td>1726/LW, Treu</td>
<td>1739/FNF, Porta (Penelope la casta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gli amori amari</td>
<td>1732/AD, Costantini</td>
<td>1733/AM, Costantini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table data order: Year of production/impresario (initials in square brackets – no preserved libretto), composer (according to the libretto)*

*Table entries provided for reference purposes only.*

---
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Table 3: Authors of the Mingotti operas adopted from Prague

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>PRAGUE Year: Composer</th>
<th>BRNO Year: Composer</th>
<th>Total musical numbers/common with Prague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gli amori amari</td>
<td>1732: La Musica è del Sig. Antonio Costantini, a riserva d’alcune Arie messe al piacere de Virtuosi</td>
<td>1733: La Musica è del Sig. Antonio Costantini, a riserva d’alcune Arie posse al piacere de Virtuosi</td>
<td>27/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argippo</td>
<td>1730: La Musica è del sempre celebre Sig. D. Antonio Vivaldi</td>
<td>1733: La Musica è del Sig. Antonio Constantini, a Riserva d’alcune Arie poste al piacere de Virtuosi</td>
<td>18/2 (+1 paraphrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armida abbandonata</td>
<td>1725: La Musica è del Sig. M. Antonio Bioni</td>
<td>1733: La Musica è del Sig. Eustachio Bambini</td>
<td>32/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didone</td>
<td>1731: La Musica è del Celebre Sig. Maestro Tomaso Albinoni</td>
<td>1735: La Musica e del Celebre Sig. Domenico Sarro Maestro della Capella Reale di Napoli</td>
<td>21/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucio Vero</td>
<td>1725: La Musica e la maggior parte del Signore Tommaso Albinoni Veneto</td>
<td>1734: La Musica è la maggior parte del Sig. Baldassare Galuppi di Venezia à riserva dell’Arie, che sono di diversi Autori</td>
<td>27/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando furioso</td>
<td>1724: La Musica del Sig. Gio. Antonio Bioni, Virtuoso di Venetia</td>
<td>1735: La Musica e del Signore Antonio Vivaldi à riserva di alcune Arie [German version: Sarro]</td>
<td>28/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La pravità castigata</td>
<td>1730: La Musica delle Arie (avventurosamente ottenuta) d’un Autore di cui si compiace frequentemente il primo Monarca del Mondo [Caldara]</td>
<td>1734: La Musica è del Sig. Eustachio Bambini di Pesaro à riserva d’alcune Arie</td>
<td>27/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullo Ostilio</td>
<td>1727: –</td>
<td>1735: La Musica e del Signore Antonio Vivaldi à riserva di alcune Arie [German version: Sarro]</td>
<td>26/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Authors of the Mingotti operas adopted from Prague
Sources

ALBINONI, TOMASO, Didone abbandonata, Wroclaw 1726; libretto: US-We, ML48 [S90].
Id., Didone abbandonata, Prague 1731; libretto: CZ-Pu, 65 E 3207.

ASTORGA, EMANUELE D’, Two arias from Dafni; score: D-B, Mus.ms.autogr. Agricola,
J. F. 1, no. 12 and 13.

BAMBINI, EUSTACHIO et al., Partenope, Holešov 1733; libretto: CZ-Bu, ST1-0019.303.

BIONI, ANTONIO, Andromaca, Wroclaw 1730; collection of arias: PL-KÓ, BK 1669.
Id. et al., Endimione, Wroclaw 1727; libretto: PL-WRu, Yv 983/2.

Id., Issipile, Wroclaw 1732; score: A-Wgm, IV 27740 (Q 1214).

Id., Orlando furioso, Prague 1724; libretto: CZ-Pu, 52 G 19.
Id., Orlando furioso, oder Der rasende Orland, Kuks 1724; libretto: D-W, Textb. 321.

BRIVIO, GIUSEPPE FERDINANDO et al., Demofoonte, Jaroměřice 1738; score: A-Wgm, IV 27698 (Q 20883).

CALDARA, ANTONIO et al., Morte, e sepoltura di Christo, Brno 1730; score: D-B, Mus.
Ms.2720.

Il confronto dell’amor coniugale, Prague 1727; libretto: CZ-Pu, 65 E 4750/3.

CONTI, FRANCESCO BARTOLOMEO, Issipile, Jaroměřice 1733; libretto: CZ-Pn, Nové
Hrady Chateau Library, 1430.


Id. et al., Gli amori amari, Prague 1732; libretto: CZ-Pu, 65 E 2524.

Id. et al., Gli amori amari, Brno 1733; libretto: CZ-Bu, ST1-0500.998.

Il Demetrio, Wroclaw 1732; libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.5385; PL-WRu, Yv 986/1.

FUX, JOHANN JOSEPH et al., Cristo nell’orto, Brno 1731; score: A-Sm, RaraHs Fux 2.

MATTHESON, JOHANN, Verzeichnis aller welschen Opern, welche von 1725 bis 1734 auf
dem breslauischen Schauplatz vorgestellet worden sind, in: Grundlage einer Eh-
ren=Pforte, woran der tüchtigsten Capellmeister, Componisten, Musikgelehrten,
Tonkünstler u. Leben, Wercke, Verdienste u. erscheinen sollen. Zum fernern Ausbau
angegeben […] Hamburg 1740, pp. 374-378.

PARADIES, DOMENICO et al., Alessandro in Persia, Jaroměřice 1740; score: A-Wgm, IV 27708 (Q 20949).

PORPORA, NICOLA, S. Giovanni Nepomuceno; score: D-B, Mus.Ms.17781.

SARRO, DOMENICO, Didone, Brno 1734; libretto: CZ-Bu, ST1-0242.152.

Id., Didone abbandonata, Venice 1730; libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.435, score: I-Ne,
Rari 7.2.5.

Schlesischer Nouvellen-Courier, PL-WRu, 446736/XI – XVI, lost, microfilm: D-BMs,
Mikrofilmmarchiv und Mediathek.

Teodorico, Brno 1737; libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.5632/1

TREU, DANIEL GOTTLOB (FEDERE, DANIELE), Three arias for ANTONIO BIONI, Endimio-
ne; score: D-SWI, Mus.4716, no. 7-9; D-B, Mus.ms.autogr. Agricola, J. F. 1, no. 10
and 11.
VINCI, LEONARDO et al., Didone abbandonata, Jaroměřice 1736; libretto: CZ-Pn, Nové Hrady Chateau Library, 1437.
VIVALDI, ANTONIO et al., Orlando furioso, Brno 1735; libretto: CZ-Bu, CH-0003.532.
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The Graz 1740 Pasticcio

Amor, odio e pentimento

A Special Case or Mingottis’ Common Practice?

Metoda Kokole

As has already been established in the last two decades or so, most or even all Italian opera productions by the brothers Angelo and Pietro Mingotti during their impresa in the Inner-Austrian capital of Graz were pasticcios. I have in the past discussed some of the cases from the years 1740 and 1742 connected with their consecutive seasons in Ljubljana/Laibach, the first organized by Angelo and the second by Pietro Mingotti.1 All the discussed productions – Artaserse, Rosmira, Didone abbandonata and Il Demetrio – were compared there with identically-titled operas given in Graz or elsewhere, or else with the rare examples of preserved scores for later Mingotti productions, such as those in Hamburg dating from the mid-1740s.

To the latter group belong Didone abbandonata and Il Demetrio, inside the scores of which some composers of the individual arias are actually named.2 The earlier Mingotti productions are therefore rather securely identified as pasticcios and have been proven to be assembled for different occasions using compositions by various composers, sometimes even ones different from those mentioned in the libretto as the sole composers for a given opera. Surveyed as a whole, the extant Graz librettos and arias connected with both Mingottis3 provide rich material for a study of the reuse and abuse of operatic

1 Kokole, 2005; Kokole, 2012; and Kokole, 2013.
3 The librettos are preserved in the University Library in Graz and/or in the Styrian Provincial Library in Graz. All of them were carefully catalogued in the “Anhang II” of Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. XLIII-CLXVII, and more recently in Theobald, 2015, pp. 21-36.
librettos, the mobility of the repertoire used in these pasticcios, connections with specific singers, possible contributions of locally available composers and perhaps also the musical tastes and preferences of the patrons, who were the local nobility.

In this article I discuss one of the Graz productions from the same period: that of Amor, odio e pentimento, produced by Pietro Mingotti during the carnival season of 1740. I chose this particular production for various reasons, but above all because it offers plausible hypotheses concerning the actual music heard by the nobility of Graz in early 1740 as well as suggestions for the possible reasons behind the choice of particular pieces for inclusion in this production.

The opera was staged at the so called “new” Tummelplatz theater built a couple of years earlier by Pietro Mingotti with the support of the local nobility (the Provincial Estates) and the city of Graz. The wooden construction, modelled on the standard Venetian plans for indoor public theaters, was erected against the old city wall in the eastern part of the town. It was 31.3 meters in length and 13 meters in height and width. It accommodated up to 400 spectators. By 1738 season tickets were being offered for 10, 5 or 3 gold pieces. Seasons were announced by flyers – Avertissements (see an example below) – specifying that performances took place on Sundays, Mondays and Thursdays, beginning at 5 p.m. Each of the productions was supported by a subvention of 300 to 500 guilders paid by the Hofkammer and 80 guilders by the town.

“The libretto (and therefore production) of Amor, odio e pentimento was dedicated by its impresario, Pietro Mingotti, to the “Province of Styria” – in other words, to his pa-

4 The earliest description of the Mingotti theater in Graz was published in Bischoff, 1892, pp. 118f. For more information, see Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. 10-14 and Fleischmann, 1974, pp. 35-40.
5 Fleischmann, 1974, p. 35.
6 Bischoff, 1892, p. 119.
7 Fleischmann, 1974, pp. 38f.
trons, the noble members of the Styrian government. These were in 1740: the Landeshauptmann Count Karl Weikhard von Breuner, the Inner-Austrian Statthalter Count Johann Christoph von Wildenstein, the Hofkammerpräsident Franz Dismas von Attems, and members of the Innerösterreichische Geheimrat including Dr. Peter Anton Cerroni, who was also a Hofvizekanzler, Count Thadeaus von Attems, Count Johann Josef von Wildenstein, Count Franz Bernhard von Saurau, and others.

The dedicatory letter is written in the general style of such texts and offers no further information, as is usual for most of the Mingottis’ Graz librettos. Other prints signed by Pietro Mingotti during the years 1739 to 1741 vary only by specifying, for example, “The Ladies and Gentlemen of the Nobility of the most famous city of Graz” (“La Nobiltà di Dame e Cavallieri della celeberrima Città di Graz”, in Demofoonte of carnival 1739 and Il Catone in Utica of carnival 1740), or “to the incomparable merit of the illustrious, most excellent Chamber of Inner Austria” (“all‘impareggiabile merito dell‘inclita eccellentissima Camera dell‘Austria Interiore”, in Adelaide and Rosmira of the carnival and autumn seasons of 1739, respectively), singling out in the dedication the “Caesarian Count Chamber, Your Excellencies, Most Illustrious Lords, Lords of the Holy Roman Imperial Council, President and other Most Illustrious Lord Councillors” (“Cesarea Aulica Camera, Eccellenze, Illustrissimi Signori, Signori del S.R.I. Cons. Presidente, ed altri Illustrissimi Sig. Sig. Consiglieri”). In the libretto of Aristheus (1741) the “Well-born Imperial Count and Gentleman Governor” (“Wohlgeborner Reichsgraf und Herr, Herr Statthalter”) is also explicitly mentioned. During the period under discussion the “Hofkammer Präsident” was Count Franz Dismas von Attems, and the Statthalter was Count Johann Christoph von Wildenstein, uncle of the former’s wife.

The libretto – with the exception of the title page and the dedication (which are printed only in Italian) – is entirely bilingual with the Italian and German texts being placed on facing pages. The texts were translated by Franz Joseph Carl Pirker, the husband of Mingotti’s regular leading lady Marianne Pirker, who was also involved in this production. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the libretto printed in Graz by the heirs of

---


11 For Count Franz Dismas von Attems and his relatives, see below, n. 34. He was honoured by Emperor Charles VI with the position of “counsellor of the Inner-Austrian government” (“Rat bei der Innerösterreichischen Regierung”) and elected its president in Graz on 7 April 1739.

12 His authorship is indicated – as usual, only through initials – on an unnumbered page after the cast list (“Auftreffende Persohnen”): “In das Teutsche übersetzt von F. J. C. P.”.
the provincial printer Widmannstätter has survived in four copies:13 two in Graz,14 one in the Cistercian monastery of Rein and one in the “Hofbibliothek” collection of the National Library in Vienna. I have consulted the copy held today by the Graz University Library15 and the Vienna copy, which is accessible online.16

Figure 1: Title page of the libretto for the production of the opera Amor, odio e pentimento in Graz in 1740 (A-Gu, I 57642; by kind permission).

A manuscript annotation on the Vienna copy identifies the author of the drama as Francesco Passerini and its composer as Giovanni Porta, helpfully adding the name of Porta’s original opera, which was entitled Amore e fortuna.17 This is indeed a textually almost

13 Its most comprehensive description, with a list of the arias, appears in: MÜLLER VON ASOW, 1917, pp. LIIIff.
14 A-Gu and A-Gl.
15 A-Gu, I 57642.
16 A-Wn, 4128-B MUS MAG: online: http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AC09655129, 23.03.2019.
17 The note, inscribed more recently (possibly in the 19th century), appears on a flyleaf: “Franc. Passarini | Mus. Giov. Porta: Amore e fortuna (Amor di sangue)”.
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identical version of Passerini’s drama – leaving aside the aria texts, which are all, without exception, different from those in Porta’s original setting. Passerini’s libretto had enjoyed a wide circulation since 1725, when it had been set to music for the first time by Giovanni Porta in celebration of the name-day of Emperor Charles VI in Naples.\textsuperscript{18} The libretto circulated also under various other titles, such as \textit{Amore di sangue}, \textit{La sorte nemica} and \textit{Amor, odio e pentimento}.\textsuperscript{19} Over time, Porta’s arias apparently lost their appeal, in later productions mostly being replaced by arias of other composers. The Graz libretto is one of the three productions entitled \textit{Amor, odio e pentimento}, of which the second and the third were in Mestre (at the Autumn fair) and in Este (in Autumn) of 1729.

\begin{verbatim}
ATTORI.\textsuperscript{20}

ARNEA, Regina di Fenici, Amante d’Ismero.
La Signora \textit{Anna Girò}. → (Jungfrau)

ORMONDA, Principessa d’Egitto, Amante d’Ismero.
La Signora \textit{Marianna Pircher}. → (Frau Maria Anna Pirckerin)

ISMERO, Pittore Regio, che poi si scopre esser Floriano, Fratello d’Arnea.
Il Sig. \textit{Alessandro Veroni}. → (Herr Alexander Veroni)

CREONTE, Prencipe d’Egitto, Tutore d’Ormonda, Amante d’Arnea.
Il Sig. \textit{Giuseppe Alberti}. → (Herr Joseph Alberti)

ARISTEO, Prencipe di Cirene, Amante d’Ormonda.
La Sig. \textit{Margaritta Flora}. → (Jungfrau Margaretha Flora)

→ “In das Teutsche übersetzet von F. J. C. P.”
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{18} Sartori, 1990-1994, no. 1596.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., no. 1596 (Naples 1725) to no. 1602 (Holleschau, today Holešov, 1739) under the title \textit{Amore e fortuna}; no. 1586 (Bergamo, 1729) under the title \textit{Amore di sangue}; no. 22310 (Vicenza, 1728) to no. 22311 (Pavia, 1729) under the title \textit{La sorte nemica}, and no. 1427 (Mestre and Este, 1729) under the title of \textit{Amor, odio e pentimento}. The copy preserved in Ljubljana in the collection of the Seminary Library differs from others cited under the same number in Sartori, for it clearly states that the opera was produced at the “The Very New Theater of Este in the Autumn of 1729” (“Teatro Novissimo di Este l’Autumno dell’Anno 1729”) and was dedicated by the impresario Giovanni Orsato to the “Most Illustrious Lord Deputies of the said City” (“Illustrissimi Signori Deputati di detta Città”. (SI-Ls, AE 51/7). The Mestre production by the same impresario took place during the autumn fair (“Fiera dell’autunno”) of the same year. On the use of the opera in the Peruzzi troupe cf. the article by Berthold Over in the present volume, pp. 258, 261.

\textsuperscript{20} The list of singers as defined in the Italian and in German versions in the libretto on two facing unnumbered pages following the dedication.

All of them had been with him from the start of his Graz impresa in 1736. Two interesting new singers joined them for the production of both carnival 1740 operas. The carnival 1740 season was the only one to host the alto castrato Alessandro Veroni,\footnote{In the sources also spelled Verroni, Varoni and Verona. The same singer also went under the names of Alessandro di Urbino or Alessandro di Bologna. Sartori, 1990-1994, Indici II. Cantanti, p. 525.} who had previously – from 1725 onwards – been active especially in northern Italian operatic centers, but had also appeared in Rome and outside Italy (Portugal and Austria). He had come to Graz from Turin, where he sang in the two carnival productions of 1739.\footnote{He was most active in the period running from the mid-1720s to the mid-1740s. Sartori, 1990-1994, Indici II. Cantanti, p. 667. On Veroni in the context of his Roman roles in Carnival 1738, see also Kokole, 2016b, pp. 255 and 264. As a castrato singer, Veroni was probably expensive to hire, although, being at the end of his career, perhaps not as expensive as some other castratos of the time. Rosselli remarks that by 1739-1742 Veroni was “at the end of an undistinguished career”. Rosselli, 1992, p. 134.} The fifth singer was Anna Girò, the well-known protégée of Antonio Vivaldi who had joined the Mingotti company in Graz after her carnival 1739 season in Ferrara.\footnote{Sartori, 1990-1994, Indici II. Cantanti, p. 324.}

Already in autumn 1739 she was singing in Pietro Mingotti’s Graz operatic productions, together with Pirker, Alberti and Flora. Why Pietro required such a strong and possibly expensive cast for the early 1740 productions is not entirely clear, but the following reasoning may shed light on the possibly special circumstances.

Let us see what an analysis of the included arias reveals. In the table here below the arias in the Graz libretto are placed opposite those in the otherwise textually matching libretto of Amor, odio e pentimento produced by Giovanni Orsato in the autumn of 1729 in Este (and during the autumn fair in Mestre), where the impresario claims in his dedication that the music is Porta’s. The table shows that, with the exception of two arias, they were all different – and even those two do not seem to be by Porta, for we do not find them in the libretto of his original Amore e fortuna. One can therefore assume that the Este and Mestre productions, too, were at least in part pasticcios, just like the Graz one.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Graz Libretto & Este Libretto \tabularnewline
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
The Graz 1740 Pasticcio Amor, odio e pentimento

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAZ – 1740</th>
<th>MESTRE – 1729 by G. Porta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>(Ismero): Pria di lasciare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Benche un oggetto per me delira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>(Creonte): Tu mi dice bel labro, chi’o sper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,7</td>
<td>(Aristeo): No, non vedrete mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,8</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Risponderti vorrei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>(Arnea): Rondinella, cui rapita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>(Ismero): Quando nel campo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>(Arnea): Tu sciegliesti un fido amante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>(Aristeo): ’Intendo, si mio Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>(Ismero): L’augel, che more, e nasce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>(Creonte): Gelosia, d’un cor tormento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,9</td>
<td>(Arnea): Leon feroce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,13</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Almen, se non poss’io</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,1</td>
<td>(Creonte): Bei lumi vezzosetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>(Arnea): Sento in riva all’altra sponde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>(Aristeo): Il saggio Nochiero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Agitato dal furore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>(Ismero): Ogni procella infida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arias (or roles) assigned to specific singers reveal that Girò, Veroni and Pirker sang four arias, and the other two singers three arias each. The two guest singers interpreted the roles of the main protagonists. Arnea’s first aria, “Dal suo gentil sembiante”, sung by Anna Girò, was – as we are informed in a note at the end of the libretto – a replacement for “L’occhio nero”.

Seven arias come from six different dramas by Pietro Metastasio (see also Appendix), and two – both sung by Alessandro Veroni – from Antonio Salvi’s opera Il Quinto Fabio. One aria comes from Zeno’s Ormisda and another from Francesco Silvani’s Attalo. The variety of aria texts does not tell us much more than we had already surmised: that the Graz Amor, odio e pentimento was indeed a compilation par excellence. I checked whether some of the aria texts were reused in other Mingotti productions, since this was a rather common practice at that time, and one adopted by Pietro Mingotti. Pietro did indeed include four of these arias in his later Hamburg productions: Demetrio in 1744 (“Ogni procella infida”); Semiramide (“No, non vedrete mai”) and Oronte (“Almen, se non poss’io”) in 1745; Arsace (“Agitato dal furore”) in 1748. However, none of

25 Titles are spelled according to the sources. There are some obvious mistakes and titles are sometimes corrupted like “Rondinella, cui rapita” which is certainly Metastasio’s “Rondinella, a cui rapita” from Semiramide riconosciuta or “Sento in riva all’altra sponde” which must be “Sento in riva all’altra sponde” from Francesco Silvani’s Attalo, re di Bitinia.

26 Most of them were already identified by Müller von Asow. Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. LIV.

27 Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. CCXXXIII-CCLXXVII.
those arias was performed by its earlier singer, so its musical setting was very possibly unconnected with the one used for the 1740 Graz production.

In my recent articles on the collection of Italian opera arias once belonging to the family of Counts Attems – in the mid-18th century one of the most influential and wealthy families in Styria – I have already pointed out the concordances with the repertoire of Pietro Mingotti’s opera productions in the years from 1739 to 1740, and have remarked on the exceptionally high number of possible musical matches relating in particular to *Amor, odio e pentimento*.

The six matching arias (see the Appendix) are documented in the extant original manuscript list of all arias in the possession of the Countess Josepha von Attems, née Countess von Khuen, in 1744: *Lista delle Arie dell’IllustriSSima Signora Signora Giuseppa Contessa d’Atthembs Nata Contessa di Khuen. L’Anno 1744*; originally numbered 2, 17, 19, 20, 24, 54 and 55. For the arias numbered on this list from 22 onwards the music itself has survived. So for three of the matching arias we also have surviving musical manuscripts preserved in the collection today housed at the Provincial Archives in Maribor. Two of the arias in question were sung by Alessandro Veroni, two by Marianne Pirker and one each by Anna Girò and Margerita Flora. In the list the replacement aria for Arnea, “Dal suo gentil sembiante” sung by Anna Girò, was entered twice as both no. 2 and no. 19, in each instance being attributed to Leonardo Leo.

The text of the aria “Dal suo gentil sembiante” comes from Metastasio’s *Demetrio*. As I have established in my earlier research on the Attems collection, most of the missing arias from the Countess’s list were in fact originally brought back from his earlier Grand Tour in Italy by her husband, Ignaz Count Attems (Ignaz Maria Maximilian Dismas Josef Alexander Count von Attems-Heiligenkreuz; Graz 1714-Vienna 1762). While in Naples in the summer of 1738, Attems also heard Leo’s *Demetrio*, produced at the Teatro San Carlo, where this aria was sung by Alceste in Act I. Leo originally composed this aria for its premiere in 1732.

28 Kokole, 2016b and also Kokole, 2016a.
29 Kokole, 2016a, p. 263. On this collection and its first owners, see also Kokole, 2016b.
30 SI-Mpa, AE 1.
31 SI-Mpa, AE 1.
32 Kokole, 2016b, 343-347 (with cited sources and further secondary literature).
33 This production was in part a pasticcio, for in the libretto we read that “Musica del 1° atto e delle arie del 2° e 3° con + di Leonardo Leo, vice maestro della R. capp. Musica dell 2° atto di diversi autori. Musica del 3° atto di Riccardo Broschi”. Kokole, 2016b, pp. 357f.
The first two arias for Ismero – “Pria di lasciare” (I,1) and “Quando nel campo” (I,11) – interpreted in Graz by Alessandro Veroni, both match the opera heard by Ignaz von Attems during the 1738 Carnival season in Rome. They came from Nicola Logroscino’s setting of Salvi’s drama *Il Quinto Fabio*, in which Alessandro Veroni interpreted Lucio Papirio – perhaps not a coincidence at all. Count Attems enthusiastically acquired as many as nine soprano arias from this production; especially ones heard in the interpretation of the famous castrato Gioachino Conti detto Il Ghizziello. Unfortunately, only one of these musical manuscripts (which is not one of the two used in the Graz production of *Amor, odio e pentimento*) has survived in Maribor. The two used in Graz in 1740 are, however, entered into the *Lista delle Arie* as nos. 20 and 17. The score for this opera by Logroscino is reportedly lost, and I was unable to trace other copies of these two arias.

It is telling that one other aria sung by Veroni in Graz can probably be traced to one of the operas attended by Count Attems in Naples. He definitely heard “Ogni procella infida” in the already mentioned *Demetrio* by Leo produced at the Teatro San Carlo in summer 1738. The fourth aria sung by Veroni remains a mystery; it is definitely not an aria that he would have sung in any of his previous seasons. Veroni’s presence in this
particular operatic season in Graz and his interpretation of some of the favorite arias acquired by Count Attems are possibly connected. The singer may well have become acquainted with Ignaz von Attems in early 1738 in Rome and have traveled to Graz at the special invitation of the young count’s powerful father, Franz Dismas (Count Franz Dismas Hermann von Attems, Freiherr von Heiligenkreuz; Graz 1688-Graz 1750)\textsuperscript{34} – at that time President of the Inner-Austrian Hofkammer and – as argued at the beginning of this article – among the foremost patrons of the Mingotti impresa.

Figure 3: Portrait of Count Ignaz Maria von Attems painted in the 1780s by an anonymous author\textsuperscript{35} (Pokrajinski muzej Maribor, 42.5 x 33 cm, inv. no. 000144; by kind permission).

\textsuperscript{34} The most comprehensive biography of Count Franz Dismas Hermann von Attems is included in the typewritten family history by Victoria Pallavicino-Attems. A-Gla, Familienarchiv Attems, (VI. 2. Kapitel). Also Ilwof, 1897, pp. 19f.

\textsuperscript{35} The portrait is inspired by an earlier one painted by Adriaen Carpentiers in 1738 in Rome and which is now housed at the Joanneum gallery in the Eggenberg palace in Graz. The latter portrait was obviously commissioned by Ignaz von Attems himself while visiting the eternal city in the last year of his Grand Tour.
For another matching aria from the list originating from the Count’s Roman collection of arias we also have preserved music. “Risponderti vorrei” was composed by Giuseppe Arena for the carnival 1738 production of his *Achille in Sciro* at the Teatro delle Dame in Rome (I,14). It was on that occasion sung by Ghizziello, who took the role of Achille. Apart from the manuscript from Maribor, a full score of the entire opera has survived in Berlin as well as two further copies of this particular aria: one in Uppsala and the other in Naples. The Maribor copy is scored for soprano, basso continuo and a string accompaniment.

---

36 The portrait adorned the festive hall at Dornava/Dornau manor in Lower Styria, which in the 18th century was the home of his musically gifted younger brother Thadeaus Cajetan Bernhard Maria von Attems (1691-1750), who in 1740 was likewise a member of the ruling elite in Graz (see above).

37 For a detailed discussion of this opera, see Kokole, 2016a. Selected arias are published in a recent critical edition that includes the aria “Risponderti vorrei” (SI-Mpa, AE 1/3): Arena, 2016, pp. 24-32.
ensemble comprising first and second violins plus violas. The Count also had, specially devised for his own use, an additional part for transverse flute adapted melodically from the soprano part.

Figure 5: The beginning of the aria “Risponderti vorrei” in the version copied for Count Ignaz von Attems in 1738 (SI-Mpa, AE 1/3; by kind permission).

“Risponderti vorrei” is a rather long da capo aria with a virtuosic A section in 3/8 meter marked Allegro, full of rapid dynamic changes and a contrasting middle section in common time. It definitely called for an experienced singer. As one would expect, it was allotted to one of the best singers: in this instance, Marianne Pirker in the role of Ormonda. It was – considering that it was the one most frequently copied – the most popular and widely known aria by Arena.

The aria “Nò, non vedrete mai” was originally written by Metastasio for his Ciro riconosciuto. The aria with the matching text is preserved in Maribor in short score for soprano and basso continuo, with separate parts for the first and second violins. The composer is not indicated and the setting is neither Leo’s, nor Hasse’s. This Metastasio text was, however, also used by Andrea Bernasconi, a composer whose works were especially appreciated by the Attems couple, in his serenata Endimione produced at the

38 SI-Mpa, AE 1, Lista; no. 54 and AE I/33.
The Graz 1740 Pasticcio Amor, odio e pentimento

Teatro Grimani on the last day of the carnival of 1742. The aria, with only two words different from those in the preserved Maribor copy (“cambiar” to “cangiar” in verse 2 of the A section and “più” to “io” in verse 2 of the B section), was in Bernasconi’s Venetian serenata used by Antonia Negri Tomi in the title role. Most of the arias in this production were pasted from elsewhere and were not part of the original Metastasio libretto of 1721. Considering the already mentioned obvious preference of this composer in the Attems family, the general popularity of his early works outside Italy, and taking into consideration that in his early career Bernasconi was not ashamed of using his own compositions for various productions, it may well be that an earlier version of Bernasconi’s aria was indeed used in the Graz 1739 pasticcio. This aria was possibly reused twice in Mingotti’s later operatic productions of the pasticcio Semiramide: in Graz in 1743 and in Hamburg in 1745.

Following immediately after this aria in the Attems list and music collection is the sixth piece, which textually matches Ormonda’s aria in the second act: “Almen, se non poss’io”. This aria was originally written by Metastasio for his Clemenza di Tito. Who the composer of the piece in the Attems collection was, is yet unknown to me; nor is it possible at this stage to speculate about the authorship of the music heard in Graz in 1740. It is however worth noting that both these scores were copied locally.

The arias performed by Mingotti’s regulars and perhaps those sung by Veroni were probably chosen for them by the impresario to suit their abilities and accord with the possible musical preferences of the patrons. It is known, however, that Marianne Pirker – at least later in her career – often decided herself which arias were best suited to her. For the guest star of the 1740 season, Anna Girò, the situation seems to have been different in at least two instances. She apparently sang her own ‘signature’ arias – belonging to the so-called arie di baule – a situation rather normal for her. One of them was “Leon feroce” – most probably the version composed in 1731 by Antonio Vivaldi for her to

40 I have consulted the libretto preserved at I-Vcg. The aria for Endimione is in Act II, Scene 1. This aria was originally written by Metastasio for his Ciro riconosciuto, composed in 1736 in Vienna by Antonio Caldara. It was an aria by Ciro in Act III, Scene 12.
41 Most of these arias, interestingly, do not feature in Bernasconi’s later version of Endimione produced in Munich in 1766.
42 On Bernasconi’s earlier operatic works, preserved arias and their dissemination see also a new article by Daniela v. Aretin. Aretin, 2018, pp. 156-178.
43 Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. CXXIX-CXLI.
44 SI-Mpa, AE I, Lista; no. 55 and AE I/34.
45 Kokole, 2016b, p. 362.
46 On Pirker, see above, n. 21. Marianne Pirker’s personal criteria for the choice of suitable arias can be deduced from the preserved correspondence between Marianne and her husband Franz Pirker in the years 1748/49. This correspondence is about to be published by Daniel Brandenburg. See also his article in the present volume, pp. 271-283.
47 She frequently sang borrowed arias taken from her own previous roles and composed especially for her. Hill, 1978, p. 81.
sing as a replacement aria in the production of Lucchini’s *Farnace.* This text originally formed part of Zeno’s 1721 libretto *Ormisda.* The aria has in modern times become a rather famous piece, since a score of it has been sold at auction twice: first in 1990 and later in 2008. When it initially surfaced, Michael Talbot devoted to this aria an entire article published in *Informazioni e studi vivaldiani* in 1991.

---

48 First produced in 1726 in Florence and in 1727 in Venice.


50 *Talbot,* 1991.
Tracking Girò’s earlier roles, I have possibly identified another of her ‘suitcase’ arias. She sang Johann Adolf Hasse’s aria “Sento in riva” in his opera *Attalo re di Bitinia*, produced in Ferrara in carnival 1739, just before she joined the Graz company.\(^{51}\) This aria for Arsinoe (interpreted by Girò) appeared in Act III, Scene 5. The same aria is preserved in various manuscript copies: namely, two in the Santini collection in Münster,\(^ {52}\) one in Milan where the full score of 1728 original production is also held,\(^ {53}\) and the


\(^{52}\) D-MÜs; RISM ID nos. 451016803 and 451016923.

\(^{53}\) I-Mc, Noseda A.26.18.-N. 3. There is also a full score of *Attalo, re di Bitinia* by Hasse preserved in I-Mc, 3-A-1a.
fourth in Naples. Unfortunately, I have not yet managed to identify the remaining two arias sung by Anna Girò in the 1740 Graz production by Pietro Mingotti.

The provisionally identified music for eight of the 19 arias in the pasticcio production of *Amor, odio e pentimento* in Graz confirms the suspicion that Pietro Mingotti truly engaged the best available singers for the task of realizing this large assembly of virtuoso arias, thereby lending the production an especially appealing form. Among the composers of the arias heard in Graz – all premiered within the previous decade – were Leo, Vivaldi and Hasse, as well as the possibly less familiar Arena and Logroscino. Since no composer is indicated or mentioned in the sole surviving source – the libretto – we can only speculate about the identity of the composer/s of the remainder of the opera: the sinfonia, all the recitatives, the remaining unidentified arias, and the possible instrumental interpolations.

Since the text conforms (leaving aside the arias) exactly to that of earlier librettos for Giovanni Porta’s opera, Mingotti could well have used his music. However, if this was not the case, I would assume that one of the locally available musicians performed the task. Perhaps this was one of the two persons engaged for this production who had done work of a similar kind previously: the singer Giuseppe Alberti (author of the recitatives and some arias for *La fede ne’ tradimenti* given by Pietro Mingotti in Graz in spring 1736) or the translator of the libretto, Franz Joseph Karl Pirker, who in 1728 had composed an opera, *Bacco trionfante dall’Indie*, for Vienna’s Kärntnertortheater.

Taking into consideration the fact that more than one third of the arias seem to be connected in one way or another with either Ignaz von Attems and his visit to Italy or with his wife Josepha’s music collection, and also in view of the presence of the castrato Alessandro Veroni only for that specific Mingotti season in Graz (and not forgetting that Ignaz’s father was at that time a leading person in the provincial government, Mingotti’s patrons), it is tempting to imagine that the production was conceived especially to honor them and their love for Italian opera.

Within the Attemps family, the year immediately preceding the carnival season of 1740 witnessed a number of important events concerning Ignaz Maria. Initially, he was appointed – on 7 April 1739 – by Emperor Charles VI to his first official function, becoming a Regierungsrat in Graz. Later in the same year – on 19 October 1739 – he was married in Vienna to the eighteen-year-old Maria Josepha Khuen zu Auer von Belas- Lichtenberg, whom he had met in Graz on his return from Italy. She was herself very fond of music, for she apparently sang and played keyboard instruments.

It may well be that the groom’s father – the then Hofkammerpräsident – together with his friends and relatives the Counts von Wildenstein (father and uncle to his sec-

54 I-Nc, Cantate 157.25.
55 MÜLLER VON ASOW, 1917, pp. 11f. Alberti is known to have composed earlier also *Gli eccessi della tirannide*, given in spring 1730 in Brescia, and *Amore e pace* in 1734. On Alberti, see also KOKOLE, 2013, p. 151 (citing older literature on the subject).
56 On Franz Pirker’s opera *Bacco trionfante dall’Indie*, composed in 1728 in Vienna, see HAAS, 1926, pp. 201f.
57 On Josepha, see KOKOLE, 2016b, pp. 342f.
ond wife, Maria Juliana), his brother Count Thadeaus von Attems and perhaps others unknown, hatched a plan to celebrate in music the newly wedded couple via a suitable operatic plot and a score interlaced with their cherished and even favorite arias. The general subject of this opera – dealing with a child entrusted to foreign care (as Ignaz von Attems also was after his young mother’s death in 1715)\(^{58}\) and then finding love in adversity – may perhaps be viewed in the light of this family’s actual history – a hypothesis that exceeds, however, the limits of this article.

### Appendix

Identifications of librettists and possible composers of arias in Pietro Mingotti’s carnival 1740 production of the opera *Amor, odio e pentimento*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aria Title (Composer and Original Opera)</th>
<th>Tenor/Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>(Ismero): Pria di lasciare (A. Salvi) → N. <strong>Logroscino</strong>: Il Quinto Fabio, I,8, Rome, Carnival 1738 (A. Veroni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Benche un oggetto per me delira (??) → ? (M. Pirker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>(Creonte): Tu mi dice bel labro, ch’io sperì (??) → ? (G. Alberti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,6</td>
<td>(Arnea): Dal suo gentil sembiente (P. Metastasio) → L. <strong>Leo</strong>: Demetrio, I,14 Naples, Summer 1738 (A. Girò)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,7</td>
<td>(Aristeo): Nò, non vedrete mai (P. Metastasio; orig. for Ciro riconosciuto) → ? [Bernasconi] (M. Flora)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,8</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Risponderti vorrei (P. Metastasio) → G. <strong>Arena</strong>: Achile in Sciro, I,14, Rome, Carnival 1738 (M. Pirker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>(Arnea): Rondinella, cui rapita (P. Metastasio; orig. for Semiramide; only A section) → ? [Vinci, Porpora] (A. Girò)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>(Ismero): Quando nel campo (A. Salvi) → N. <strong>Logroscino</strong>: Il Quinto Fabio, II,4, Rome, Carnival 1738 (A. Veroni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,2</td>
<td>(Arnea): Tu sciegliesti un fido amante (??) → ? (A. Girò)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>(Aristeo): T’intendo, si mio Cor (P. Metastasio; orig. for Siface) → ? [Porpora, Terradellas] (M. Flora)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>(Ismero): L’augel, che more, e nasce (??) → ? (A. Veroni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>(Creonte): Gelosia, d’un cor tormento (??) → ? (G. Alberti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,9</td>
<td>(Arnea): Leon feroce (A. Zeno; orig. for Ormisda) → A. <strong>Vivaldi</strong> for Farnace 1731 (A. Girò)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,13</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Almen, se non poss’io (P. Metastasio; orig. for La clemenza di Tito) → ? (M. Pirker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,1</td>
<td>(Creonte): Bei lumi vezzosetti (??) → ? (G. Alberti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>(Arnea): Sento in riva all’altr’ sponde (F. Silvani) → J. A. <strong>Hasse</strong>: Attalo, III,5, Ferrara, Carnival 1739 (A. Girò)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>(Ormonda): Agitato dal furore (??) → ? (M. Pirker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>(Ismero): Ogni procella infida (P. Metastasio) → L. <strong>Leo</strong>: Demetrio, I,5, Naples, Summer 1738 (A. Veroni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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A Granted Royal Wish, or Carlo Goldoni’s *La buona figliuola* with Music by Niccolò Piccinni and
*Il mercato di Malmantile* with Music by Domenico Fischietti,
Staged in Warsaw in 1765*

Alina Żórawska-Witkowska

1. Circumstances of the stagings

During the entire reign of Poland’s last king, Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski, the theater was the main tool of social and political propaganda, with the objective of bringing the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth closer to the illuminist tendencies of Western Europe. Hence the King’s endeavor to bring two theatrical ensembles to Warsaw: a French comedy and *opera buffa*, which he initiated even before his election, the outcome of which was obvious thanks to the support of Stanislaus’s former lover, the Empress Catherine II of Russia. The election took place on 7 September 1764, but a month earlier Poniatowski had contacted Pietro Mira, resident in Bologna (I have presented the achievements of this talented man in another paper), charging him with the task of organizing an *opera buffa* ensemble for the King’s expected coronation. Moreover, he planned to hire Mira for the position of the ensemble’s director. Correspondence on this topic continued until October 1764, but for some reason the project never materialized. Poniatowski was so meticulous

* This paper was written within the project *PASTICCIO. Ways of Arranging Attractive Operas*, programme Beethoven 2, financed by the Polish National Science Center (NCN) and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

1 A more comprehensive account, with quotations from literature and sources, is presented in Żórawska-Witkowska, 1995, p. 371.

in his care for the musical accompaniment of his coronation festivities that he even indicated the titles of the operas that he wished to be staged. These included two *drammi giocosi per musica* by Carlo Goldoni, both already enormously popular in Europe but hitherto unknown in Poland: *La buona figliuola* with music by Niccolò Piccinni and *Il mercato di Malmantile* with music by Domenico Fischietti.

The *opera buffa* genre was unknown to Polish audiences as at the Warsaw theater of Augustus III, Poniatowski’s predecessor on the Polish throne who died in 1763, almost only *opere serie* were staged to the music of the royal-electoral Kapellmeister Johann Adolf Hasse; additionally, a commercial French comedy ensemble, led by one J. F. Albani, operated briefly at the court (from late 1761 through February 1763). While an *opera buffa* ensemble was eventually not featured at Poniatowski’s coronation, which took place in Warsaw on 25 November 1764 (the birthday of Catherine II!), both operas desired by the King eventually entered the repertoire of the royal theater soon after its opening. The French comedy ensemble was inaugurated on 8 May 1765, while *opera buffa* singers and dancers arrived in Warsaw in early July of the same year. They were hired in Italy by Carlo Tomatis, an Italian nobleman who served in the imperial army and became the entrepreneur of the Warsaw theater following a recommendation from the Austrian army general, Prince Andrzej Poniatowski, the King’s brother, who resided in Vienna.

The seven-strong *opera buffa* ensemble recruited by Tomatis included prima donna Caterina Ristorini (*prima buffa*) who, as the manager assured the King, not exaggeratedly, was “absolutely the best subject in all Italy” (“absolument le meilleur sujet de toute l’Italie”); her brother Giovanni Battista Ristorini (*parti serie*); Michele del Zanca (*primo buffo*), stage and life partner to Ristorini; Teresa Crespi (*seconda buffa*); Teresa Torri (*parti serie*); Francesco Calenzuoli/Calenzoli/Calensoli (*secondo buffo*); and Domenico Occhilupi/Ochilupi/Occhilupo (*terzo buffo*). In less than two years, between August 1765 and March 1767, they performed in Warsaw at least 18 *opere buffe*; significantly, all were to Goldoni’s librettos though with music by various composers popular at that time, including Galuppi (four works) and Piccinni (three). Nonetheless, we only have partial knowledge of that repertoire.

The ensemble’s members had extensive theatrical experience. This was particularly true of Michele del Zanca, member of Bologna’s Accademia Filarmonica from 1761 as well as librettist, and of the Ristorini siblings: Caterina had been a star of Venetian stages since 1757, while Giovanni Battista was active at the Russian court in St. Petersburg until 1789; before entering the service of Stanislaus Augustus, both also belonged to the Imperial Opera ensemble in Vienna. Before coming to Poland, Occhilupi sang...
main roles in Venice; Torri and Crespi performed in theaters in northern Italy, the former exclusively in the serio repertoire, the latter in comic works. Only Calenzuoli appears to have had less experience: in his catalogue, Claudio Sartori only lists an Antonio Calenzuoli, perhaps identical to the Francesco of Tomatis’s ensemble (Antonio Francesco?, Francesco Antonio Calenzuoli?).

In Warsaw, these artists were handsomely remunerated. As prima donna, Caterina Ristorini earned 700 ducats per year, while Michele del Zanca earned 500. When in spring 1767, following anti-royal political unrest in Poland, Stanislaus Augustus was forced to close his theater, Caterina Ristorini and Michele del Zanca were hired in Białystok at the court of Grand Crown Hetman Jan Klemens Branicki, the brother-in-law but also political opponent of the King. In 1770-71, they performed at London’s King’s Theatre, but reportedly formalized their long-term relationship with a marriage in Białystok before moving to England.

The ballet ensemble included predominantly Italian dancers and totaled twelve artists, according to a contract signed in December 1764 by Tomatis. The prima ballerina was the beautiful wife of the manager Caterina Gattai-Tomatis, who was the object of a notorious duel in Warsaw 1765 between Count Franciszek Ksawery Branicki and the famous Giovanni Giacomo Casanova de Seingalt. The ballet master was Bartolomeo Cambi, and the choreographer and first dancer was Pietro/Pierre Godardi/Godard. The duty of composing ballet music was entrusted to Heinrich Megelin, cellist of the royal orchestra, formerly active at the Polish court of Augustus III.

The arrival in Warsaw of an opera buffa ensemble, never seen before in this city, triggered the universal rapture of the audience, including the King. The author of a contemporary account wrote: “the King […] several times a week has the habit of entertaining himself watching operas and [French] comedies, […] which are so outstanding they cannot be bettered.” Stanislaus Augustus could finally satisfy his thirst for the works of Goldoni: La buona figliuola with music by Niccolò Piccinni and Il mercato di Malmantile with music by Domenico Fischietti. The former was premiered in Warsaw on 7 August and the latter on 7 September 1765.

The Curonian baron Karl Heinrich Heyking, who resided in Warsaw at the time, wrote in delight:

“the King has brought […] from Italy an excellent opera buffa. […] Warsaw has become a city of good taste and entertainment. How delighted was I when I first attend-

8 PL-Wagad, Archiwum księcia Józefa Poniatowskiego i Marii Teresy Tyszkiewiczowej [Archive of Prince Joseph Poniatowski and Maria Teresa Tyszkiewicz], 444 chap. V no. 2; published in WIERZBICKA, 1951, pp. 84f.
9 PL-Wagad, Archiwum Radziwiłłow [Radziwiłł Archive], Akta majątkowo-prawne [Property and Legal Acts], 122, fol. 25. See also ŻÓRAWSKA-WITKOWSKA, 2005.
10 ŻÓRAWSKA-WITKOWSKA, 1995, passim.
Heyking’s feelings must have been shared by other spectators, as Caterina Ristorini was later known in Warsaw as Cecchina, derived from the name of the opera’s protagonist.

The premiere of *Il mercato di Malmantile* on 7 September lasted “until the chime of eleven o’clock, because they say the King was so raptured by some of the arias that he had them repeated once or twice each.”

Why did Stanislaus Augustus so much desire to have these two *opere buffe* in his royal theater? They did enjoy great popularity in Europe, particularly in Vienna, and the King’s main advisor in all theatrical matters was his brother Andrzej Poniatowski, a resident in the Austrian capital.

All the Warsaw scores of several hundred Italian, French, German, and Polish operas performed and gathered at Stanislaus Augustus’s theater have been lost through historical turmoil, particularly during World War II. Thus the shape of the two works discussed here can only be reconstructed from the librettos printed in Warsaw by comparing the arias included therein with those from the same operatic librettos as performed earlier in Italian and Viennese theaters. Of course, judging on such bases whether and to what extent the Warsaw versions were pasticcios, pasticcios of pasticcios, or more or less advanced adaptations of works in their original shape, is a very complex affair, while establishing provenances is highly risky. Nonetheless, it is the only available approach to the beginnings of *opera buffa* in Poland, so important for national culture also through its influence on national opera, the creation of which it inspired in 1778.

---


14 Rice, 1998, has dedicated special attention to the Vienna stagings of these two operas.

15 I have studied them in Roman libraries: I-Rn and I-Rsc; I have also consulted the online scans of first editions from other libraries and from the online resource *Die italienische Opera buffa auf der Wiener Bühne/Die Opera buffa in Wien (1763-1782)*: https://www.univie.ac.at/muwidb/operabuffa/projekt.htm, 03.02.2020.
2. **La buona figliuola**


Carlo Goldoni’s *dramma giocoso per musica La buona figliuola*, based on his *commedia in prosa* of 1750, *Pamela nubile*, which in turn was a free dramatization of the English novel by Samuel Richardson *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* (London, 1740), was premiered in 1757 at Parma’s Teatro Regio Ducale with music by Egidio Romoaldo Duni. One of the work’s performers on that occasion was Michele del Zanca in the role of Marchese della Conchiglia. But Goldoni’s *La buona figliuola* reached pan-European fame only with new music by Niccolò Piccinni. That version was premiered in Rome’s Teatro delle Dame on 6 February 1760, with only male singers, of course. Piccinni’s *La buona figliuola* quickly became likely the most popular 18th-century *opera buffa*.

In London alone between 1767 and 1810 it had well over a hundred performances and, as Charles Burney emphasizes, that success was due not only to Piccinni’s excellent music, but also to the drama itself, devoid of profanities and buffooneries so common in earlier Italian burlettas. Indeed, Goldoni created a libretto in the noble *comédie lar­ moyante* style. The protagonist, an orphan, the simple, honest and sentimental gardener Cecchina turns out to be a German baroness and thus worthy of marrying an aristocrat, the Marchese della Conchiglia, with whom she is mutually in love. The denouement was consistent with social convention, but the history of that couple also suggested the possibility of transcending existing social boundaries. As remarked by Reinhard Strohm, the drama’s touching main character contributed to a veritable fashion amongst the European *beau monde* for objects and clothes “alla Cecchina”.

The success of *La buona figliuola* encouraged both Goldoni and Piccinni to continue the history of its protagonists in a sequel titled *La buona figliuola maritata* (premiered in Bologna in 1761), staged in many European theaters, including Warsaw in 1765.

---

16 Copy held in PL-Wn, as well as a microfilm of that copy. The libretto was apparently also printed in Innsbruck (!) in 1765; see SARTORI, 1990-94, no. 4193, and Corago. *Repertorio e archivio del melodramma italiano dal 1600 al 1900*, online: http://corago.unibo.it/libretto/DRT0007491, 03.02.2020. A libretto in D-LEm is cited on this site, but it could not be found in the library catalogue.

17 I quote information on the performances of all works after SARTORI, 1990-1994.

18 See ibid., though even this is incomplete in this regard.

19 BURNLEY, 1789, vol. 4, p. 490.


21 This is substantiated by the Warsaw libretto, a copy of which is held PL-Kj, while a microfilm is available in PL-Wn. The Warsaw performance of this opera was not a known fact before.
In Warsaw, *La buona figliuola* was staged as *La buona figliuola puta*, which was an idiosyncrasy as this title was only ever elsewhere used in Verona in 1766 (but with music by Baldassare Galuppi).\(^{22}\) The Piccinni version was replayed in Warsaw in 1776 and 1783, while the Polish translation by Wojciech Bogusławski was staged successfully under the title *Czekina, albo cnotliwa panienka* [Cecchina or the virtuous girl] in 1782-1783, 1790, and 1792-1793.\(^{23}\)

In the case of the Warsaw *La buona figliuola puta* version, I have used the following sources for comparison: 1) a libretto of the first performance at Rome’s Teatro delle Dame in 1760; and 2) a libretto of the opera’s performance at Vienna’s imperial Teatro Privilegiato vicino alla Corte (Burgtheater) in 1764, where the six performers included the Ristorini siblings Caterina as Sandrina and Giovanni Battista as Mengotto. Earlier, the two took part in various stagings of this opera in Italy and Vienna: Caterina as Marianna/Cecchina in Milan (1761), Mantua (1763), and Venice (1764); Giovanni Battista as Marchese della Conchiglia in Mantua (1763), Mengotto in Venice (1764) and Armidoro in Vienna (1764). Likewise, Domenico Occhilupi shone in the role of Tagliaferro at Venice’s Teatro San Moisè in 1760, where the opera was staged to music by Salvatore Perillo, which however failed to gain popularity. In turn, Michele del Zanca sang Tagliaferro and Colonello in *La buona figliuola maritata* in Mantua (1763) and Venice (1764) as well as Mengotto in Vienna (1764). Thus, the librettos of both *La buona figliuola* and *La buona figliuola maritata* were well familiar to four of the singers of the Warsaw opera buffa ensemble.

Amongst the seven *personaggi*, the Warsaw edition of *La buona figliuola puta* distinguishes two *parti serie*, played by Teresa Torri (La Marchesa Lucinda) and Giovanni Battista Ristorini (Il Cavaliere Armidoro), as well as five *parti buffe*: Caterina Ristorini (Cecchina giardiniera), Teresa Crespi (Sandrina Contadina), Domenico Occhilupi (Il Marchese della Conchiglia), [Francesco] Calenzuoli (Mengotto contadino) and last but not least, Michele del Zanca (Tagliaferro coraziero Tedesco, a character both comical and sentimental). Goldoni delighted in using in his works not only a number of Italian dialects, but also the awkward Italian pronunciation by foreigners: the German Tagliaferro in this case. According to Reinhard Strohm, this distinction between *parti serie* and *parti buffe* does not fit the opera’s protagonist which, as the prototype of a truly romantic character, is the work’s true dramaturgical innovation and original element.\(^{24}\) The Warsaw cast also included supernumeraries: “uomini armati custodi del feudo” and “cacciatori del Marchese.” Moreover, the opera was embellished by ballets with choreo-

---


graphy by Bartolomeo Cambi, performed by nine dancers whose names are listed in the libretto. The ballet composer is omitted, however: it was likely Heinrich Megelin.

The opera with music by Duni included eight characters during its premiere in Parma (1757) and repeated performances in Florence and Modena (1759), but in Turin (1758) and Modena (1759) these were reduced to seven (in Turin, Cecchina was omitted!). In the Piccinni version the characters ranged from eight in the Roman premiere to as few as five in Rome’s Teatro Capranica in 1762, where the opera was presented as “a farsetta for four voices arranged from the burletta in musica by Polisseno Fegejo, Arcadian shephard” (“farsetta a quattro voci ridotta dalla burletta in musica di Polisseno Fegejo P[astore] A[rcade],”), and one of the singers played both Mengotto and Tagliaferro.

In the opera’s librettos I analyzed (Rome, 1760; Vienna, 1764; Warsaw, 1765) the opera each time has a different structure. In Rome, the text is essentially consistent with the Parma original. In Vienna, two characters were deleted from the Roman version: Cavaliere Armidoro and Cameriera Paoluccia, which triggered significant abridgements and modifications to the text. Michele Calella, who analyzed the musical score of that version, indicates that not only two arias of Armidoro and Paoluccia were omitted but also two by the Marchese: “Furia di donna irata” and “Sento che il cor mi dice”; two by the Cavagliere della Conchiglia: “Cara s’è ver ch’io v’ammi” and “Chi più di me contento”; one by Sandrina: “Son tenera di pasta”; and one aria by Mengotto: “Vedo la Bianca”.25 In total, as many as eight from the original 24 arias were deleted, while four new ones were added, borrowed from other works: two sung by Sandrina: “Se mi vedo alla fontana” (instead of “Poverina, tutto il di”) from the opera I bagni d’Abano (?) by Goldoni and Galuppi (1753) and “Trovare un amante” by unknown authors (replacing “Sono una giovane”), which, according to the online database Die italienische Opera buffa auf der Wiener Bühne/Die Opera buffa in Wien (1763-1782), shares a text with Le vicende della sorte by Giuseppe Petrosellini and Piccinni (1761) and the intermezzo Le avventure di Ridolfo by Piccinni (1762). Another new aria is sung by Mengotto, “Recipe di quegli occhi” (replacing “Non comoda all’amante”), borrowed from La calamita dei cuori by Goldoni and Galuppi (1752), while Cecchina’s “Alla larga, alla larga, Signore” was sung in Vienna in a musical setting by Perillo taken from his Venice score of La buona figliuola (1760).

Calella is right in observing that the reduction of characters from eight to six in the Vienna version resulted from the cast of the local ensemble, which at that time included only three female and three male singers. Calella believes that together with Giovanni Lovatini and Francesco Carattoli, who sang the roles of Marchese and Tagliaferro, respectively, at the 1760 Rome premiere, the work’s original score also traveled to Vienna, but that due to the participation at the imperial theater of the esteemed Ristorini siblings (coming from Venice), that music had to be modified. In any case, the Vienna version is not merely an adaptation of the Rome version’s text, but also a musical pasticcio of it, as shown by the use of two arias by Galuppi, one by Perillo, and one by an unknown com-

poser, perhaps Piccinni, as well as another work by the latter. In total, twelve arias are modified in the Vienna version – half of those included from the original Rome version.

Surprisingly, in Warsaw the opera was presented in a form similar to the Rome version. So far, I have been unable to substantiate why the Vienna version, in which both Ristorini siblings took part, was not used instead. In Warsaw, only the character of Paoluccia was removed, thus her aria “Che superbia maledetta” was deleted. As for the other characters, only Sandrina, sung by Teresa Crespi, received an aria different from the original: “Io sono una ragazza” (instead of “Sono una giovane” in the Rome version and “Trovare un amante” in the Vienna version), the text of which was then used in Vienna in 1764 in Goldoni’s and Galuppi’s Le nozze (with Caterini Ristorini also performing in that opera, by the way). The remaining arias are textually identical to the Rome version. Therefore, if the Warsaw staging is to be considered a pasticcio, it is only on the basis of that single aria. It is debatable whether such a minor change is sufficient for this genre qualification.

3. Il mercato di Malmantile

The title page of the Warsaw libretto announces: Il mercato di Malmantile, dramma giocoso per musica di Polissseno Fegejo P[astore] A[rcade] da rappresentarsi nel Reale Teatro di Sua Maestà il Re di Polonia nell’anno 1765. In Varsavia, 1765. Within the edition, a note adds: “La musica è del sigr. Domenico Fischietti.” The opera was staged to celebrate the first anniversary of Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski’s coronation on 7 September 1765, though apparently “a part of the audience demanded that the Polish theatre be inaugurated on that occasion.”

The opera was performed by the same cast as La buona figliuola puta, interpreting the parts of seven characters. Again, Teresa Torri and Giovanni Battista Ristorini played the two parti serie (La Marchesa Giacinta vedova and Il conte della Rocca, respectively), while the parti buffe were sung by Michele del Zanca (Lampridio governatore di Malmantile), Caterina Ristorini (Brigida figlia di Lampridio), Domenico Occhilupi (Rusicone ciarlatano), Teresa Crespi (Lena contadina rustica), and Francesco Calenzuoli (Berto contadino rustico). The opera was accompanied by one (or more?) ballet with choreography by Bartolomeo Cambi, performed this time by ten dancers.

The opera had been premiered during Carnival 1758 at Venice’s Teatro San Samuele, although from the printed libretto Claudio Sartori gathers that on that occasion Goldoni’s work was staged to music by Giuseppe Scarlatti. The name of that composer might have been the editor’s error, however, as the subsequent performances of Il mercato di

26 A copy of the libretto is held in PL-Kcz, and a microfilm in PL-Wn.
27 Wołoszyńska, 1967, p. 40. In fact, the Polish theater held its first performance only on 19 November 1765, but included no operas in its repertoire until 11 July 1778.
Malmantile in the same year of 1758 (Bologna, Bonn, Florence, Leghorn and Milan) all list Fischietti as the author of the music. “Domenico Fischietti” is indeed pasted over Scarlatti’s name in a libretto preserved in Washington.\footnote{The librettos in I-Mb and US-Wc name Scarlatti as the composer of the opera. In another copy in US-Wc Scarlatti’s name is pasted over with a small sheet of paper bearing the name of Fischietti.} In any case, eight characters took part in the Venice premiere, including Cecca contadina, which is absent from later versions from Rome (1759), Vienna (1764), and Warsaw (1765), while one of the original performers was Caterina Ristorini in the role of Lena.

Il mercato di Malmantile gained widespread fame by 1765, having been staged throughout northern Italy as well as in Bonn (1758), London (1761), Dublin (1762), Vi- enna (1763), Lisbon and Warsaw (1765), but it did not match the popularity of La buona figliuola, likely because it is in content a standard Goldoni dramma giocoso, a pithy satire on human stupidity and other vices. For this opera, I have compared its Warsaw structure primarily with the libretto published in Vienna in 1764, while also referring to the versions of Milan (fall 1758) and Rome (1759).

The libretto as staged in Milan’s Regio Ducal Teatro in the fall of 1758 (“dramma bernesco per musica”) mentions that the music is by the Neapolitan composer Domenico Fischietti, but “with various songs by another author” (“con diverse ariette d’altro autore”), though sadly unnamed and also unmarked in the libretto. The ballets were composed by Pietro Godard, who was later part of the Warsaw ballet ensemble, while the eight singers included Caterina Ristorini, again in the role of Lena. Earlier in spring 1758 and later in 1764, Caterina Ristorini also sang Lena in Bologna and Vienna. Also the libretto of the version staged in Rome’s Teatro delle Valle in 1759 notes: “The music is by signor Domenico Fischietti from Naples with various arias from another eminent author” (“La musica è del sig. Domenico Fischietti Napoletano con diverse arie d’altro celebre Autore”) who is again unnamed.\footnote{A unique copy of this libretto is held in I-Rsc; it has no title page, but includes a handwritt-en note with the time and location of the work’s performance.} Formerly in three acts, the opera here becomes an intermezzo composed of two parts (not acts), with the participation of six characters (the Marchesa and Cecchina are omitted), with Il Conte being a silent part (“non parla”). In Leghorn in fall 1758 and Vienna in 1763 and 1764, there were seven characters. The choreography of the ballets accompanying the Verona version of 1761 was by Bartolomeo Cambi, later also the choreographer of the Warsaw ballets.

In Vienna, the opera was premiered on 16 July 1763 at the Teatro Privilegiato vicino alla Corte (Burgtheater) where it was repeated in 1764. The latter libretto includes, according to the already quoted online database, five Einlagenarien. These include two arias by unknown composers sung by Lampridio: “Ci sposeremo fra suoni e canti” and “Dunque mia cara Lenina”; one aria each for the Marchesa and the Count, also by unknown authors: respectively “Io non so se infido sei” and “Sento oh Dio il seno mio”; and an aria for Rubicone, “Cara, quest’occhi miei” by Niccolò Piccinni, originating probably from his Le donne vendicate to a libretto by Pietro Petrosellini (1763).
In the Warsaw version, apart from extensive changes in the recitatives, seven arias also have texts different from the Vienna version. Some are printed in the Warsaw libretto with a different font from the others, as if they were interpolated at the last minute. These include three arias by Lena, sung by Teresa Crespi: “Povere donne, che fa da far!” of unknown origin; “Ah quegl’occhi ladroncelli” with a text identical to that used in Goldoni’s and Piccinni’s La buona figliuola maritata in Vienna (1764) and Warsaw (1765) as well as Goldoni’s and Galuppi’s Il filosofo di campagna in Dresden (1755), an opera also staged in Warsaw (1766); “Bricconcelli disgraziati” with a text identical to that used in Goldoni’s and Galuppi’s Il mondo alla roversa, o sia Le donne che comandano (Prague 1754), Il filosofo di campagna (Dresden, 1755), and Antonio and Baldassare Galuppi’s Li tre amanti ridicoli (Bologna, 1761). There are also two arias for the Marchesa: “Se tanto e in lui straniera” and “Son tradita abbandonata”, unknown to me; one aria each for Lampridio (“Bella Lenina”, identical to the 1758 Venice premiere) and the Count (“Pria vò lasciar di vivere”, identical to Goldoni and Florian Leopold Gassmann’s Li uccellatori, Venice, 1759, an opera also played in Warsaw in 1765). On the other hand, the Warsaw version omits Rubicone’s aria in Vienna “Cara, quest’occhi miei”, while it reinstates two arias for the Marchesa omitted in the Vienna version: “Son tradita abbandonata” and “Dammi di pace un segno”; one for Rubicone, “Se siete bella” (present in the 1758 Venice version); and one for the Count, “Non vi sdegnate” (also from the original premiere).

* * *

The above-cited information suggests that the operas by Goldoni were each treated differently in their respective Warsaw stagings. La buona figliuola puta, which was the first demonstration of the capacities of the newly hired opera ensemble, despite the earlier participation of the Ristorini siblings in a 1764 Vienna staging of the same work, was based not on that Vienna version but instead was very similar to the Rome premiere with Piccinni’s music. La buona figliuola puta was thus an adaptation of the premiere but rather not a pasticcio, unless a work with just one borrowed aria can be termed as such. On the other hand, Fischietti’s Il mercato di Malmantile, staged a month later, was undoubtedly a pasticcio, including hitherto unidentified arias alongside other ones borrowed from Florian Leopold Gassmann’s Li uccellatori, Piccinni’s La buona figliuola maritata, and Galuppi’s Il filosofo di campagna. Interestingly, those operas were also staged in Warsaw in that period.

Why did the stagings follow different approaches? Perhaps La buona figliuola puta was a case of respecting a composer already widely appreciated in Europe, while for Il mercato di Malmantile by Fischietti, an author less popular than Piccinni, the introduction of foreign arias had been encouraged by the stagings in Milan (1758) and Rome (1759), where that dramma giocoso was performed “con diverse arie/ariette d’altro celebre autore.” Undoubtedly, the final say on the musical shape of each work presented in that period in Warsaw belonged to the singers, who had extensive experience from many other European theaters. At the court and theater of Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski,
there was no composer equally able in operatic art. Nonetheless, it seems that the choice of foreign arias (Einlagenarie) was dictated by the authorship of their texts, which were always by Goldoni. The interference of the King himself, a great connoisseur of drama and literature, cannot be excluded, too.

We must hope that future research on the operatic pasticcio, still to be undertaken by Polish scholars, both musicologists and theater historians, will reveal numerous other filiations and the fuller scope of said practice. If only we could find the scores of the Warsaw opera performances from the time of King Poniatowski!
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5. Pasticcio Practices Beyond Opera
Bad Habits in Theater – Late Forms of Operatic Pasticcios in Vienna Around 1800

Klaus Pietschmann

We are used to associating the term “pasticcio” with a rather well-defined phenomenon which upon closer inspection, however, becomes more and more hybrid and even unstable. The problem becomes even more virulent in the context of operatic production in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and here I focus in particular on Vienna, a context which is usually not considered a central locus of the pasticcio at all, but, because of the presence of Mozart and Beethoven, as one of the main locations of author-centered concepts of opera. A closer look reveals that this impression is only partially correct: apart from ‘real’ pasticcios in the traditional narrow sense such as Lorenzo da Ponte’s rather famous L’ape musicale staged in the Burgtheater in 1789 and two other subsequent similar pieces, L’ape musicale rinnovata in 1791 and Le inconvenienze teatrali in 1802, Matthäus Stegmayer made Rochus Pumpernickel the protagonist of three German pasticcios called “musikalische Quodlibets”. In turn, these provoked a wave of similar pieces by Ignaz Ritter von Seyfried, Joachim Perinet, Franz de Paula Roser and many others – compositions consisting of popular numbers from opere buffe, German Singspiele etc. but often mixing pasticcio-like practices with the traditional travestie, the comical parody of successful heroic operas of the time. And John Rice has shown that pasticcio and quodlibet techniques were also highly en vogue at the court where empress Marie Therese organized musical games and humorous cantatas for her husband Franz II, like Ferdinando Paer’s Conte Clò in 1805, or Johann Nepomuk Hummel’s Trumpet Concerto for the New Year festivities of 1804, which is full of references to operas by Mozart and Cherubini.1 The so called ‘collaborative operas’2 like Emanuel Schikaneder’s Der Stein der Weisen (1790) in the German repertoire of the Vorstadtdtheater, whose scores were composed by “several individuals at the same time, […] the very

1 Rice, 2003, pp. 212-229.
2 Term used by David Buch in his edition of Der Stein der Weisen. Schikaneder, 2007, p. IX.
best manner when an opera must be created quickly”3 only appear to fall into a similar category. While pasticcios could contain some new musical numbers, in the case of the ‘collaborative operas’ the bulk of the music was newly composed and thus these pieces should be treated as a separate genre.

These examples show that the ‘pasticcio principle’ (as I would like to define it) continued to be popular not only in Vienna well into the 19th century and beyond. As has already been shown, the phenomenon diffuses into a vast diversity of modes of popular reception of opera in the 19th century,4 which at the moment seems to be not only unmanageable due to the sheer amount of preserved material, but also to be beyond any musicological interest. Metaphorically speaking I would call the 18th-century pasticcio a broad river which in the decades around 1800 begins to spread to a large delta before entering the ocean of 19th-century arrangements.

In this article it is not possible to offer more than a short and partial overview, for which I will concentrate on the two main types of pasticcio-like pieces on the Viennese stages, Italian “pasticci” in the narrow sense, and the “Musikalisches Quodlibet” created by Matthäus Stegmayer. The principal question concerns the place of these pieces within the general development of the pasticcio, but also the local Viennese circumstances which had, as will be shown, an enormous impact on the development of this repertoire.

The only two Viennese pieces which use the term “pasticcio” are da Ponte’s L’ape musicale (1789/91) and the anonymous L’inconvenienze teatrali (1802). In 1789, Lorenzo da Ponte’s L’ape musicale would make successful the self-funded opera troupe which had been formed with the Italian opera singers and actors whom Joseph II had dismissed.5 Following the model of popular metatheatrical sujets (especially Gassmann’s L’opera seria), da Ponte chooses the process of development of the performed piece itself as the subject-matter of his libretto: the author Bonario searches for singers for the performance of an operatic pasticcio and tries several arias with them. Two years later, da Ponte published L’ape musicale rinnovata, which changed the storyline very little but included different musical numbers.6 These arias are closely connected to the Viennese repertoire of the time, a fact which can be concluded from the list in the libretto (Table 1).7 The fact that Domenico Mombelli’s concert arias for Francesco Bianchi’s L’inglese stravagante (Vienna 1787) and Domenico Cimarosa’s L’Italiana in Londra (Vienna 1786) are included, which he had composed in Vienna for himself and were now performed in a new context, points to metatheatrical methods which had earlier been established in

---

3 “[Es] componirten mehrere zugleich, […] und es ist nicht zu läugnen, dass diese Manier die allerbeste ist, wenn eine Oper bald zu Stande gebracht seyn soll.” Sonnleithner, 1794, p. 188. Cf. Schikaneder, 2007, p. X.

4 Hinrichsen/Pietschmann, 2011.

5 On this pasticcio cf. especially Woodfield, 2019, pp. 185-201.

6 Da Ponte prepared two further versions for Trieste (1793) and New York (1830). On the different versions cf. Maymone Siniscalchi, 1992, pp. 95-118.

7 L’Ape musicale, 1789, pp. 3f. See also Gier, 2005, pp. 68-84.
Vienna with *Prima la musica, poi le parole*. Da Ponte’s announcement to exchange less popular pieces with others in every performance is especially remarkable. In the preface he distances himself from the outdated musical academies (“musicali Accademie”) and offers characteristics for his pasticcio without mentioning this term explicitly until after the first aria when Bonario gives an account of his plans which are briefly summarized by Don Cappriccio: “This will be a pasticcio, anyway.” (“Sarà dunque un pasticcio.”) This metatheatrical experiment is carried to extremes when da Ponte puts the following words in the mouth of the singer Farinella: “You are thinking of doing a pasticcio where everybody can sing what he wishes.” (“Il suo pensiero è di fare un pasticcio, dove ognun puo cantare a suo capriccio.”) The deprecatory attitude of the singers towards the pasticcio as a haphazard product of singers’ fancies that is obviously imputed here, is made by da Ponte a leading principle in his own conception of *L’ape musicale*. He manages the ‘pasticcio principle’ in the sense of a performance that is governed by the taste of the audience, but controlled in its volatility at every time by the author.

The anonymous pasticcio *L’inconvenientze teatrali* of 1802 also deals with a metatheatrical *sujet* which – other than the title – has nothing in common with Antonio Sografi’s *farsa* published shortly beforehand in Venice. Announced as “Eine komische Oper in zwey Aufzügen” only the audience used the word “pasticcio” as evidenced in Josef Karl Rosenbaum’s diary on May 30, 1802: “in the city at 6 o’clock to see ‘Theatrali inconvenienze’ or Pasticcio in the Burgtheater. Had only meagre amusement.” (“um 6 h in die Stadt, um im Burgtheater ‘Theatrali inconvenienze’ oder Pasticcio zu sehen. Unterhielt mich wenig.”) Similar to *L’ape musicale*, the performance is closely related to the dismissal of Italian opera troupes from the court theaters. In this case, however, they had been re-employed at a lower wage a few months earlier. According to the playbill the focus lies again on presenting popular numbers: “The music is a choice of pieces from the best-known Italian operas that were received with applause.” (“Die Musik ist eine Auswahl einiger mit Beyfall aufgenommener Stücke aus den bekanntesten italienischen Opern.”) In this case, the collection of compositions by Pierre Dutillieu, Domenico Cimarosa, Joseph Weigl, Giovanni Paisiello and especially Antonio Salieri (see Table 1) evokes the idea of bidding farewell to the Viennese opera culture of the 1790s,

---

8 Salieri, 2013, pp. VII-XX.
9 “Si avverte che si cangeranno di sera in sera tutti quei pezzi che faranno minor effetto di quello che si spera”, *L’Ape musicale*, 1789, p. 4. Some of these changes are listed in Woodfield, 2019, pp. 193-196.
12 Sografi, 1800.
13 Playbill 20 May 1802 (A-Wtm, 773.042).
14 A-Wn, SN 197, IV, fol. 50v. My thanks go to Peter Prokop for sharing his transcription of the Rosenbaum diaries with me.
16 Playbill 20 May 1802 (A-Wtm, 773.042).
an impression that is indirectly confirmed in the first scene: “What the public in other times liked, selected with skill and combined with judgement I think may be liked.” (“Quel che in tempi diversi il publico gradì, scelto con arte e con giudizio unito credo ancor io d’esser potria gradito [my italics].”)\(^{17}\) Again, arrangement markings in the score point to changes made during successive performances. However, as no printed libretto has been preserved the question whether the audience knew of the origin of the musical numbers and how this was communicated must remain unanswered.

_Gli Argonauti_ which premiered in March of 1796 with “music by different eminent masters” (“Musik von verschiedenen berühmten Meistern”)\(^{18}\) has also been designated a pasticcio in academic literature.\(^{19}\) However, an analysis of the score (A-Wn, KT 38) shows that this was an extensive adaptation of Giuseppe Gazzaniga’s _Argonauti in Colco_ premiered in Venice in 1789. As was the case everywhere during the 18\(^{th}\) century, adapting music was a common practice in Vienna. However, the composer of the performed works was always clearly indicated.\(^{20}\) The _Argonauti_ thus appear as the tip of an iceberg because the changes here were considered so far-reaching even by Viennese standards that naming the author was dispensed with altogether (see Table 2). Again, unfortunately no libretto print has survived from which further conclusions could have been drawn. This case therefore illustrates the fluid boundaries between the practices common to both opera adaptations and the pasticcio, both of which were not merely limited to Vienna around 1800.

Accordingly, it can be stated that the term “pasticcio” was used in Vienna around 1800 primarily to refer to pieces that placed popular compositions in new, metatheatrical contexts which were loosely related to real crises in the Viennese opera business. The fact that da Ponte deemed it necessary to introduce the Viennese audience to this new genre in his preface points to the novelty this phenomenon held in this city – a result that would have to be confirmed by analyzing the repertoire of the previous years. The changeability and spontaneous adaptations according to the audience’s taste, which da Ponte even explicitly emphasizes, represent specific features of both of these Viennese pasticcios. Thus, the understanding of both pasticcios and their individual parts, as well as the compositions from which these pieces were taken, questioned the work concept as such.

Another central characteristic of the two Italian pasticcios lies in the fact that the composers borrowed parts from Italian works from related genres. The French exceptions in _L’ape musicale_ corroborate this rule insofar as they are purposefully treated as ‘alien’ parts: either they had been perceived as ‘alien’ parts in their original context such as the “Scena francese” from Gassmann’s _Amor artigiano_, or they were French outliers of composers like Anfossi and Salieri, otherwise rooted in the Italian repertoire. This feature fundamentally distinguishes the Viennese pasticcios from _quodlibets_ which had become very popular since _Rochus Pumpernickel_ in 1809. With these, only the popularity of the melodies was important: numbers from Italian _opere buffe_, _Sing-

\(^{17}\) A-Wn, KT 221, no fol.  
\(^{18}\) Playbill 28 March 1796 (A-Wtm, 773.042).  
\(^{19}\) JAHN, 2006, p. 33.  
\(^{20}\) For an example cf. PIETSCHMANN, 2007, pp. 151-182.
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spiele, and opéras comiques stand alongside folk songs such as the Lieber Augustin and instrumental works of the time. The use of the German language and the performance context of the suburban theaters clearly mark out the different audiences: while the pasticcios performed at the court theaters addressed a predominantly aristocratic audience seated in the boxes, the quodlibets were aimed towards an audience of the middle-class or lower middle-class. In their edition of selected Quodlibets of the Viennese Theatre Lisa Feurzeig and John Sienicki uncover the genre’s origin as rooted in the Viennese Hanswurstiaden and show their close connection to travesties – parodies of the serious music-theatrical repertoire of the court theaters which draw their humor from the relocation of gods and heroes into the simple suburban population of Vienna. Although badly documented, these parodies seem to have ‘recycled’ musical parts of the compositions they were modeled on. But in the case of Satzrenchen’s Travestirter Ariadne of 1799

“he completely changed the musical material, replacing Benda’s serious classical style with a collage of excerpts from all sorts of theatrical works known to his Viennese audience. […] When, for example, Ariadne scolds the absent Theseus, we hear the melody of ‘Seit ich so viele Weiber sah’ – Ever since I saw so many women, the opening line of which hints at Theseus’ frivolous character.”

The melodramatic character, however, is maintained, and intertextual references are primarily created through melodic quotations in the orchestral parts.

Feurzeig/Sienicki identify an important reason for the popularity of Viennese quodlibets: “the Viennese appreciation of intertextuality. […] The audience enjoyed the music not only for its own merits, but also because it could be understood differently in its new contexts.” This juxtaposes the quodlibet to techniques used in the sometimes highly sophisticated practices of reworking in the operas imported to the Viennese stages: as I showed in the case of the Viennese version of Cimarosa’s Impresario in angustie, the new aria for Gelindo, “Finche sarai costante”, unambiguously takes up Papageno’s “Ein Mädchen oder Weibchen.” This case is also interesting because it shows that not only was the court theater repertoire ‘centonized’ in the Vorstadt but also vice versa – thus emphasizing the mentioned observation that the Viennese appreciated and recognized intertextual references, as was also shown by John Rice in the context of the repertoire practiced at the court during the lifetime of empress Marie Therese.

A libretto print of the Viennese Impresario in angustie has not been preserved, however this musical reference was certainly not made explicit here. In the case of quodlibets, various different strategies emerge as well: in a print of Rochus Pumpernickel published by Wallishausser in 1811 the origin of the individual numbers is accurately

21 Feurzeig/Sienicki, 2008.
22 Ibid., p. XIX.
23 Ibid., p. XI
24 Pietschmann, 2007, pp. 175-178 (see n. 19).
noted, the libretto of the sequel *Pumpernickels Hochzeitstag*, also premiered in 1811, however does not indicate them—in contrast to the piano reduction published shortly afterwards by Simrock which at least mentions the composers.

Altogether, more differences than similarities between the pasticcios of the court theaters and the *quodlibets* of the Vorstadt can be observed. First of all, this concerns the trend towards printing *quodlibets* by which means the text becomes fixed, a practice that is not connected to the Italian pasticcios. So, while the *quodlibets* became published products themselves, the pasticcios conversely benefitted from the publishing houses’ activities: the score of *L’Inconvenienze teatrali* demonstrates that the anonymous arranger used handwritten copies of the favorite pieces which had been acquired in Thadé Weigl’s Hoftheater Musikverlag (Figure 1). It can be assumed that da Ponte drew from Wenzel Sukowaty’s copy shop of the Viennese court theaters for the numbers of his *L’ape musicale* and found out about the most popular numbers there.

Figure 1

---

26 For example, in the case of the first aria: “Aria from the opera: la Molinara, to the melody: Il cor non misento etc. etc. Entzückend sind die Freuden, wenn man sich zärtlich liebt [etc.]” (“Aria aus der Oper: la Molinara, nach der Melodie: Il cor non misento etc. etc. | Entzückend sind die Freuden | Wenn man sich zärtlich liebt [etc.]”). Stegmayer, 1811b, p. 3.

27 Stegmayer, 1811a.

28 Stegmayer, s.d.
While the *quodlibet* saw a remarkable rise in popularity in subsequent years, the pasticcios almost completely disappeared from the court theaters. The attempt to participate in the success of the new genre did not change this either: the “Posse mit Gesang” *Fünf sind zwey* was based on the theater play *Domestikenstreiche* by Ignaz Castelli that had been successfully performed in 1805 after a French model and was later enriched with music “von verschiedenen Meistern”\(^\text{29}\) in 1813. According to statements made in the musical score (A-Wn, KT 113), numbers by Ignaz Moscheles, Michael Umlauff, Ignaz Ritter von Seyfried, Ignaz Franz von Mosel, Joseph Weigl, Johann Nepomuk Hummel, Adrien Boieldieu, Adalbert Gyrowetz, and Graf Moritz von Dietrichstein were played. However, it remains unclear whether all these pieces existed beforehand or if some were composed *ad hoc*.\(^\text{30}\) The piece “did not please” (“gefiel nicht”) as Rosenbaum laconically notes in his diary\(^\text{31}\) and was dropped quickly from the program. This attempt at a German pasticcio consisting mostly of compositions by protagonists of the German opera in Vienna of these years evidently exhibited a programmatical character, but one which remained without consequences – a fact which applies to many other efforts regarding German opera during these years. At best, a certain conceptual proximity can be observed between *Fünf sind zwey* and the two joint works created in 1814 and 1815 on the occasion of the victories over Napoleon: based on librettos by Friedrich Treitschke, *Die gute Nachricht* and *Die Ehrenpforten* were set to music by Gyrowetz, Hummel, Kanne, Weigl and Beethoven – leading composers in Vienna of this time who were close to influential aristocrats or were employed by them.\(^\text{32}\) However, these did not constitute pasticcios in the proper sense, but rather ‘collaborative operas’ similar to Schikaneder’s *Stein der Weisen*. The patriotic *impe­tus* of these two efforts is unmistakably clear, but it was closely linked to the extraordinary global political situation and remained irrelevant for the further history of Viennese opera.

In conclusion, the ‘pasticcio principle’ can be considered a broadly accepted practice in Viennese opera production around 1800. While in the Italian repertoire true pasticcios like *L’ape musicale* and *L’inconvenienze teatrali* remained rather isolated exceptions, a case like *Gli argonauti* makes clear that wide-ranging adaptation practices in the court theaters resulted in sometimes hybrid entities whose relationship to author-centered original forms could become rather elusive. Instead, the *quodlibet* in the Vorstadtdtheater can be considered the central Viennese contribution to the genuine pasticcio tradition which made profit out of the audience’s *vogue* for mixing different musical genres. Pumpernickel’s enormous popularity both at home and abroad therefore marks his ground-breaking importance for the development of new popular genres in 19\(^{\text{th}}\)-century musical theater based on mixing pasticcio-like practices with the traditional parody of successful heroic operas, which was summed up here as the ‘pasticcio principle’.

---

29 Playbill 20 March 1813 (A-Wtm, 773.042).
30 In Wroclaw/Breslau, where the piece was subsequently performed, several numbers were exchanged for others which points to the fact that these were favorite pieces (*Gesänge aus: Fünf sind zwey*, s.d.).
31 A-Wn, SN 197, VII, fol. 142r.
32 Cf. Mathew, 2013, pp. 84f.
### Table 1: Pasticcio repertoire in Vienna around 1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasticcios:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1789</strong> (Court theaters)</td>
<td>Lorenzo da Ponte</td>
<td>L’ape musicale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libretto: Salieri (La grotta di Trofonio, Axur re d’Ormus, Il ricco d’un giorno, Tarare, La scuola dei gelosi), Martin y Soler (Una cosa rara, Arbore di Diana, Il burbero di buon cuore), Gazzaniga (Le vendemmie), Gassmann (L’amor artigiano), Anfossi (“Scena francese”), Cimarosa (insertion for Anfossi, Gelosie fortunate; Il falename, Le trame deluse, Il fanatico burlato), Mozart (Don Giovanni), Paisiello (Re Teodoro in Venezia, La modista raggritarice, Le gare generose), Sarti (Litiganti), Giordani (Erifile), Mombelli (L’Inglese stravagante, insertion for Cimarossa, L’Italiana in Londra), Piccinni (I viaggiatori felici), Tarchi (insertion for Arbore di Diana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1791</strong> (Court theaters)</td>
<td>Lorenzo da Ponte</td>
<td>L’ape musicale rinnovata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libretto gives no indications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1801</strong> (Court theaters)</td>
<td>Anon. “Aus den bekanntesten italienischen Opern”</td>
<td>L’inconvenienze teatrali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Score: A-Wn, KT 221: Salieri (La grotta di Trofonio, Palmira), Dutilleux (Gli accidenti in villa), Cimarosa, Mayr, Weigl (Giulietta e Pierrotto), Fioravanti (La famiglia in scompiglio), Winter, Paisiello (Re Teodoro in Venezia), Nasolini (Il Medico di Lucca), others not identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arrangement:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1796</strong> (Court theaters)</td>
<td>“Von verschiedenen berühmten Meistern” [Sografi/Gazzaniga]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gli Argonauti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score: A-Wn, KT 38: Guglielmi, Righini, Paisiello, Andreozzi, Weigl, Cimarosa; others not identified (Gazzaniga?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Matthäus Stegmayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Matthäus Stegmayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Matthäus Stegmayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Matthäus Stegmayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quodlibets:**

1809
(Theater an der Wien)
Matthäus Stegmayer

1811
(Theater an der Wien)
Matthäus Stegmayer

1812
(Theater an der Wien)
Matthäus Stegmayer

1813
(Court Theaters)
Anon.

“Von verschiedenen Meistern”
Table 2: Musical numbers in Gli Argonauti (Vienna 1796), after the score A-Wn, KT 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduzione</td>
<td>“Calmate lo stupore”</td>
<td>“Del Sig.re Guglielmi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aria Giasone</td>
<td>“I puri voti miei”</td>
<td>“del Sig. Righini”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aria Eeta</td>
<td>“Splende per me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aria Medea</td>
<td>“Per ora quel pianto”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aria Argo</td>
<td>“Tremar non sa chi in petto”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aria Giasone</td>
<td>“La dall’eterne sfere”</td>
<td>“Del Sig. Paisiello”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Preghiera Medea</td>
<td>“Contro i feroci Tauri”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aria Giasone</td>
<td>“Un marmo istesso”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duett Medea, Giasone</td>
<td>“Tu sei il mio Rè”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aria Sommo Sacerdote</td>
<td>“Si smarisce in tanto affano”</td>
<td>“del Sig. Andreozzi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aria Calliope</td>
<td>“Viva l’Eroe straniero”</td>
<td>“Del Sig.re Giuseppe Weigl”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Coro di Colchi</td>
<td>“Liete voci che tanto esultate”</td>
<td>“del Sig. Gius. Weigl”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aria Giasone</td>
<td>“No di me non paventate”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aria di Eeta</td>
<td>“Nel seno mi sento”</td>
<td>“Del Sig.re Giuseppe Weigl”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rec. and Rondo Medea</td>
<td>“Eccoti giunta al fine … Ah se un padre a un infelice”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Terzetto Medea, Argo, Giasone</td>
<td>“Che mai vidi”</td>
<td>“del Sig. Cimarosa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Aria Giasone</td>
<td>“Alma tritonide … A questo ch’io sento … O dea d’Atene … Tu che fosti”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coro ultimo</td>
<td>“O Fisi nocchiero si sciogli se vele”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources

Anon. (Dutillieu, Weigl, Paisiello, Salieri), L’Inconvenienze teatrali; score: A-Wn, KT 221.

L’Ape musicale. Comedia per Musica in due atti, da rappresentarsi a Quadragesima dell’anno 1789 nel Teatro di Corte a Benefizio di Alcuni Virtuosi, Vienna 1789.

FEURZEIG, LISA/SIENICKI, JOHN, Quodlibets of the Viennese Theater (Recent Researches in the Music of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries 47), Middleton 2008.

Gesänge aus: Fünf sind zwey, von zehn Komponisten und in einem Aufzuge, Breslau: Stadt- und Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, s.d.

Playbill, A-Wtm, 773.042.

ROSENBAUM, JOSEF KARL, Diary, A-Wn, SN 197.


SCHIKANEDER, EMANUEL, Der Stein der Weisen (Recent Researches in the Music of the Classic Era 76) ed. by DAVID BUCH, Middleton 2007.

SOGRAFI, ANTONIO SIMEONE, Le inconvenienze teatrali, Padua 1800.

STEGMAYER, M., Pumpernickels Hochzeitstag […] im vollständigen Clavier-Auszuge, Bonn: Simrock, s.d.

STEGMAYER, MATHIAS, Arien und Gesänge aus Pumpernickels Hochzeitstag, als dritten Theil des Rochus Pumpernickel, s.l., 1811a.

Id., Rochus Pumpernickel, Vienna: Wallishausser, 1811b.

Wiener Theater Almanach, Vienna 1794.
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Dance in Pasticcios – Pasticcios in Dance

CAROLA FINKEL

Studying the role of dance in pasticcios shows that there are two types: either dances were inserted into operatic pasticcios or danced works like ballets or entr’acte divertissements were pasticcios themselves. In both cases the pasticcio techniques and the reason for their use will be investigated. Since the question of pasticcio and dance has not yet been addressed on a general level, this article is intended as an overview rather than a detailed study of an individual case. For this reason, four examples are presented which serve as suggestions for a more intensive study of the topic.

Dance in pasticcios – Handel’s Oreste

In the early 18th century, dance was an essential component of opera. Single dances or ballets were usually performed at the end of the acts and sometimes within an act. In French opera, the dances were not just an ‘external’ divertissement (although they are called such), but an integral part of the plot. In Italian style these dances were often independent and without connection to the plot.1 While the choreographies were undoubtedly the responsibility of the dancing master, the music could come from several agents involved in dance productions: from the dancing master as well as from the composer of the opera or even from a musician in the orchestra. If the dances were integrated into the plot, they were mostly written by the composer of the opera itself. If dances by a second person are used, due to the lack of sources it is often uncertain if they were newly composed for the actual opera production or if they were taken from already existing compositions. In the latter case the opera could be considered a pasticcio solely due to its dance entrées.

Several of Handel’s opera scores contain dances written by the composer himself. His pasticcios, which were all staged in London, do not have dances, with one exception: Oreste. Handel’s pasticcios were based mostly on contemporary Italian works. He

---

1 Concerning the role of dancing in French and Italian opera see for example KUZMICK HANSELL, 1991, and HARRIS-WARRICK, 2009.
also presented London’s audiences with excellent virtuosos, which he partly engaged personally in Italy. Accordingly, the selection of the arias takes into account the preferences and needs of the respective singers of a production.

Handel, who was until this point music director at the King’s Theatre, Haymarket, began to collaborate with the theater manager John Rich in autumn 1734. Rich had produced The Beggar’s Opera in 1728 and his success allowed him to build his own theater, the Theatre Royal at Covent Garden, in which Handel would subsequently stage his works. During his first opera season the following works by Handel were presented:

9 November 1734: Il pastor fido (third version, HWV 8b) with newly added prologue Terpsicore (HWV 8c)
27 November 1734: Arianna in Creta (second version, HWV 32)
18 December 1734: Oreste (HWV A11)
8 January 1735: Ariodante (HWV 33)
16 April 1735: Alcina (HWV 34)

The fact that in his new workplace he initially reverted to two earlier works and then created a pasticcio, may be related to the fact that the composer was heavily absorbed in his work on his new operas Ariodante and Alcina. The season 1734/35 differs from the earlier ones by the strong inclusion of dance in the operas.

The reason was a group of dancers who were under contract with Rich, and in particular the dancer Marie Sallé. She was one of the most important dancers of the 18th century. Sallé performed alternately in Paris and London and enjoyed great success. Both as a dancer and choreographer she was significant for the development of pantomime and the ballet d’action. Her innovative and expressive dancing style was an inspiration for the great dance reformer Jean-Georges Noverre. Her first appearance at the Theatre Royal in 1734 was in Pygmalion, a ballet-pantomime she choreographed herself, which was remarkable for a female dancer at that time. She caused a great sensation not only for her choreography but also for her costume, because “She dared to appear in this entrée without a pannier, without a skirt, with her hair all dishevelled and no ornament on her head; dressed neither in a corset nor a petticoat, but in a simple muslin robe arranged as a close-fitting drapery, in the manner of a Greek statue.” Sallé was not unknown to Handel, because in 1717 she had already danced in Rinaldo at the age of ten. Her art

2 Händel, 2012, p. VIII.
3 Voss, 2009, p. 419.
5 “Elle a osé paraître dans cette Entrée sans panier, sans jupe, sans corps et échevelée, et sans aucun ornement sur sa tête; elle n’estoit vêtue, avec son corset et un jupon, que d’une simple robbe de mousseline tournée en draperie, et ajustée sur le modele d’une Statue Grecque.” Mercure de France, April 1734, p. 772, translation from McCleave, 2007, p. 166.
6 McCleave, 2013, p. 140.
of dancing had an important influence on Handel’s artistic work, which finally resulted in the extensive dance scenes in his prominent ‘dance-operas’ *Ariodante* and *Alcina*.

Concerning *Oreste* the inclusion of dance is not the only aspect which stands out from Handel’s other pasticcios, but also the fact that this is his first self-pasticcio. As libretto he used Giuseppe Barlocci’s *L’Oreste*, which was set to music for the first time by Benedetto Micheli (Rome 1723) but in the latter opera no dances were included. The leading role was written for the castrato Giovanni Carestini, who had an excellent reputation both as singer and actor. But the opera was unsuccessful and removed from the program after three performances. For Sallé and her troupe, to which her brother also belonged, Handel planned extended ballet *entrées* at the end of each of the three acts. No choreographic hints, let alone choreographies have survived, which regrettably is generally the case with almost all operas. The following table gives an overview of the dances and their origin.

**Table 1: Dances in Handel’s *Oreste*.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of 1st act (“A dance”/“Segue il Ballo” [Dance of Grecian Sailors])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 11 Gavotte</td>
<td>newly composed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 12 Gavotte</td>
<td><em>Lotario</em> (HWV 26), extract from the overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 13 Jigg</td>
<td>presumably newly composed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of 2nd act (“A dance”/“Segue il Ballo”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 25 Prélude</td>
<td><em>Terpsicore</em> (HWV 8c), Prelude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 26 Air</td>
<td><em>Terpsicore</em> (HWV 8c), Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 27 Ballo</td>
<td><em>Terpsicore</em> (HWV 8c), Ballo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of 3rd act (“A dance”/“Segue il Ballo”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 37 Gavotte</td>
<td><em>Arianna in Creta</em> (HWV 32, 2nd version Nov. 1734), 1.1 Gavotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 38 Menuett</td>
<td><em>Arianna in Creta</em> (HWV 32, 2nd version Nov. 1734), 1.2 Lentement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Ibid., 2013, pp. 70-112 (chapter 3). The two operas were given the designation “dance-opera” by the contemporary periodical *London Daily Post*.

8 The arias are drawn from the following earlier London operas: *Radamisto*, *Floriodante*, *Ottone*, *Tamerlano*, *Riccardo I*, *Siroe*, *Lotario*, *Partenope* and *Sosarme*. The recitatives were newly composed. (Händel, 2012, p. XIII).

9 McCleave, 2013, p. 84.

10 Voss, 2009, p. 419.

11 The information is based on Händel, 2012, pp. 157, 161 and 165.

12 In 1739, it was included in the Trio Sonata op. 5, no. 7 (HWV 402; 5th movement).

13 Händel, 1890, p. 56. The work has not yet been published in the Hallische Händel-Ausgabe.

14 Ibid., pp. 63f.

15 Ibid., p. 66. In 1739 it was included in the Trio Sonata op. 5, no. 7 (HWV 402; 6th movement).

16 In 1739, it was included in the Trio Sonata op. 5, no. 1 (HWV 306; 5th movement).
The majority of these dances originate from recently staged works, where they were specifically composed by Handel for Sallé. The libretto does not tell us anything about their character and their cast, but only states “A dance” resp. “Segue il ballo”.

The plot of the first act ends dramatically: Oreste’s wife Ermione, who is looking for her missing husband, is captured and sentenced to death by Toante, the King of Tauris. He importunes her but she rejects him and then laments her fate. The following dance was, according to newspaper reports, a “Dance for Grecian sailors” which was choreographed by Leach Glover. The title indicates that it was danced by men, but the number remains unclear: one report mentions five, another six dancers. That the dramatic ending of the act is followed by a comic dance, is strange at first sight, but “[…] Handel was drawing on an English theatrical convention where comic characters sometimes intensify the tensions in a tragic story.”

At the end of the second act Oreste and Ermione are reunited but sentenced to death by Toante. The couple bid each other a long farewell. The dances which comment on the plot are all taken from Terpsicore. There they were assigned to the title role and thus to Marie Sallé. This suggests that she also danced as a soloist here in Oreste. Whether she performed identical choreographies or whether she created something new, remains unknown. But Sallé could draw on her whole gamut of expression to portray the despairing feelings of the loving couple – in Terpsicore the corresponding dances represented the passions of love and the fire of jealousy.

The final act ends with a lieto fine: the tyrant Toante is put to death and Oreste is finally reunited with his wife Ermione. A suite of five dances concludes the opera, followed by the final choir in which the people of Tauris express their joy. The homogeneity of dance and action is established in such way that the music of the minuet

---

17 It was later included in unabridged form in the overture to Alcina.
18 See the work list of the 1734/35 season above.
19 The facsimile of the libretto is printed in Händel, 1991, pp. XXX-XXXIX.
20 Händel, 2012, pp. 52-54.
21 Daily Journal from 17 April 1735, cited in McCleave, 2013, p. 86. Leach Glover was appointed dancing master at the royal court in 1738.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., p. 87.
25 Ibid., p. 88.
26 Händel, 2012, pp. 137-140.
uses the same theme as the final choir. Although the libretto gives no further information, it has to be assumed that the choreography was performed by the whole group of dancers as was common at the *finale*.

Through the dances Handel wrote for Sallé and her troupe, his *opera seria* was enriched by French style elements. *Oreste* was not only written due to time restrictions or, as was common with pasticcios, to present excellent singers like Giovanni Carestini. It was also Handel’s tribute to his own muse Terpsicore, Marie Sallé.

**Dance in pasticcios – the ballad opera**

A special form of pasticcio is the English ballad opera which satirized the conventions of the *opera seria*. Instead of extended Italian arias and recitatives, it used short familiar tunes and spoken dialogues in English. In contrast to complicated mythological and historical plots, the ballad opera addressed current social topics of the time like poverty, prostitution or corruption, and was therefore an allusion to contemporary politics. This form of opera was thus not reserved for an exclusive upper class like the *opera seria*, but also addressed the middle class, which is why it gained enormous popularity. The tunes of the ballad opera were popular folk songs, dance tunes, famous arias by contemporary composers and especially broadside ballads on which the term ballad opera is based.

In the textbooks, the tunes were listed in a separate index to give the audience a first impression of what to expect. The melodies were also printed in the librettos and one can imagine that the audience sometimes sang along. The recognition effect was crucial for the tunes, because they were parodied. As a result, they were not only entertaining, but also ambiguous, since the original text or context was very familiar to the audience.

Intertextuality is an important aspect in the ballad opera, because by the subtle allusion to the original texts, moral and political messages were created. This was the reason why many of the ballad operas were censored or banned, as was the case with *Polly*, which will be discussed below.

The first and most successful ballad opera was *The Beggar’s Opera* by John Gay (text) and Johann Christoph Pepusch (music). Bertolt Brecht said that the title meant an “opera *for* beggars”, but this is not correct because it is an opera written *by* a beggar as the introduction explains. The piece was produced by John Rich and premiered on 29 January 1729. It was staged 62 nights in succession which was a theatrical record.

---

27 Voss, 2009, p. 419. Carestini was in competition with Farinelli, who was at that time engaged at a rival company, the Opera of the Nobility.

28 A broadside ballad was a descriptive or narrative verse or song in a simple ballad form. Topics were, for example, love, religion or current news. It was sung or recited in public places or printed on a broadside – a sheet printed on one side – for sale on the streets.

29 Joncus, 2016, p. 31.


31 Barlow/Goff, 2015, p. 144.
1729 Gay and Pepusch wrote the sequel Polly with which they probably wanted to build on the success of The Beggar’s Opera. However, because the political allusions were even more pointed than in its predecessor, the piece was banned from being performed. Nonetheless, the censorship was a good advertisement and so Gay published Polly for subscription with success.

Before the dances of both operas are discussed, some general remarks about social dancing during that time are necessary. The theatrical and the social dances of the ‘French noble style’ or belle danse originated at the court of King Louis XIV and were adopted at other European courts. In this art of dancing lies the origin of classical ballet. Due to the high dancing level of the upper class – members of the nobility had dance lessons several times a week from early childhood on – the borders between dances for the stage and for the ballroom were fluid.

Popular stage dances were published for the next ball season and ballroom dances were adapted for the stage. The technically sophisticated solo and couple dances were notated in a special form of writing, the Beauchamp-Feuillet notation. In England these dances were also popular but the prevailing form of social dances were the country dances, which had their origin in Britain. Their most common form is ‘longways for as many as will’, in which any number of couples danced in a row. The dances had catchy melodies which initially were taken from folk songs and later were also newly composed. In England they were danced by all social classes.

At the end of the 17th century the country dance came to mainland Europe where it soon enjoyed much popularity as the contredanse. As well as the longways formation, in France the cotillon developed. The cotillon was danced in a square by two or four couples. Country dances und cotillons gradually replaced the belle danse in the European ballrooms and became the leading social dances which were still danced in the 19th century. Country dances were published for the first time in 1651 by John Playford. His collection The Dancing Master was printed by himself and his successors in 18 editions and five supplement editions until 1728 and contained a total of more than 1,000 dances.

In contrast to belle danse, English country dances were notated in verbal form.

The Beggar’s Opera contains some dance tunes from The Dancing Master, which are based on folk songs and which are sung in the opera. Three dances were not only

32 Gay, 1729, Preface.
33 Pierre Beauchamp was the actual inventor of the notation, but his pupil Raoul-Augier Feuillet published it without Beauchamp’s permission. Thanks to contemporary dance manuals, more than 300 extant choreographies can be reconstructed and danced today.
34 Since the second half of the 18th century the longways formation is called contredanse anglaise and the square formation is called contredanse française.
35 All editions and their dances are indexed in the internet database by Keller, The Dancing Master 1651-1728. An Illustrated Compendium.
36 In the first half of the 18th century in France and Germany a simplified form of the Beauchamp-Feuillet notation was used.
sung but also performed. The first of them is in Scene 4 in a tavern where Macheath is in company of eight prostitutes. He asks a musician to “Play the French Tune, that Mrs. Slammekin [one of the prostitutes] was so fond of”. The stage direction states: “A Dance a la ronde in the French Manner; near the End of it this Song and Chorus [music and text follow].”

The tune is named *Cotillon* and comes from an eponymous dance which was choreographed in 1705 by Feuillet. It was the first *cotillon* which gave this dance form its name. The term *cotillon* (“petticoat”) comes from the popular French tune “Ma comère quand je danse, mon cotillon va-t-il bien?” Maybe in *The Beggar’s Opera* it was chosen as an allusion to the eight prostitutes in this scene.

The same melody was used for a longways dance in *The Dancing Master* from 1728 under the title *Toney’s Rant*. The question of what was really danced in this scene remains open. With eight people in the scene, dancing the choreography of *Toney’s Rant* is just as possible as dancing a *cotillon*. “[...] a la ronde in the French manner [...]” indicates the latter. However, the aforementioned *cotillon* by Feuillet could not have been used because it is for two couples. What speaks against a *cotillon* is the meter of the music: in the opera and also in the country dance it is notated with a downbeat whereby the accent is deferred by two beats; while the French original has an upbeat of two crochets which is typical for a *cotillon*. It is unlikely that Maceath danced together with the women because of the uneven number of dancers. It also remains unclear if the actors danced and sang simultaneously.

After Macheath is taken off for trial, in Scene 12 “A Dance of Prisoners in Chains” is performed. This is the only dance for which no music is notated in the libretto. The title indicates that it was danced by several men. In later performances a hornpipe was played and danced, but as a solo for a single man. In contrast to the other two, this dance is neither connected with the plot nor with the actors, but rather serves as a divertissement.

The last dance takes place at the end of the opera. Macheath is to be executed. In addition to Polly and Lucy, four other women unexpectedly appear and claim to be married to him. An actor interrupts the plot and points out to the beggar, who in the beginning emerged as the author of the play, that Macheath should not die, “[...] for an Opera must end happily” – which is an allusion to the lieto fine of the opera seria. Macheath is then released and asks all his women to dance together: “Ladies, I hope you will give me leave to present a Partner to each of you. And (if I may without Offence) for this time, I take Polly for mine.” So it was probably performed by six couples. The country dance

37 For a detailed discussion of the dancing scenes see *Barlow/Goff, 2015.*
38 *Gay, 1728,* p. 29.
40 *Gay, 1728,* p. 70.
41 *Barlow/Goff, 2015,* pp. 148f.
42 *Gay, 1728,* p. 74.
43 *Ibid.,* p. 75.
44 The libretto only says “A Dance”.
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“Limps of Pudding” was chosen as the tune and probably the six couples also danced its choreography, which is a longways formation. However, here questions also remain open, because song and instrumental parts alternate in the score. Maybe it was danced first, and then sung to the same music.  

From the second season onwards, *The Beggar’s Opera* was performed at Rich’s theater with additional *entr’acte* dances, which had no connection to the opera. In the 1730/31 season the famous Marie Sallé and her brother were among these dancers – probably to lure the audience into the well-known piece.  

In the sequel *Polly* dance is performed only at the end of the ballad opera: “Let the sports and dances then celebrate our victory.” For that the dance *The Temple* is played, which was published in the Playford editions between 1701 and 1728. This country dance in turn is based on the music of Jeremiah Clarke’s famous *Prince of Denmark’s March* resp. *Trumpet Voluntary*. Again, several questions arise: who danced (probably all members of the cast because of the finale), what was danced (maybe the published choreography) and was singing and dancing done simultaneously or successively?  

Not only are the danced pieces interesting, but also those that were presented in the form of song. Compared to its predecessor, *Polly* contains significantly more songs with dance melodies. Of the 71 numbers, 28 are dances from the *Dancing Master*. The oldest appeared in the first edition of 1651; all of them are included in the then current 18th edition of 1728. Some of them, for example *Christ Church Bells*, are based on well-known tunes. Furthermore, *Polly* contains two minuets from Handel’s *Water Music*, and *Les Rats*, a popular *cotillon* from France for two couples. The fact that pieces, as mentioned above, were chosen not only for their nice melodies but also for their hidden meaning is shown by an example from Scenes 6 and 7. The plot of *Polly* is set in the Caribbean, where both Macheath and Polly ended up. In the scene, the Caribbean people and Polly fight against the pirates led by Macheath. At the beginning of the battle, *Prince Eugene’s March* will be heard and *Marlborough* sounds at the end when the pirates surrender. *Prince Eugene’s March* is a country dance, which was published for the first time in *The Dancing Master* in 1710. The title is an allusion to Prince Eugene of Savoy. *Marlborough* was a dance for a couple which was choreographed in 1704 or 1705 by the dancing master of the court, Mr. Isaac, in the style of French *belle danse* and was for the first time “Perform’d at Court on Her Majesties Birth day Feb’r ye 6th”. The dedicatee was the First Duke of Marlborough. With same title and melody, a country dance was published in 1706. The majority of the

45 Barlow/Goff, 2015, p. 151.  
46 Ibid., p. 145.  
47 Gay, 1729, p. 72. The melody is printed in the added score part on p. 31.  
48 Ibid. The dances and their publication dates were identified using the database by Keller.  
49 Air no. 19 corresponds to the minuet in F (no. 6) and air no. 28 to the minuet in D (no. 14) in Handel’s *Water music*. See Gay, 1729, score part pp. 2f. and 31.  
50 Air no. 55, Ibid., score part p. 24. The choreography has been preserved in a manuscript of French provenance (Anon., s.d., vol. 1, pp. 38-49).  
51 Little/Marsh, 1992, pp. 46 and 105.
audience will have known the country dance, even if the couple dance belonged to the ball repertoire. Both dedicatees, Prince Eugene and especially the Duke of Marlborough were famous in England, because they defeated the French and Bavarian troupes in the War of the Spanish Succession in the battle of Blenheim in 1704. The fact that the two dances in Polly sound at the beginning and at the end of the battle signaled to the audience musically that ‘the good ones’ (the Caribbean people) will emerge victorious.

In case of the ballad opera dances were indeed performed, but this was less important than the musical integration of the pieces. On the one hand, the melodies were chosen for their entertainment value and their popularity; on the other hand, they had a subtext between the lines, which often contained political or moral messages, which was the reason why one or the other work fell under censorship.

From today’s point of view, the ballad operas are also interesting for the reception history of the included dances, as their selection shows which dances in England were known and popular at the time. In the case of The Beggar’s Opera and Polly, the majority of the dances are from the famous collection The Dancing Master, all from the latest edition of 1728. Gay and the audience were therefore up-to-date. Also, the use of Handel’s works shows their great popularity. The inclusion of French repertoire in addition to English is enlightening, because the two cotillons show that this comparatively young French dance form was also widespread in England, which is all the more interesting since for the first half of the 18th century no English cotillon choreographies are known.

Pasticcio in dance – ballets by Lauchery

From the 1740s, the dance scenes in the operas – regardless of whether they were connected to the plot or not – were replaced by extensive entr’acte ballets which were now completely independent stage works. They had a self-contained plot, which had nothing in common with the opera and which was usually published in a scenario. The ballets also had their own stage decoration. Compared to earlier years, dancing masters now composed the music for the ballets only in single cases. Although there was of course genuinely composed ballet music, the borrowing of music was common practice. There was appreciation for the difficult task of selecting individual pieces appropriately and putting them together in a coherent manner. This changed only from the 1820s.

In addition to operas, orchestral and chamber music also served as a source for the selection of pieces. Pragmatic reasons such as saving time and work were certainly

52 Blenheim is a French malapropism of Blindheim, a village near Höchstädt. In German, the famous battle is called “Second Battle of Höchstädt”.
53 In contrast, performances of cotillons on London stages have been proven by announcements in newspapers (Barlow/Goff, 2015, p. 146).
54 Mostly the first entr’acte was a ballet sérieux, the second a ballet demi-caractère.
55 Smith, 1988, p. 12f.
56 Ibid., p. 8.
reasons for the choreographer to put together a pasticcio ballet. Also, there were enough dance movements, for example, in instrumental music – why not use them when the music was beautiful and appropriate in character? However, there were other reasons that differed from those of the pasticcio opera. Unlike the opera, the ballets do not focus on the music but on the dance. The music had to serve the ballet and should not compete with the dance, so one could save the effort of writing a composition. Since the ballets dispensed with the sung and spoken word, the action was only implemented through dance, gesture and mime. Although there was usually a printed scenario summarizing the plot, there were voices complaining that they did not understand everything that was danced on stage. Music that was generally well-known could be used deliberately to make the danced action understandable. The original music was connected with a specific plot or context which was familiar to the audience. When the same music was used in a ballet with similar content it helped the audience to understand the scene. A special case here was the air parlant, a “[…] popular air, or fragment thereof, which recalled to mind the words joined to the melody” and not only a general situation. In a way, these methods are similar to the targeted use of tunes in the ballad opera. Choosing suitable music for pasticcio ballets therefore was a demanding task.

One encounters a problem concerning ballets of the 18th century; in the majority of cases no scores have survived, but only scenarios. The latter was printed for the audience and the music existed in manuscript form for use in the theater. Compared to an opera, ballet music was considered even more utilitarian and thus less worth preserving. Even when both music and scenario survived it is, in most cases, problematic to fit the two together. And last but not least the most important part is always missing: the choreography. Except for two exceptions (discussed below), not a single choreography of ballets has survived. Despite the poor situation of sources, numerous aspects of pasticcio ballets can be examined, which will be done here with the example of Lauchery.

Étienne Lauchery is one of the representatives of the ballet d’action, but stands in the shadow of Jean-Georges Noverre and Gasparo Angiolini, because in contrast to them, he didn’t write theoretical reflections on this new form of theatrical dance. He was employed as a dancer at the Mannheim court and was eventually appointed dancing master there. However, his colleague François André Bouqueton was responsible for the ballets. Perhaps this was the reason why Lauchery went to Kassel in 1764. Eight years later he returned to Mannheim, where he took over his predecessor’s duties. In 1778 the

57 Ibid., pp. 8f.
58 Ibid., p. 4.
59 Ibid., pp. 7f.
60 Ibid., pp. 6f.
61 Léon and Marie Escudier, cited from ibid., p. 9.
62 From the first third of the 18th century choreographies of single dances from operas have been preserved since they were adopted into the ballroom and were published for this purpose. Complete stage choreographies do not exist.
court, and so Lauchery, moved to Munich when Elector Palatine Karl Theodor inherited the Electorate of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{63}

During his eight years in Kassel he choreographed 54 ballets. In the seven years in Mannheim 23 works by Lauchery were staged; some of them from his time in Kassel.\textsuperscript{64} According to current knowledge, no scores from the Kassel ballets have survived, and from Mannheim just eight scores are extant without however a single pasticcio.\textsuperscript{65} In contrast, the scenarios of all ballets are preserved.

Although he worked in Kassel and Mannheim for almost the same amount of time, more than double the number of Lauchery’s works were put on stage in Kassel. Among other reasons, this was due to the fact that in the operas in Kassel, often three instead of the usual two \textit{entr’acte} ballets were played, while in Mannheim only one or two ballets were required. Looking at the portion of pasticcios in total, we can notice that they clearly dominate in Kassel where just 56\% of the ballets are pasticcios compared to just 9\% in Mannheim.\textsuperscript{66} It has to be assumed that this was due to the comparatively many ballets required in Kassel, so that Lauchery mainly used pasticcios because of time restrictions.

In the majority of pasticcio scenarios, the composers are not specified, but it is only noted “the music is by different authors” (“La musique est de differents auteurs”). In terms of quantity, these pasticcios are followed by pasticcios based on works by Christian Cannabich and Carl Joseph Toeschi as well as by Johann Joseph Rudolph and Florian Johann Deller. Lauchery knew Cannabich and Toeschi from Mannheim, where they were responsible for ballet music. Rudolph und Deller were employed at the Stuttgart court, where they wrote the music for Noverre’s ballets. In some cases, works by one Mannheim and one Stuttgart composer were combined, and once Lauchery himself contributed music to a pasticcio.\textsuperscript{67} Composers from the Kassel court were not involved. This is restrictive, however, and one must say that due to missing scores and other documents it cannot be clarified for certain whether they are ‘real’ pasticcios or collaborative compositions. One argument which points against the latter is the fact that pasticcios were common practice. Also, only composers were chosen who were responsible for ballet music at their courts, thus providing sufficient repertoire. Finally, in some cases besides Lauchery in Kassel, a composer both from Mannheim and Stuttgart was involved. A real cooperation of the three would have been difficult and time-consuming from the perspective of communication and traveling at that time. Thus, most of the arguments speak in favor of the fact that the ballets are actually pasticcios.

\textsuperscript{63} For his further biography see Dahms, 2003.

\textsuperscript{64} The scenarios of his ballets are collected in Anon., 1768, and \textit{[Collection de Ballets 1765-1781]}. A work list is published in Dahms, 1992.

\textsuperscript{65} For a list of extant Mannheim scores see Cornelson/Wolf, 1996.

\textsuperscript{66} 30 pasticcios of a total of 54 ballets in Kassel, two of a total of 23 in Mannheim. The numbers are determined on the sources from n. 64.

\textsuperscript{67} Ceyx et Alcione, for example, is based on music by Christian Cannabich (Mannheim) and Niccolò Jommelli (Stuttgart); Hylas et Eglée is by Lauchery and Deller (Anon., 1768 and \textit{[Collection de Ballets 1765-1781]})
Particularly noteworthy is the fact that numerous pieces were chosen from com-
posers who had collaborated with Noverre, especially when in some cases Noverre’s
scenarios also were used.\textsuperscript{68} That Lauchery knew Noverre’s ballets is certain; whether he
knew him personally cannot be proven, but could be possible.\textsuperscript{69} Noverre, who indeed
also has some pasticcios in his œuvre, usually worked closely with his composers and
had the music ‘tailor-made’ to his ballets, because for him the music had a very high
priority in the \textit{ballet d’action}.\textsuperscript{70} The high quality of Noverre’s ballet music was possibly
the reason why Lauchery used it as the base for his own pasticcios. It is also possible
that the decision to perform music from the courts of Stuttgart and Mannheim did not
come from Lauchery, but from the Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel, who heard of their ex-
cellent reputation and wanted to have it performed at his own court. This is supported
by the fact that Lauchery’s successor “Regnaud” also used music from Mannheim and
Stuttgart in his pasticcios.\textsuperscript{71}

The structure of a scenario provides information on how many scenes a ballet is
divided into and individual dances are also highlighted in the description of the plot.
Moreover, the cast list gives an idea of how many soloists, figurants and extras were in-
volved. However, unfortunately, it is not possible to assign the individual pasticcio parts
to the respective composers. Some more information about Lauchery’s pasticcios can be
found in cases when they are based on a work by Noverre or when there are two versions
by Lauchery. In the case of \textit{La mort d’Hercule} both variants apply. A ballet pantomime
of this title was first choreographed in 1762 by Noverre in Stuttgart. The music that has
survived was written by Deller;\textsuperscript{72} the choreography, as usual, does not exist anymore. If
one compares Noverre’s scenario with the score, it is difficult to assign all 19 musical
numbers to specific scenes or actions. The first piece, “Marcia”, played at the beginning
of the ballet, as Hercules returns home triumphantly.\textsuperscript{73} Yet the following \textit{Allegro} cannot
be clearly assigned. In the second scene there is a \textit{pas de trois}, which is then extended
to five dancers. This results in a dance for four and finally in a \textit{pas de deux}.\textsuperscript{74} For a con-
temporary spectator, this group of dances was the center and highlight of the ballet.\textsuperscript{75}
Therefore, the music of no. 8 was most probably used, which is by far the most extended
dance and has a rondo structure.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{68} In addition to the Stuttgart composers Rudolph and Deller, Jommelli and “Granier” also
appear in ballets. The latter is probably the composer François Granier who collaborated
with Noverre in Lyon.
\textsuperscript{69} Occasionally, it is falsely stated that Lauchery was Noverre’s student.
\textsuperscript{70} Dahms, 1996, p. XII.
\textsuperscript{71} Some of Regnaud’s scenarios can be found in \textit{[Collection de Ballets 1765-1781]}.
\textsuperscript{72} Deller/Rudolph, 1913. In this edition the music of \textit{La mort d’Hercule} is ascribed to Ru-
dolph, but Lauchery’s scenario and other sources call Deller as the composer.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., pp. 191-195. The scenario of the ballet is printed on pp. XLf.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., p. XLI.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p. XLII.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., pp. 203-219.
Figure 1: Étienne Lauchery, La mort d'Hercule, Kassel 1767, title page and extract from the scenario (D-Kl, 34 8° H.lit. 475, n.p.).
In 1767 Lauchery choreographed *La mort d’Hercule* for the Kassel court.77 The ballet was a pasticcio with music by Deller and by the Mannheim composer Toeschi. The scenario is preserved, the music does not exist anymore. If one compares the scenario with Noverre’s, one notices that the plot is basically identical, but divided into eight instead of four scenes in Noverre’s version. The cast is the same for the soloists, but there are differences in the supporting roles such as the slaves and companions of Hercules. Although Deller’s music for Lauchery’s ballet has not been preserved, the high similarity of the scenes suggests that it was the same music as for Noverre’s ballet. Additions made by Lauchery in the plot certainly corresponded with newly added music. For example, at the beginning of the triumph, Lauchery added a scene in which Dejanira, with her four companions – whose roles are not in Noverre’s version – waited anxiously for Hercules’ return.78 Since this scene does not exist in Noverre’s ballet, it was probably based on music by Toeschi.

In 1772 the choreographer brought the ballet to the Mannheim stage.79 Names of composers are not specified this time; the German scenario gives only the hint “the music consists of various beautiful pieces from several eminent masters” (“[…] die Musik besteht aus verschiedenen schoenen Stuecken mehrern beruehmten Meistern”). The scenario is fundamentally identical to the one from Kassel but the action was extended and protracted, so that the Mannheim version had 14 scenes. Moreover, the number of figurants was increased again, for example with regard to the slaves or the companions of Dejanira. The latter now appeared with twelve figurants instead of four solo dancers. Most likely, this expansion also required more new pieces of music, though it cannot be said whether they came from Deller and Toeschi, or even from one or more additional composers.

*Table 2: Comparison of the three versions of La mort d’Hercule.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer/s</th>
<th>Noverre (Stuttgart 1762)</th>
<th>Lauchery (Kassel 1767)</th>
<th>Lauchery (Mannheim 1772)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle</td>
<td>Ballet tragi-pantomime</td>
<td>Ballet héroïque</td>
<td>Ballet héroï-tragique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejanira, wife of Hercules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philoctet, friend of Hercules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77 Anon., 1768, fols. 276r-282r.
78 Ibid., fol. 278r.
79 Anon., 1772. In Mannheim, *La mort d’Hercule* was an entr’acte in the opera *La fiera di Venezia*. The scenario is printed at the end of the libretto.
80 Unless otherwise stated, these are danced roles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noverre</th>
<th>Lauchery</th>
<th>Lauchery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Stuttgart 1762)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilus, son of Hercules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioile, slave of Hercules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycas, slave of Hercules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno</td>
<td>Extra</td>
<td>Dancer</td>
<td>Dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companions of Hercules</td>
<td>One couple of Americans, Africans, Europeans, Asians each (8 dancers)</td>
<td>4 dancers, as well as an indefinite number of extras</td>
<td>1 soloist and 12 figurants, as well as an indefinite number of extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaves</td>
<td>Slaves of different nations (indefinite number of extras), 1 Thessalonian slave (female extra)</td>
<td>3 female slaves and 2 male slaves dancing, as well as slaves of different nationalities (an indefinite number of extras)</td>
<td>2 African, European, Asian and Scythian male slaves each, 1 female slave dancing, as well as slaves of different nationalities (an indefinite number of extras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combatants</td>
<td>3 or 4 dancers</td>
<td>2 dancers</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companions of Dejanira</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4 soloists</td>
<td>12 figurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest/s</td>
<td>At least 2 extras</td>
<td>1 extra</td>
<td>1 extra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrificer</td>
<td>An indefinite number of extras</td>
<td>4 extras</td>
<td>An indefinite number of extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians</td>
<td>“jouans de divers instrumens militaires dans la marche triomphante d’Hercule” (extras)</td>
<td>“jouant dans la marche” (extras)</td>
<td>extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers and people</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>An indefinite number of extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinities of the Olympus</td>
<td>An indefinite number of extras</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>An indefinite number of extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>1 extra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of scenes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene decoration</td>
<td>Room in the palace of Hercules</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1st-2nd scene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81 The eyewitness account speaks of twelve slaves (DELLER/RUDOLPH, 1913, p. XLI).
82 Three dancers are listed in the libretto, the eyewitness, however, speaks of four (ibid.).
Lauchery proceeded similarly with other pasticcio ballets which were first performed in Kassel and later in Mannheim. Almost always the plot of the scenarios has to a large extent the same wording, but as a rule it was expanded for Mannheim and there were minor changes in the roles.83 For this procedure, the pasticcio method was well suited, as it was easy to remove or add new pieces. Scores of Lauchery’s ballet pasticcios may be hidden somewhere in libraries, in which these trains of thought could be checked.

### Pasticcio in dance – extant choreographies

Among the surviving choreographies in Beauchamp-Feuillet notation, two stand out because they contain complete stage choreographies – an absolute rarity when one realizes how many ballets there have been. Therefore, these two sources are valuable testimonies for the stage dance of the 18th century. And there is something else about them – both are pasticcios. These are *Ludus pastoralis* and a manuscript by Auguste Ferrère.

*Ludus pastoralis* is a Jesuit school ballet which dates from 1734.84 It was dedicated to the new bishop of Metz und was performed at the local Jesuit college. Ballet and drama were important components of the Jesuit’s educational program, as evidenced by numerous extant scenarios. The beautiful decorated manuscript of *Ludus pastoralis* contains the whole play including poetry, music and dance. Thereby it is a unique testimony for the Jesuit’s college repertoire. The shepherd play which was performed by nine students of the college is an allegory which symbolizes the faith of the dedicatee.85 The manuscript indicates the performers as well as the creators of the play. The composer was “Maillard” and the choreographer “Dalizon”. The composer most likely must be identified with Pierre-Joseph Maillard, who, at the time, was maître de musique at Metz cathedral.86 The identity of the choreographer remains unclear, but it was probably the dancing master of the Jesuit college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noverre (Stuttgart 1762)</th>
<th>Lauchery (Kassel 1767)</th>
<th>Lauchery (Mannheim 1772)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square with triumphal arch</td>
<td>1st-2nd scene</td>
<td>1st-3rd scene</td>
<td>3rd-4th scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iole’s room</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4th-5th scene</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden of the palace</td>
<td>3rd scene</td>
<td>6th-7th scene</td>
<td>5th-12th scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood at the shore of the sea</td>
<td>4th scene</td>
<td>8th scene</td>
<td>13th-14th scene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

83 Dahms, 1996, p. XVII.
84 Anon., 1734.
85 An overview about genesis and content of the manuscript is found in Berton, 2007.
86 Rose, 1992, p. 32. Berton erroneously takes the “D.” before the surnames of Maillard and Dalizon for the initials of their first names. But it is the Latin abbreviation for “dominus” (see “Ludi argumentum” in Anon., 1734, n.p.).
Although Maillard is mentioned as a composer, the ballet is a pasticcio, because at least one musical piece comes from someone else. This concerns the penultimate dance, which is overwritten with “Gigue”. However, in terms of dance and music, it is a gavotte. The music was taken from a dance called La Transilvanie which was published in Jacques Dezais’ XIII Recueil de danses pour l’année 1715. The origin of the music remains unknown. It was choreographed by Claude Balon for a couple while the dance from Dalizon is a solo. The music in Ludus pastoralis was transposed from the original D minor to E minor and the musical structure was changed at some point: La Transilvanie has the structure ABACAA compared to \( \|:ABAC:\|A \) in the gigue. In the choreographical structure (floor tracks, step sequences), however, there are no borrowings.

Against the background of this case, the question arises whether other dance tunes from the repertoire of belle danse are borrowed. Perhaps the composer Maillard named in the manuscript wrote only instrumental and vocal parts and the choreographer Dalizon chose music that best suited his choreographies. The present author searched for concordances for the other six dances, but without success. This raises the question of why only one piece in the play is borrowed. (The choreographies preserved today are only a fraction of what existed. Many dances have not survived but also many are still undetected in archives, so this question may possibly be clarified sometime in the future.)

The other remarkable source is a manuscript by the dancing master Auguste Ferrère from 1782. It contains three ballet pantomimes, one ballet demi-caractère and entr’acte divertissements for three stage works. They are all written in a grotesque or comic style and are therefore lighter than the ballets by Noverre. The manuscript contains not only music and dance, but also gives information concerning other elements of staging: pantomimic gestures, the timing of entrances and exits and even the timing for raising the curtain. To record all this information, the Beauchamp-Feuillet notation was not sufficient. Therefore, Ferrère combined it with simplified dance notation, verbal instructions and small drawings. The music is not reduced to the upper melody as is usual in dance notation, but written in two to five voices and contains details of instrumentation. In its unique form the manuscript is an invaluable source for understanding ballet in the late 18th century.

---

87 ANON., 1734, fols. 31r-33r.
88 The music of La Transilvanie is in alla breve time with two crotchets upbeat, which is typical for a gavotte, while a gigue is always in 6/4 or 6/8.
89 DEZAIS, [1714], pp. 1-7. Nicoline Winkler is credited with this valuable discovery.
90 Ibid., p. 1.
91 An incipit search was conducted in the catalogue La Belle Danse by Francine Lancelot, Paris 1996, and in RISM.
92 FERRÈRE, 1782.
93 MARSH/HARRIS-WARRICK, 2005, pp. 231f.
94 Ibid., p. 189.
In at least five of the eight stage pieces, pasticcio elements have been detected so far and possibly even more are included in the score.

Table 3: Borrowings in the Ferrère manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Le Peintre amoureux de son modèle</em> (ballet pantomime)</td>
<td>contredanse générale (pp. 9f.): entrée from Jean-Philippe Rameau’s opéra-ballet <em>Les Fêtes d’Hébé</em> (1739)*95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Les Trois cousines</em> (3 entr’acte divertissements for an opera)</td>
<td>Some music was taken from Jean-Claude Gillier (1700) who wrote the music for the eponymous stage play by Florent Dancourt*96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L’Embarras des richesses</em> (2 entr’acte divertissements for a stage play)</td>
<td>Tambourin sérieux (pp. 47f.): tambourin from Rameau’s tragédie en musique <em>Castor et Pollux</em> (1737)*98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myrtil et Lycoris</em> (2 entr’acte divertissements)</td>
<td>Some music was taken from the eponymous pastorale by Léopold-Bastien Desormery (1777)*99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list confirms, on the one hand, the statement that the pasticcio technique was common practice in ballets in the second half of the 18th century. On the other hand, it shows the wide range from which Ferrère took his music both in period and genre: there are compositions between 1700 and 1777, and they range from the tragédie en musique to the vaudeville tune. The manuscript also makes it possible to study the close connection between music, dance and pantomime. Concerning the pasticcios, the reasons for choosing specific pieces of music and the question whether this music specifically supports dance and gesture could be a project for further studies.

**Conclusion**

As shown in the examples, dances could be integrated in pasticcio operas. On the other hand, danced stage works such as ballets or pastorals could also be pasticcios themselves. All the examples have in common that the pasticcio technique refers to the music which was used, while the choreographies usually come from the pen of a single dan-

---

95 Harris-Warrick/Marsh, 2005, p. 190.
96 Ibid., pp. 192f.
98 Harris-Warrick/Marsh, 2005, pp. 194f.
99 Ibid., pp. 190 and 195.
100 Which was done in Marsh/Harris-Warrick, 2005.
cine master. Whether pasticcios also existed in choreographic terms cannot be proven for lack of sources. Although the pasticcio method is similar to that of the opera, there are partly other and thereby different motivations and reasons for the decision to write a pasticcio.

Like the arias in pasticcio operas which were chosen by a composer for a particular virtuoso, dances could also be inserted when the composer had the opportunity to collaborate with excellent dancers. Also, pragmatic reasons like time restrictions could play a role in the decision to write a pasticcio. In the case of ballad opera, performing dances was not as important as the use of their tunes. On the one hand, they were chosen because of their entertainment value and popularity; on the other hand, they transported a subtext which often contained political or moral messages. When writing a ballet, choreographers often used pasticcio techniques. By choosing suitable music, these could help to support the danced action and to make it more understandable.
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Ballet Performance as Motivation for Pasticcio Practices – Gluck’s and Berton’s \textit{Cythère assiégée} (1775)

Daniel Philippi

In Gluck’s operatic work and performance practice one encounters several models of collaboration with artists for the realization of stage presentations and works and the combination of already existing ‘numbers’ with newly composed pieces. Another kind of combining was and is common for the music that is used for the realization of stage dance. In Gluck’s biography, the stage dance had different meanings in several creative phases and in quite different ways. In the late 1750s and early 1760s, Gluck was at first only the arranger of ballet performances at the Viennese court theaters, and later developed his musical and dramatical conception for the ballet pantomime with its innovative features (see especially \textit{Don Juan}, 1761). His conception of opera (starting with \textit{Orfeo ed Euridice}, 1762) integrated the dramatic acting component of the pantomime as well as expressive dance. But, looking to the reform operas that Gluck created in the 1760s and 1770s, it turns out that his integration of stage dance or instrumental music was stylistically quite diverse. In other words, Gluck did not always integrate stage dance in the same way, but decided on the use of dance music for pantomimic acting depending on the subject or dramatic situation, the compositional context and the performance conditions. With \textit{Cythère assiégée}, composed for Paris in 1775, we have a special case. Based on Gluck’s \textit{opéra-comique} from 1759 this stage work can be attributed to the genre of \textit{opéra-ballet} with its typical alternation of vocal and instrumental airs. However, continuous action is part of its three-act conception. Regarding Gluck’s borrowing practices, his combinations and transformations of earlier pieces may well be worthy of note, but more interesting is the case of Act III of \textit{Cythère}. This is because the sources which came down to us indicate pasticcio-like practices for performances in Paris in 1775. For this reason, the following article will focus exclusively on Act III.
As fate would have it, Gluck was unable to rehearse and perform his own *Cythère assiégée* in 1775: he lingered in Vienna, working intensively on *Alceste*\(^1\) from spring until late summer, during which he became ill. Before leaving Paris in March 1775, he handed a score of *Cythère* over to Pierre-Montan Berton and entrusted him with preparing and rehearsing the work. Berton (1727-1780) was given the title of *Maître de musique* by the Paris Académie royale de musique in 1755 and in the 1760s he was temporarily one of the three directors of the Opéra, also serving as its general manager in the years 1776-1777 and 1777-1778.\(^2\) His activity consisted largely in editing, rehearsing and directing older works of the French operatic tradition for new performances and he also composed some stage works.\(^3\)

In the printed libretto of Gluck’s *Cythère*\(^4\) (approved on 7 June 1775) a note provides evidence of Berton’s contribution to it. On the title page’s *verso* the names of librettist and composer, Charles-Simon Favart and “Chevalier Gluck”, are mentioned. Beneath this a “Nota” informs us that Act III contains music by two authors:

> “Mr. Gluck was forced to return to Vienna sooner than expected, so that he no longer had time to compose the music for the *divertissement* of the last act. He engaged Mr. Berton to represent him in this regard. His [Berton’s] devotion to Mr. Gluck and his extraordinary respect for his [Gluck’s] unique talents, did not allow him to refuse the confidence placed in him [and] his distinctive character: so, he worked out of pure affection and without any pretensions other than to show the author his eagerness and to the public his desire for everything that is suitable for his pleasure.”\(^5\)

---

5. “M. Gluck ayant été obligé de retourner à Vienne plutôt qu’il ne s’y attendoit, n’a pas eu le temps de faire la Musique du Divertissement du dernier Acte: il a engagé M. Berton de le suppléer à cet égard. Son amitié pour la personne de M. Gluck, & l’estime singulière [sic] qu’il a pour ses talents, ne lui ont pas permis de se refuser à la confiance qu’il lui marquoit: il a travaillé en conséquence, mais par pur sentiment, & sans nulle autre prétention que de prouver à l’Auteur son attachement, & au Public son zèle pour tout ce qui peut concourir à ses amusements.” FAVART, 1775, p. 2.
The “Nota” mentions Gluck’s allegedly premature departure from Paris as a reason for Berton’s authorship of the *divertissement* in Act III. It implies that this act had not been completed yet. At the same time, it emphasizes that the work was done at the request of Gluck (“il a engagé”). Of course, more relevant for Berton is that this note indicates him as composer of some dance numbers, though which numbers of Act III Berton composed is not mentioned exactly. The latter question can be determined only on the basis of other sources. Therefore, in the first place reference should be made to a note on page 192 in the printed full score which was also published in 1775: “All pieces of the *Divertissement* which follow the *Annonce* of the *Marche* until the end in the printed full score are compositions by Mr. Chevalier Gluck and the pieces of the *Divertissement*, played at the Opéra are composed by Mr. Berton.”

Here is specified that from a certain point in Act III the dances performed on stage are by Berton and in contrast, however, the dances given in the printed full score are by Gluck. The passage in question (in the printed score, p. 162) can be found in the 4th scene, starting at bar 36. We will focus on the stage version and the contribution of Pierre-Montan Berton: his dance numbers were printed in parts in 1775 by Le Marchand in Paris and their titles clearly designate that they formed part of the performance of Gluck’s *Cythère assiégée* in 1775. The title page of the *Violino primo* part is:

```
```

The whole *divertissement* of this print contains six movements. These are five more or less short movements and one, the last movement, is an extended *chaconne* (equated with *passacaille*), as is normal for the genre. A reference to the sequence within the dramaturgy of Act III is hinted at by some key words and brief references to the scene,
which can be found above some of the ballet numbers. They have correspondences in the 5th and 6th scenes of the (printed) libretto. The printed parts can be used to reference the music by Berton which is related to Gluck’s Cythère. However, the separate publication and the non-specific nature of the key words, makes it difficult to reconstruct how the six dance movements by Berton were integrated into Gluck’s opéra-ballet.

In search for the stage version

It seems reasonable to assume that another source will be helpful in answering the question of how the stage version of 1775 looked. This is the full score copy which has served as the reference for performances in 1775 and is situated in the Paris Bibliothèque-Musée de l’Opéra. While Act I shows only insignificant notices affecting aspects of interpretation, Act II includes additional interventions with a greater level of detail. But Act III was subject to major interventions, both in terms of interpretation and on the course of the whole act. Unfortunately, these are not sufficiently useful for our present task of establishing the stage version.

There are irregularities of pagination which can only be explained by the exchange of pages, but in search for the six dance movements by Berton only a single number could be found. The dance movement is embedded in a sequence that – like in Act I – is characterized by the alternation of vocal and instrumental passages. According to the quoted hint from the printed full score, however, several dance numbers are sure to be found. In addition, the course of Act III, from Scene 4 on, does not correspond completely to the libretto. The manuscript score was used to prepare the performance, but it does not show the complete version given on the stage. This is the result of collation and the comparison of sources carried out in the course of preparing the edition for Christoph Willibald Gluck – Sämtliche Werke.

Another source is therefore required: fortunately, the handwritten material in parts has been preserved which is closely related to the performances of the year 1775. Like the manuscript score, it belongs to the collection of the Paris Bibliothèque-Musée de l’Opéra. The material includes the vocal and instrumental parts of the complete performance personnel. Despite numerous deletions, other changes and various kinds of

---

8 F-Po, A.234 a. For more details see the critical report in: PHILIPPI, 2019, pp. 421f.
10 F-Po, Mat.18 [75(1-123). For more details see the critical report in: PHILIPPI, 2019, pp. 422f.
11 This means only the parts (they are nearly complete). Under the shelf mark Mat.18 [75(1-123) this material is divided into several groups: until no. 82 it consists of vocal parts, and from 83 on instrumental parts. The vocal parts for the soloists have the shelf mark numbers 1-35, those for the two choir scores 36-37 and those for the choir parts 38-82; the instrumental parts are arranged in the order wind instruments (nos. 83-94), strings (nos. 95-111), basso parts (nos. 112-122) and timpani (no. 123). Because some shelf mark numbers have bis-digits (nos. 4bis, 13bis, 19bis, 40bis, 58bis und 94bis) and one digit is missing (no. 101) the sum
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damage, the material can serve to establish the musical course of Act III or several possibilities for its reconstruction. All this can be achieved on the basis of the information about the final passages given in the libretto and the printed divertissement (dance numbers) by Berton.

Looking at the scenes of Act III – for which divergent versions are to be found in the manuscript full score with its revision levels, the printed full score and the libretto – we also find signs of revision in the handwritten parts. The changes up to the chorus “Ici mille plaisirs” in principle correspond to those made in the manuscript score. For those changes that follow after the chorus, on the other hand, the printed score is the only source that can be used for comparing the music. It is noteworthy that the handwritten parts contain all the vocal sections by Gluck and additionally the six dance movements by Berton’s divertissement, and some revisions.

The comparison of handwritten parts and the printed score confirms the note on page 192 of the latter. In other words, in the manuscript parts are found all the dance movements which follow Act III, Scene 3 (i.e. from Scene 4 on [cf. overview below]) from Berton’s Cythère divertissement. There we find no dance movements by Gluck. As indicated, the two vocal pieces by Gluck, the ariettes “Nymphes, chantez victoire” (with notated repetitions, Daphné) and “L’aimable paix règne dans ces asiles” (Cloé), which also belong to the sequence of Act III from Scene 4 onwards are to be found in the manuscript parts as well as in the printed score. In addition, their position within the sequence of music pieces is largely comparable. Not surprising within a comprehensive manuscript material, the individual parts also differ among themselves: in relation to the musical sequence starting from the 4th scene in Act III such deviations can roughly be distinguished in three variants. Here, the most common variant in the material shall be considered:

**The sequence of the stage version**

_Cythère assiégée_ – Act III (from Scene 3 on): stage version according to the handwritten part no. 115 (basse continue and contrebassee) from the material F-Po, Mat.18 [75(1-123)]

*in italics* = quotes from the sources (including spelling)

highlighted in gray = pieces composed by Berton

**SCÈNE III**

_Récitatif_ (13 bars) Olgar, Doris, Cloé, Brontès: “Ciel! Est ce Brontes que je vois”

_Andante Gracioso_ (46 bars) Cloé, Doris, Olgar, Brontès: “Les Dieux”

(of parts is 128 (not 123, which the shelf mark [75(1-123)] may suggest). Gaps within a part are to be found in nos. 13th, 27, 32, 91 and 94th. Two fragments with shelf mark numbers (nos. 91 and 94th) can be identified as one complete part (Cor. 1).
SCÈNE IV
Gravement sans lenteur (11 bars)
Récitatif (8 bars) Daphné: “Que le calme regne à Cythere”
Gravement sans lenteur (17 bars)
Annonce. (5 bars = bar 1-5 in no. I of the divertissement by Berton)
Récitatif (6 bars) Daphné: “Tout annonce ici la presence du Dieu”
Marche (22 bars = no. I of the divertissement by Berton)
Récitatif (11 bars) Barbarin: “Que vois je Olgar, Brontès, les chefs” (previously before ariette “Nymphes, chantez victoire”, but crossed out with raddle)

SCÈNE V
Chœur (123 bars, Dal segno 18 bars) Cloé, Daphné, Carite, Doris, Olgar, Brontès, Cheur: “Ici mille plaisirs”
Passacaille Lourée (94 bars) (= no. II of the divertissement by Berton)
Entrée des Bergers. (111 bars) (= no. III of the divertissement by Berton)

SCÈNE VI
Ariette (153 bars, after that: repetition written out in full including revision, 58 bars)
Daphné: “Nymphes chantés victoire”
2e Air. Louré Et viellé. (138 bars) (= no. V of the divertissement by Berton)
Gigue (52 bars) (= no. IV of the divertissement by Berton)
Ariette (62 bars) Cloé: “L’aimable paix règne en ces aziles”
Chaconne. Tempo di Minuette Gratioso (first 244 bars, enlarged to 385 bars)
(first 244 bars = no. VI of the divertissement by Berton)

The schematic representation of the finale according to the performance material shows the aforementioned combination of musical pieces by Berton and Gluck; this combination here corresponds with the alternation of dance and vocal sections. In addition, the densification of dance after the chorus “Ici mille plaisirs” becomes evident. Thus, after only one dance number in the 4th scene, five dance numbers in the 5th and 6th scenes are to be found. In the first layer of notation, the manuscript parts correspond completely to the six dance movements by Berton as they appeared in the printed parts. In the course of the performance preparations, however, changes were made: in many of the instrumental parts the Gigue (no. IV) was removed or the Gigue and 2me Air (no. V) were moved to another position in the sequence, which also affected the position of the ariette “L’aimable paix règne”.

In addition, the handwritten parts for the final Chaconne (no. VI) deviate from the printed parts by adding a large number of bars (about 140),12 where further interventions including revised textures make it difficult to bring all the parts into coherence. The handwritten material deviates from a plausible change between vocal and dance pieces, which we can see in Act I, for example; this is caused by repetitions of individual pieces.

12 See n. 29 in: Phillipi, 2017, p. 86.
sections of dance numbers and different expansions of dance pieces in the handwritten parts.

The plot of *Cythère assiégée* is essentially limited to an allegory of the failed conquest of the island of Cythera, which means that the god Mars and his warriors were defeated by the friendly power of Cupid and Venus. Due to the predominantly idyllic atmosphere, which is disturbed only at the end of Act I and in Act II by the encroachments of the besiegers, the musical design is characterized by lyrical moods. The motive reminds us of Jean-Antoine Watteau’s famous painting *L’embarquement pour Cythère* or one of its three versions, which of course inspired the idea of the opera. The fact is that the Arcadian ambience goes hand in hand with the use of fixed types (which means that the role conceptions are not multi-layered). In addition, the scenery is very similar to that of the (rococo) *fêtes galantes* with their portrayal of couples in love, pastoral scenes of erotic nature embedded in park landscapes and surrounded by antique sculptures or ruins of a love temple. *Cythère* therefore remains in the tradition that was established in Paris by François Boucher and incorporated into classicism. And this includes motifs of dance scenes that can easily be assigned to different action contexts in their abstract gallantry.

Act III, which is examined here more closely, begins with the complaint of the warrior Brontès that his army is no longer under his command, but follows the love of the nymphs of Cythera. Already in the 2nd scene of Act III he himself was also conquered by a nymph (Cloë) and in the 3rd scene, the nymph Doris and the Scythian Prince Olgar quickly accept the new lovers and all praise Cupid together. For the next scenes, different versions in two or three scenes have been passed down in the sources. But everything revolves around the worship of Arcadian fortune.

---

13 See Jean-Antoine Watteau (1684-1721) *L’embarquement pour Cythère*, version of 1710 in the collection of Städel Museum Frankfurt, version of 1717 in Musée de Louvre Paris and version of 1718 in Schloss Charlottenburg Berlin. On Watteau’s painting in relation to pasticcio techniques see also the study by Hans Körner in the present volume, pp. 71-102.


15 Boucher (1703-1770), for example, was commissioned by Louis XV to paint *fêtes galantes* for the boudoir of the Marquise de Pompadour.

16 Like the motifs by Jacques Sébastien Leleclerc (c. 1734-1785), which he used for gobelins as well as for oil paintings. An example is *Le Menuet*, which is a part of the collection of the Petit Palais. Musée des Beaux-Arts de la Ville de Paris, online: http://parismuseescollections.paris.fr, 07.04.2020.
Sequence of music and clues for the participation of dancers

The printed libretto is helpful in identifying the stage version. Here scene and person references can be found both within the textual progression and under the performance personnel information at the beginning of the libretto. Here the names of the singers (pp. 3f.) as well as dancers are listed.

Figure 1: Libretto, pp. 5f.: dancers.
Unlike the vocal parts however, the naming of the dance personnel largely follows the sequence of their appearance on stage. This is because the information in the libretto is divided according to the three acts in an arrangement that calls the various groups of dancers in order, as well as detailing the arrangement of the three soloists in the scene at the end of the opera. The order of entry also possibly indicates that of the appearances— at least within the groups of people: soloists, entourage of Venus and Cupid, shepherds and shepherdesses. According to the libretto (p. 6), the cast and event sequence for Act III would therefore be as follows (spellings according to the libretto):

“Mars – M. Vestris
Venus – Mlle. Heinel
L’Amour – Mlle. Michelot
Suite de Vénus et de l’Amour
M. Gardel, l. [l’aîné]
Mme. Leger, Abraham
Mlle. d’Elfevbre, du Bois
Mme. Trupti, Henri, Huart, Rivet, Laval, Lieffe, Roissi, Pladix
Mme. Gertrude, Durville, Bigotini, Saunier
Mme. Martin, Jonveau, du Mesnil, l’Huillier, Gertrude, Durville, Bigotini, Saunier
Bergers et Bergeres
M. d’Auberval, Mlle. Guimard
Mme. Dossion, Aubri, Hennequin, l. [l’aîné], le Breton, Olivier, le Doux, Barré, Rufflet
Mme. Henriette, Constance, du Pin, Duval, Auberte, Thiste, du Parc, Belletour”

The multiple naming of some dancers (e.g. Mllles Gertrude and Durville within Act III, or Mme Henri and Huart in Acts II and III) makes it clear that the typographically grouped names do not specify immutable person combinations but the respective formation for a dance. The clarity of the displayed sequence of dances is deceptive, because comparing it with the course of action as it can be reconstructed in the libretto by corresponding instructions, and in the handwritten parts through music or number sequences, we see that all these instructions leave room for several possibilities in the pairing of dance and music.

**Example of dance sequences in the stage version**

To detect the dance sequences in Act III, the handwritten parts, supplemented by the information that can be found in the libretto, provide the most concrete clues. The beginning of the sections inserted by Berton as well as the two following dance movements are taken into account as examples:

17 Names taken from *Favart, 1775*; these can be identified mostly as members of the Opéra’s staff, see: *Les Spectacles de Paris*, 1776.

18 For all six numbers see the “reconstruction of the sequence” in: *Philippi, 2017*, pp. 91-94.
According to the manuscript parts the first dance appearance in Act III takes place in Scene 4 (see the table on p. 580). It is the march no. I (4/4, C major), which is titled “Annonce” and integrated into a recitative passage; here, only five bars are played and after another recitative the entire movement by Berton is inserted. In the libretto, these sung lyrics reach into the 5th scene, and not until the beginning of the chorus does a scene instruction appear, assigned here to march no. I. This scene instruction describes the homage of all the three gods that are now becoming visible: “During a march, all persons render homage to Venus, Cupid and Mars who descend in a glory”.19

Figure 2: Printed violin part.

Consequently, for the choreographic implementation of the march a large group of people is needed; but in the light of the libretto (p. 6) it must be concluded that it was not the dancers, but the choir which was set in motion here for the homage of the gods.20 This is also supported by the position of the next scene instruction related to the three gods found in the vocal text. In terms of content, it is the moment when the gods descend on the theater stage: “During this song piece Mars, Venus and Cupid descend on the stage; their retinue appears at the same time”.21

The Passacaille lourée (no. II) following the choir, in turn, provides a musical basis for solo dances of the three gods, which corresponds to the described events through its

19 “Sur une marche, tous les personnages vont rendre hommage à VÉNUS, à l’AMOUR & à MARS, qui descendent dans une gloire”, Favart, 1775, pp. 53f.
20 This choir is also part of Gluck’s Cythère assiégée of 1759, in which it is the last musical piece and more a celebration of happiness. During or after the choir the singers (nymphs, inhabitants of Cythère and the Scyths [or “Les Scites” according to the libretto]) form a “Ballet general [sic]” to end the opera. See the printed libretto, Favart, 1759, pp. 39-41.
21 “Pendant ce morceau de chant, MARS, VÉNUS & l’AMOUR descendent sur le théâtre; leur Suite paroit en même tems”, Favart, 1775, p. 54.
cheerful character (3/4, G major). In addition, its extension (94 bars) and multi-part form allow a succession of varying choreographed solo sections.

Dance movement no. III of Berton’s divertissement follows immediately (see the table on p. 580). It has the title “1er Air [or in some parts “Entrée”] des Bergers” and thus determines the identity of the group of people represented by the dancers. In the libretto (p. 6) there are three ensembles for the shepherds: a couple, a male shepherd’s and a female shepherd’s group. The dance (2/2, G major), comprising 111 bars, makes it possible to think of a choreography that makes the succession and combination of all three groups possible. In the sequence this variety is realized by the three roles or groups and their performances. But it is also possible that in no. III only two groups were dancing, because the third, i.e. the female shepherds’ group come on stage later. An indication of an extended combination of groups is to be found only in the libretto (p. 54, in connection with the choir “Ici mille plaisirs”), where the entourage of Venus and Cupid is added: “The shepherds, the shepherdesses and the retinue of Venus and Cupid unite while dancing and begin the feast”. Of course the stage version by Berton does not add the entourage here; and it is not taken into account in the handwritten parts.

The necessity of interpreting the material found is also encountered in the following sections. It generally applies that the type of choreographic design remains scarcely determinable due to a lack of written evidence, although the musical sequence can be proven almost beyond doubt. This means that no concrete step sequences, space paths or arm positions are known for the dance numbers.

**Interpretation of the results**

Berton’s supplement to Act III of Gluck’s *Cythère assiégée* is an adaptation to conventions of the performance practice of the Opéra, especially in the field of *opéra-ballet*. The fact that Gluck was neither present for the rehearsals nor the premiere and follow-up performances of *Cythère* contributed to the fact that Gluck’s work closely followed genre-like performance patterns. In terms of Gluck, the situation of the altered finale of *Cythère assiégée* is not singular. In this respect, his other works, which he composed for the Académie royale and performed there, were also edited (re-worked), particularly his *Iphigénie en Aulide* – though for various final versions of this opera the composer

22 “Les Bergers, les Bergeres & la Suite de Vénus & de l’Amour se réunissent, en dansant, & commencent la fête”.

23 See Lajarte, 1878, vol. 1, p. 282. The reference of the performance dates including the numbers of visitors can be found in: Recettes de l’Opéra, preserved in: F-Pn, Archives de l’Opéra, Comptabilité, Recettes à la porte, 25 April 1775-27 March 1776, CO-14. Here, 22 performances of *Cythère* are listed; the first performance was on Tuesday, August 1st and the last one on Sunday, September 24th. Normally, the performances were on Tuesday, Friday and Sunday, and only on one Tuesday (August 15th) and one Friday (September 8th) no performances took place.
himself was responsible. Only with Cythère assiégée in Paris had the composer Gluck less responsibility for the version of the first performance.

Cythère assiégée is Gluck’s only work of the genre opéra-ballet, a genre which was an established stage form in Paris characterized by a quasi-equal combination of dance and vocal performance. Gluck’s first idea, which is limited in the original form to the direct sequence of an ariette (“Nymphes, chantez victoire”) and the tutti choir (“Ici mille plaisirs”) after Scene 3, was evidently not convincing. In this sense the combination of dance and vocal movements in the second half of Act III, both in line with the libretto and the need for a balanced conception of opéra-ballet, need no further justification. And, therefore, it is not surprising that the director responsible for ballet music realized a similar design for the stage by adding his own dance movements. The variants in the handwritten parts regarding the sequence beginning with Scene 4 also point to the variable nature of the conceptions for performances in the 18th century.

Sources
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Id., Cythère assiégée (Paris 1775); score (ms.): F-Po, A.234 a.
Id., Cythère assiégée (Paris 1775); parts (ms.): F-Po, Mat.18 [75(1-123).

Recettes de l’Opéra; F–Pn, Archives de l’Opéra, Comptabilité, Recettes à la porte, 25 April 1775-27 March 1776, CO-14.
RISM – Répertoire international des sources musicales, online: https://opac.rism.info/. Watteau, Jean-Antoine, L’embarquement pour Cythère (version of 1710), Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, Inv.-Nr.2150.
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The Use of Extracts of Mozart’s Operas in Polish Sacred Music

ALINA MĄDRY

Introduction

In the archives and libraries located within the borders of the Republic of Poland various manuscripts of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s music have been preserved. This situation is an indication that the music of the Viennese composer reached the vocal-instrumental ensembles active in the territory of the Commonwealth of Poland in the 18th century and in the first half of the 19th. However, these ensembles were not court ensembles, but mostly church ones. The church, therefore, became the main stage for a wide range of Mozart’s works. I believe that exploring the phenomenon of Mozart’s music in the church ensembles of the then Commonwealth is very important for further research on the repertoire preserved in Poland for these ensembles and the connections of that repertoire with music created in Europe. This is essential for determining the transmission routes and ways of presenting these works. The compositions signed with Mozart’s name were often, in some way, changed by arrangers who are unknown to us today. It is possible that they were local Polish composers or that the works had already been changed when they reached the musical ensembles active in the Commonwealth of Poland. Sometimes these modifications were quite surprising, but it should be remembered that they were to be used for the setting of religious services that took place in the church. Mozart’s music was remembered in the Commonwealth of Poland for quite a long time, yet in a specific way. Hence the need for research that would investigate those modifications, which have been present for over ten years in my work on the sources of Polish religious music of the 18th century. The analysis of a few cases will show how

1 They are included in the collections of musical manuscripts which formed the repertoire of music ensembles operating in the former Commonwealth. Partly they have already been entered in the RISM database (354 results); see: opac.rism.info. In part, they are available in published catalogues, among others: IDASZAK, 2004, pp. 76-202; IDASZAK, 2001.

2 MĄDRY, 2015.
surprising the changes presumably made by the Polish musicians-arrangers sometimes were. There is also the possibility that the works of Mozart had already been modified when they reached Poland. However, in order to prove this hypothesis, we need comparative studies which can give a wider perspective than the one we currently have.

Musical life in the Commonwealth of Poland did not diverge from what was happening all over Europe. The 18th century saw the consolidation of new trends that arose in the previous century. It was the time of instrumental stabilization and an intensive development of instrumental and vocal-instrumental music. In the Commonwealth of Poland, however, this was historically a very turbulent time, which led to the Third Partition of the country in 1795. Despite all the historical and political turmoil and almost constant presence of foreign troops on Polish territory, who repeatedly plundered the country and engaged in violent acts, musical life was constantly evolving. This is proven by the activities of hundreds of musical ensembles in churches and monasteries of the 18th century Commonwealth of Poland. In the era of the political and economic crisis that swept Poland of that time, the structures of the Catholic Church played a special role. Indeed, it can be suggested that the churches were not limited to their role as places of worship and that because of their territorial, legal and administrative roles, they largely fulfilled state and social functions as well. Great importance was then attached to the expansion of the network of parish churches and monasteries, which is visible in Poland even today. This had a direct impact on both the musical activities of the ensembles that functioned in such places, and on the shaping of musical tastes and needs, even in small religious centers. Pastoral care and education complemented each other, also creating a huge field in the area of music because at that time music belonged to the primary areas essential for the life of the parish or monastery. Considering the huge number of over 6,000 parish and monastic churches, we see that it created incredible opportunities for the development and presentation of music. Did the Third Partition stop this development? How did the repertoires of ensembles develop after the partitions when Poland disappeared from the map of Europe in 1795? Did the works of major foreign composers of Europe find their place in those repertoires? What was the function of the pieces presented in the church during the services? These and other questions arise in the context of performance practice. The attempt to answer these questions will be made through the prism of the music of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart preserved to this day in Polish archives and libraries, mainly those originating in churches.

In the last decade of the 18th century and in the first decades of the 19th, Mozart’s name appeared surprisingly often on manuscript title pages of pieces present in the repertoire of Polish church ensembles. Closer study of these works, whose authorship was sometimes only attributed to Mozart, often leads to rather unexpected results. These point to a rather surprising reception of his works – the pieces were composed by Wolfgang Amadeus indeed, but their form and purpose were completely different to the composer’s original intentions. Namely, opera music for which the typical place of presentation was the theater was performed in the church. This is an unusual phenomenon but

---

3 See more: Mądry, 2015, pp. 19-33, 85-338.
it cannot be assumed that it existed only in Poland. A study of selected cases will allow us to show how interesting the outcomes of these modifications were and of how great a sense of invention the Polish arrangers of Mozart’s opera music had. Below are three examples of pasticcio practice. The first two cases show arrangement practices, the third is an example of a compilation in a pasticcio-like manner with numerous borrowings. All cases also point to the mobility and transfer of sources which is important for musical and stylistic developments.

**Case 1: How did Figaro’s aria from Le nozze di Figaro become a symphony in Grodzisk Wielkopolski?**

In the 18th century in Grodzisk Wielkopolski/Grätz,⁴ there was a vocal and instrumental ensemble which was active in the parish church of Saint Jadwiga. A collection of musical manuscripts of this ensemble survived and is now stored in the Archdiocesan Archive in Poznań/Posen (PL-Pa). It was catalogued by Danuta Idaszak and published in the form of a thematic catalogue.⁵ In total, the collection contains 615 inventory items, in which we can find masses, requiems, vespers and vesper psalms, litanies, arias, motets, passions and instrumental works – symphonies. The Grodzisk collection is very interesting in many respects. It covers works from the beginning of the 18th until the first half of the 19th century. The oldest piece is dated 1711. It is Giovanni Battista Bassani’s *Concerto de Deo* (shelfmark: PL-Pa, Muz GR III/78). In Grodzisk Wielkopolski, in the 18th and 19th centuries, musicians performed not only pieces of Polish composers, but also of the most recognized composers in contemporary Europe, including Jan Dismas Zelenka, Johann Adolf Hasse, František Xaver Brixi, Joseph Haydn and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.

Now, we will have a closer look at Mozart’s *Symphonia* (shelfmark: PL-Pa, Muz GR V/17; RISM ID no.: 300234338). In the thematic catalogue of this collection Danuta Idaszak qualified the *Symphonia* as a composition by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. This is partly true as the original music of this piece comes from Mozart (Figure 1).⁶

---

⁴ Grodzisk Wielkopolski – a town in the south-western part of Greater Poland Voivodeship, with a population of nearly 15,000. It received a town charter at the beginning of the 14th century and was an important place on the historical map of Poland for many years. See more: Polak, 1990.

⁵ Idaszak, 1993.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 129f.
Specifically, it is Figaro’s aria “Non più andrai farfallone amoroso” from Act I of Le nozze di Figaro KV 492 (1786). However, the opera aria turned into a symphony in Grodzisk Wielkopolski. The vocal and instrumental piece became purely instrumental. This manuscript contains a lot of information, thanks to which it was possible to obtain many interesting leads. Originally, the title page mentioned “Autore Pompernicus” as the author, but later “no” and “Mozart” was added by another hand. Danuta Idaszak suggested that this Rochus Pompernicus, who appears again inside the manuscript on the sheet of an unnamed part containing Figaro’s part (Figure 2), was a musician of the Jasna Góra (Częstochowa) ensemble.
The author of the catalogue, unfortunately, did not provide the source on the basis of which she made such a hypothesis. It is worth noting that the vocal and instrumental ensemble active at the Pauline monastery in Jasna Góra in the 18th century was an excellent ensemble and was in possession of very good instruments and a large modern repertoire, of which of 3,000 manuscripts and prints remains to this day in the Jasna Góra archive together with other important archives related to the ensemble. Unfortunately, exploring them did not bring any findings on Rochus Pompernicus. Lengthy attempts to find him in the pieces for the ensemble in the 18th and early 19th centuries did not bring any results. Therefore, I gave up on this lead. There is one more, quite surprising lead related to this manuscript sheet. On the vocal part of Figaro/Rochus Pompernicus, Danuta Idaszak wrote an additional specification, “timpani”. It probably resulted from her simple listing of all the sheets and matching them to the instrumentation written on the title page because the Symphonia was composed for two violins, flute, two oboes, two horns, kettledrums and bass. Accordingly, the “timpani” part was missing. On closer inspection, it turns out that the part of Figaro, which Idaszak referred to as “timpani”, is notated in the bass clef and indeed accurately reflects Figaro’s aria from Mozart’s opera. It is not possible that kettledrums could perform it as 16 of them would be needed, which would be an unfeasible and quite strange idea even today. However, the manuscript contains no specified instrumental part of the bass and everything indicates that this is the abovementioned part. Nevertheless, it is still unclear why the mysterious person of Rochus Pompernicus was placed in this part. At first, I concluded that it was a kind of ‘joke’ of the person who remade the aria into a symphony. Fortunately, my efforts
together with those of my students yielded interesting information about this mystery. It turned out that in 1809 a three-act *quodlibet* entitled *Rochus Pumpernickel* was created for the Viennese theater. It was a type of ironic song that, at that time, was supposed to reflect the entire spectrum of musical and social life in Vienna. It was enhanced by selected fragments from Mozart’s, Salieri’s, Haydn’s, Weigl’s and Wenzel Müller’s music, i.e. all those who at that time were very popular composers with operatic triumphs in Vienna. In addition, *Rochus Pumpernickel* derived from popular folk melodies and included waltzes, which were very important from the Viennese perspective. There are 32 sources referring to this *quodlibet* in the RISM database. Having examined them, we can see that the figure of Rochus Pompernicus enjoyed great interest and new musical arrangements were made. The text was also translated into Polish: *Roszko Cymbalek* (or *Tobiaszek Fatalaszek*), a musical *quodlibet* in three acts translated into Polish by Dominik Jakubowicz (1813). The only version of this work is currently stored in the Library of the Lviv/Lemberg Theater. Certainly, the figure of the above-mentioned Polish Roszko Cymbalek was a mocking type and maybe in the *quodlibet* he was assigned the melody of Figaro’s aria, probably one of the most recognizable to this day and extremely popular then. Perhaps then, the Grodzisk musicians or the creator of this modification associated this melody more with Rochus Pompernicus, and only a more knowledgeable musician recognized Mozart’s music and wrote his name on the title page by putting the word “no” at Pompernicus. We need to remember that Figaro in Mozart’s opera is a bass. Therefore, the assignment of this part to Rochus, whose part is in the bass clef on the part from Grodzisk collection, complies with the opera and confirms the consistency between the two characters. The struggle with the mysterious figure of Rochus was a very interesting source-exploration adventure.

Coming back to the aria, which in the Grodzisk ensemble became a symphony, we firstly need to pay attention to the changes in the instrumental composition compared to the original aria. The original included quite an extensive set of instruments: bass (Figaro’s part), two violins, viola, cello, basso, two flutes, two oboes, two bassoons, two horns, two trumpets and kettledrums. *Symphony in C* from Grodzisk Wielkopolski was composed for two violins, flute, two oboes, two horns, kettledrums and bass, however, there is no kettledrum part in the set of parts. It is clearly visible that the reduction of the orchestration was the result of the limited possibilities of the Grodzisk ensemble. It also resulted in the necessary modifications of the original music, which mostly involved the simplification of the wind instruments’ parts. The lack of text in the bass part, despite the suggestion pointing to the figure of Rochus Pompernicus, indicates that it could not be intended for vocal performance, especially since the aria was labelled a symphony. It was most likely performed by an instrument with a low register.

---

7 On *Rochus Pumpernickel* and the Viennese *quodlibet* see also the article by Klaus Pietschmann in the present volume, pp. 541-552.

Example 1: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Figaro’s aria “Non più andrai farfallone amoroso” from Act I of Le nozze di Figaro KV 492 (1786), bars 1-9:

a) original version

b) arrangement, Symphonia in C from Grodzisk Wielkopolski

Danuta Idaszak dates the manuscript to around 1790. When we take into account the fact that the opera’s premiere took place in Vienna in 1786, it is really surprising that it appeared so quickly in the parish church in Grodzisk Wielkopolski in the form of an
instrumental piece. This confirms once again that the repertoire of the largest European music centers reached the local church ensembles of the 18th-century Commonwealth of Poland very quickly. Most probably, the aria-symphony fulfilled the function then typical for symphonies, i.e. it was played at the entrance or exit of the procession during the church service. It is even more astonishing how such a popular aria with a rather frivolous melody could accompany a religious ceremony. We can regard the Grodzisk transformation of Figaro’s aria into an instrumental piece, i.e. a symphony, as either an arrangement, which by definition was mainly the transcription of an existing work for another instrument/instruments or voice, or as a modification or simplification of the work’s texture to adapt it to other performance conditions. This way a new arrangement of this work was created and it may differ so much from the original that it becomes more the work of an arranger than of the original composer. Furthermore, we can certainly claim that in the case of the Grodzisk symphony there is also an element of recomposition. One thing does not cease to amaze: Figaro’s aria added splendor to the services in the parish church in Grodzisk Wielkopolski in a purely instrumental form just a few years after the premiere of Le nozze di Figaro in Vienna.

**Case 2: How was Donna Elvira’s aria from Don Giovanni transformed into a church aria?**

In the Archdiocesan Archive in Poznań, there is another collection of music from a parish ensemble which was active from the late 1660s to the 1870s in Poznań. The Poznań ensemble was resident in the collegiate church of St. Mary Magdalene until 1774. Then the destruction of the church by fire and the dissolution of the Jesuit Order caused that the post-Jesuit church became the main church of the city. In total, 375 works have been preserved and in its character the collection is similar to the aforementioned one from Grodzisk Wielkopolski. The Poznań music collection covers the second half of the 18th century and the entire 19th century. The compositions which survive from the 18th century constitute about one third of the collection. The preserved repertoire contains compositions by both Polish composers (e.g. Wojciech Dankowski, Józef Zeidler, Karol Petrowski or J.[?] Paszkiewicz) as well as foreign ones (including František Xaver Brixí, Franz Bühler, Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf, Joseph Haydn, Václav Pichl, Ignaz Pleyel or Carl Stamitz).

The works of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, including fragments from his operas, can also be found in this collection. One of them is the contrafactum of Donna Elvira’s aria “Mi tradi quell’alma ingrata” from Act II of Don Giovanni KV 527 (shelfmark: PL-Pa, Muz MM V/59, ZNF 99; Figure 3).

---

9 Stróżyńska, 2015, pp. 319-341.
10 Recomposition is a modification of the piece changing its status, most often it concerns the change of genre affiliation and original function, but the connecting element remains the musical layer. See more: Feder, 2011, pp. 41-84.
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Figure 3: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, the contrafactum of Donna Elvira’s aria “Mi tradi quell’alma ingrata” from Act II of Don Giovanni, KV 527, shelfmark: PL-Pa, Muz MM V/59 (ZNF 99), title page.

The premiere of Mozart’s opera took place in Prague in 1787. A year later it was revived in a slightly changed version in Vienna, and in 1789 the Polish premiere took place in Warsaw. The Poznań manuscript dates from the late 18th century, so the aria from this opera appeared there very quickly. Inside the manuscript there is a recitative as well as the aria which is quite unusual. Only arias were used for religious music and recitatives were left aside. This is indicated by examples preserved in collections across Poland. Two texts were written in the Poznań manuscript of Donna Elvira’s aria (Figure 4).

The Latin text “Festum diem recolentes” was added under the original text and this was undoubtedly made by another copyist because the handwriting of the two texts is significantly different. What is more, two additional sheets with the tenor voice part were added to the manuscript, but only containing the aria with the Latin text.

This way, the original disposition of the vocal part was changed. The name of Mozart was placed on the title page. The only change that was made was the insertion of the Latin text but only in the aria, omitting the recitative, and adding the tenor version with the original text (Figure 5). This addition may indicate that only the aria was used during the liturgy in the church.
Due to the inclusion of a new text in the main part of the manuscript, it was necessary to fragment the values in two bars – in the third, the quarter note was changed into two eighth notes, and in the fourth the original half-note was surrounded on both sides with quarter notes. These are indeed very small and the only changes that could have been made without rewriting the whole part. In spite of this, a separate tenor version was made, apparently for a specific performance that could have taken place in the church in Poznań. The original instrumentation was preserved and no changes to the musical composition were made in the other parts. The added Latin text does not match the affect of the original aria. Donna Elvira sings about how the ungrateful Don Giovanni cheated on her and made her unhappy as well as about her own eternal love for him. The text of “Festum diem recolentes” is, in turn, ceremonial and speaks of the joy of the holiday. Therefore, the choice of the Latin text seems quite accidental. This is an example of a typical contrafactum – only the text was changed, leaving the original music intact. Donna Elvira’s aria “Mi tradi quell’alma ingrata” from Act II of Mozart’s Don Giovanni could have been performed at the end of the 18th century in a church in Poznań during the service in the following form: tenor or soprano, with a changed text. This proves how quickly Mozart’s music reached the Commonwealth of Poland and was modified for local needs.
Case 3: Why was *Don Giovanni* performed during the Holy Mass?

On the Święta Góra near Gostyń/Gostyn, in the Archives of the Congregation of the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri (PL-GOkr) there is a collection of musical manuscripts which is the legacy of a vocal and instrumental ensemble active there. The once rich collection of about 1,000 compositions was dispersed after the dissolution of the monastery by the Prussians in 1876. Only a fifth of the entire collection, i.e. 211 compositions, has survived until today. The collection was catalogued by Danuta Idaszak and published...
in 2004 in the form of a thematic catalogue in the book *Muzyka u Księży Filipinów na Świętej Górze w Gostyniu* (Music of the Congregation of the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri on the Święta Góra in Gostyń). The character of the preserved collection does not differ from the two mentioned above. The collection includes both manuscripts and music prints from the second half of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century. A characteristic feature of the Gostyń collection is a relatively large number of preserved litanies (52) in relation to the whole collection. It certainly resulted from the function of the Oratorian church, which was and still is the sanctuary of Our Lady of Gostyń. The Polish composers whose works we find in the collection include, for example, Józef Zeidler, Jan Wański, Wojciech Dankowski or Adam Jędrowski. 18th-century foreign composers in the collection include among others: Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf, Alexius Gulitz, Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Václav Pichl, Ignaz Pleyel, František Pokorny, Augustin Senkyř and Johann Baptist Vanhal. Not surprisingly, we are most interested in the legacy related to Mozart. The collection includes, among others, two Mozart masses (shelfmarks: PL-GOkf, I/12 and I/13) preserved as separate parts which most probably come from the late 18th or early 19th centuries (Figures 6 and 7).

After an initial analysis, it turned out that the *ordinarium missae* text was adapted to fragments from the *Don Giovanni* opera. At the moment, we do not know the authors of these compilations. Nevertheless, it is an amazing example of the use of Mozart’s operatic music for a strictly liturgical text. The masses in such an arrangement were performed in the church during the liturgy! This material still requires an in-depth analysis – it should be precisely indicated which musical fragments come directly from *Don Giovanni* and which were composed by the probable arranger of the whole piece. Both masses offer so extensive research material that they should deserve a separate study. The acquisition of all sources and setting it with a music notation program in order to create a score, necessary for detailed analysis, requires a large undertaking, which is certainly worth performing. This will allow for the undertaking of a separate study combined with an edition of the source. However, it is worth looking at three examples found in one of the Gostyń masses (with the signature I/13) which come straight from Mozart’s music in order to show the scale of borrowing. The identification was made mainly on the basis of a manuscript comparison of the first violin part with its counterpart in the original version. A comparative analysis related to the difference, for example, in the instrumentation between the original and the mass has not yet been carried out. Below are mentioned the borrowings found in the manuscript of the *Don Giovanni* mass from the musical collection of the monastery ensemble of the Oratorians on Święta Góra near Gostyń and their original counterparts:

12 The score edition used here is: http://dme.mozarteum.at/DME/nma/nmapub_srch.php?l=1, 20.01.2020; Public Domain. Musical examples in this article were taken from this edition.
Figure 6: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Missa in D, shelfmark: PL-GOkf, I/12, title page.

Figure 7: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Missa in D, shelfmark: PL-GOkf, I/13, title page.
1. The beginning of the *Gloria* part is identical to the Act II finale, no. 26 Terzetto “Già la mensa è preparata” (Don Giovanni, Leporello, Donna Elvira).

*Figure 8: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Missa in D, shelfmark: PL-GOkf, I/13, the beginning of the Gloria, page of violino I.*

*Example 2: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Don Giovanni, the Act II finale, no. 26 Terzetto “Già la mensa è preparata”.*

\[ \text{Allegro vivace} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Violino I} \\
\end{array}
\]

2. The continuation of *Gloria*, fragment “Gratias”, corresponds to the Act II terzet, no. 16 “Ah taci, ingiusto core” (Donna Elvira, Don Giovanni, Leporello).

*Figure 9: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Missa in D, shelfmark: PL-GOkf, I/13, fragment “Gratias”, page of violino I.*
Example 3: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Don Giovanni, the Act II terzet, no. 16 “Ah taci, ingiusto core”.

![Musical notation](image1)

3. The *Credo* part from the mass I/13 is musically identical to Donna Elvira’s aria from Act I, no. 8 “Ah, fuggi il traditor!”.

*Figure 10: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Missa in D, shelfmark: PL-GO/kf, I/13, the beginning of the Credo, page of violino I.*

Example 4: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Don Giovanni, Donna Elvira’s aria from Act I, no. 8 “Ah, fuggi il traditor!”

![Musical notation](image2)

The examples above indicate that the various *ordinarium missae* parts are musically based on specific excerpts from *Don Giovanni*. It is not a hidden borrowing, taken from the middle of a certain fragment, but a transparent one, deriving the musical material straight from the exact movement from the very first bar. Further research on this mate-
rial will certainly allow us to answer whether the material undergoes different transformations in the course of the piece.

When identifying fragments of the mass, another source of borrowings from Mozart’s music, different from Don Giovanni, became evident. The beginning of the Sanctus in the same mass I/13 points to a borrowing from the Fantasy and Fugue in C major KV 394 (383a). The key of the original is changed from C major to D major, in which the mass is written. Finding this kind of borrowing in distant Poland, in the repertoire of a monastery ensemble, is very interesting. How did the person who created this compilation of opera music used for a mass setting and performed during the liturgy in the church, know Mozart’s keyboard music and so skillfully use it in the Sanctus? We have no evidence so far that Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s keyboard compositions were present in the preserved music collections of church ensembles operating in the former Commonwealth. Of course, this state of knowledge can change at any time. But it is probably worth thinking about other ways to solve this mystery. After all, this mass could have traveled as a complete piece to the Oratorians on Święta Góra near Gostyń and it was not created by any Polish arranger-composer operating in this place. It is worth looking for this type of mass in the preserved collections of church ensembles in Europe. Certainly, the RISM database is very helpful for this type of activity, which also proved to be a basic tool during the identification of the examples presented here. The masses, which are extant in the preserved music collections of the monastery ensemble operating on Święta Góra, are certainly not an isolated case. This kind of practice of creating re-compositions or compilations was a common phenomenon in the musical culture of all Europe of that time.\textsuperscript{13} However, there is still a huge necessity for research of this phenomenon. And let the following example be an inspiration for this:

\textit{Figure 11: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Missa in D, shelfmark: PL-GO$k$, I/13, the beginning of Sanctus, page of violino I part.}
Example 5: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Fantasy and Fugue in C major KV 394 (383a), the beginning of the Adagio.

Conclusion

Both Don Giovanni and Le nozze di Figaro were the most popular operas of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart in the Commonwealth of Poland at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th. The examples above clearly show this. Music from Mozart’s operas was adapted to the liturgy in the church, both to strictly liturgical texts, such as the ordinarium missae, as well as to more casual ones, as indicated by contrafacta of arias. It is also extremely surprising that an aria, a vocal-instrumental work, was arranged as a purely instrumental symphony. Importantly, not understood as a cyclical, but a one-piece type that was used for the entering or leaving during the service. Thus, a specific type of ecclesiastical symphony was created, which was at the service of the liturgy and used in its framing. Ways of using Mozart’s operatic music and presenting it in churches in the Commonwealth of Poland at the end of the 18th and early 19th centuries were, as we can see from these few examples, very diverse and imaginative. Churches became the stage for their presentation. Churches were very important for the dissemination of the latest music, of styles, composers and so on. In contrast to exclusive opera church music was accessible for everyone – from the pauper attending a church service until the aristocrat sitting on the favored places in the front rows. Thus, music for the higher ranks of society (as represented by opera music) is transferred to the people. Mozart’s operatic music reached the country on a regular basis and was adapted according to the needs of a given place. Undoubtedly, this matter requires further research, which I hope will result in a list of Mozart’s opera music preserved in the archives and libraries that possess collections of musical ensembles active at the time in the Commonwealth of Poland. It will allow this heritage to be placed in a wider international context. An interesting example is the use of Mozart’s keyboard music in the mass, as evidenced by the example presented above. Placing an initial fragment from the Fantasy and Fugue in C major KV 394 (383a) in the Sanctus can testify to familiarity not only with Mozart’s

operas, but also with his keyboard music. Of course, this hypothesis can turn out to be completely erroneous. Maybe the mass was brought to Święta Góra near Gostyń in such a form? This can only be resolved by further research, which is certainly worth continuing. Let this article become a good start for this process.
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Pasticcio *da chiesa*: Transforming Opera Arias into an Oratorio

The Case of Contrafacted Oratorios in Wrocław and Żagań from the Mid-18th Century

Katarzyna Spurgjasz

It is widely known and confirmed by numerous sources that operatic music often crossed the boundaries between sacred and profane, being often adopted and adapted for a religious context. Operatic form – with its recitatives, arias, ensembles, stylistic and rhetorical features – was imported to present various *historiae sacrae* in the form of an oratorio. The arias and ensembles themselves were imported to the church and through the *contrafactum* technique, popular for many centuries, the profane text was replaced with a sacred one. The music, however, remained almost the same.

Creating a new opera from different existing arias – a well-known phenomenon and one examined in the present volume under the name of pasticcio – occurred also in the sacred context. In fact, at least in some cases, such a pasticcio was a combination of the transformation of an opera into an oratorio and of a secular piece to a sacred *contrafactum*. The case study in my analysis of this hybrid form will be an oratorio-pasticcio which is preserved in two sources. The first is a music manuscript, containing six vocal and six instrumental parts, now preserved at the Music Department of the Warsaw University Library (PL-Wu, RM 5325). The second is a printed libretto containing the same text, but deriving from a slightly different place and time, and now held at the Wrocław/Breslau University Library (PL-WRu, Gabinet Śląsko-Łużycki, Yu 50/434). Both sources were created in the region of Lower Silesia. The music manuscript was written in the Canons Regular monastery in Żagań/Sagan (about 150 km north-west of Wrocław) in 1764. The libretto print was published twelve years earlier in Wrocław itself, printed in the Jesuits’ printing house, documenting a spectacle that took place in the Jesuit church in Wrocław in 1752.

1 The author was awarded the scholarship of the Foundation for Polish Science for young scientists (START) for the academic year 2018/19.
In my paper I would like firstly to present this oratorio-pasticcio as a musical piece: how it was constructed, and how the pre-existing operatic material was adapted to a new context, both in terms of text and music. Secondly, I will analyze how the two existing sources – the music manuscript and the printed libretto – complement each other and enable us to answer some questions concerning the transmission of the repertoire as well as the cultural context of the two centers in which this oratorio was performed in the second half of the 18th century.

The music manuscript from Żagań was the first of the two sources that I encountered. It is now stored in the Warsaw University Library among other music manuscripts and prints from Silesian monasteries secularized in 1810 by the Prussian authorities (those sources were transferred from Wrocław to Warsaw in 1952, and that is why they are now stored outside their region of origin). On the title page of the manuscript we can see the title, a list of parts and a provenance note with a date (1764). There is no information about the composer, so at first sight this oratorio remains anonymous. The RISM database however enables the identification of music material due to the resemblance of music incipits, which is now significantly faster and more precise than it used to be in the times of printed thematic catalogues only.

While comparing the musical material of the subsequent arias and ensembles of the oratorio to the resources of the RISM database, it turned out that seven pieces of the oratorio – four arias, one arioso and two ensembles – can be identified as fragments from operas and oratorios of at least three different composers. It is due to that identification that this composition can be classified as a pasticcio. The text however has been completely changed, because the original arias were derived mostly from secular works with Italian librettos, and then transformed into German sacred contrafacta. The libretto of this oratorio remains quite conventional, presenting the Soul (“Anima”, soprano) in discourse with different allegorical figures: Hope (“Die Hoffnung”, soprano), Reason (“Die Vernunft”, alto), Divine Love (“Die Göttliche Liebe”, tenor), Faith (“Der Glaube”, tenor) and Envy (“Der Neid”, bass). Their conversation refers often to the topic of redemption of the soul due to the Passion of Christ – as this oratorio was performed at the Holy Sepulchre either on Good Friday or Holy Saturday, being strictly bound to the Holy Week celebrations. The author of the text is not known and both the manuscript and the printed libretto do not bear any attributions.

Let us have a look at the structure of this oratorio, presumably to see which parts of it can be identified as contrafacta, and from which operas and oratorios they have been derived. It should be noted, however, that when the resources of incipits in the RISM

---

2 On the history of this collection see e.g.: MRYGOŃ, 1994, pp. 292-300; BURCHARD, 2005, pp. 91-99; DROŻDŻEWSKA, 2012.

database are eventually enlarged to contain more operas and oratorios, the fragments not yet identified may also turn out to be contrafacted opera excerpts.

Table 1: Overview of the oratorio with identified contrafacta and their sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of the oratorio</th>
<th>Identified contrafacta sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduzione</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recitativo: “Ach ihr flügelreiche Schaaren”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria 1: “Sind Berg und Thäler grün”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recitativo: “Wenn wahre Zufriedenheit”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aria 2: “Siehe jene Sternen”             | Carl Heinrich Graun, *Catone in Utica*  
(aria “Se in campo armato”) |
| Recitativo: “Fröhliche Post”             |                                |
| Arioso: “Ich eile ohne Rast”             |                                |
| Recitativo: “Thörechte Jugend”           |                                |
| Aria 3: “Wer vergnügte Stunden”           | Johann Adolf Hasse, *Il natal di Giove*  
(aria “D’atre nubi è il sol ravvolto”) |
| Recitativo: “Wenn dies allein”           |                                |
(duet “Sia propizia desir tuoi dell’amor”) |
| Recitativo: “Betrachte das Ende”          |                                |
| Aria 4: “Wie der Blitz und Donner”        |                                |
| Recitativo: “Nach solchen Freuden”        |                                |
| Arioso: “Stete Lust”                      |                                |
| Recitativo: “Hier siehe den Schöpfer”     |                                |
| Aria 5: “Siehe an die goldne Sonne”       |                                |
| Recitativo: “Niernals hat in meiner Brust” |                                |
(duet “Ah che fa la pigra Aurora”) |
| Recitativo: “Undanckbares Geschäft”      |                                |
| Aria 6: “Siehe jene offne Wunden”         | C.H. Graun, *Ifigenia in Aulide*  
(aria “Non sa il mio Nume amato”) |
| Recitativo: “O unermessene Güte”          |                                |
| Arioso: “Ach wer giebt mir”               | J.A. Hasse, *Didone abbandonata*  
(aria “Tacerò se tu lo brami”) |
| Recitativo: “Auff! Auff!”                 |                                |
| Aria 7: “O! Vermenschchter Gott”          | J.G. Schürer, *La passione di Gesù Cristo*  
(aria “Potea quel pianto”) |
| Recitativo: “Unbeglückte Stunden”         |                                |
| Coro: “Kommet, eilet”                     |                                |

At present, the other pieces remain anonymous: the instrumental opening part, *Introduzione*, scored for two violins, viola and organ; the first recitative and aria for soprano
solo, sung by the Soul (Anima); the recitative and arioso also sung by Anima; the fourth aria for alto solo, the subsequent arioso, the fifth aria for tenor solo, and the final ensemble for six voices. All the other arias and ensembles have been identified as contrafacta.

The first of them is the aria for tenor solo, “Siehe jene Sternen”, identified as a contrafactum of Carl Heinrich Graun’s aria “Se in campo armato” from Catone in Utica (Berlin 1744).\(^4\) After examining the two versions in a more detailed way, we can observe that the elaboration of the original material consists not only of the change of text, but also of voice (the part has been transposed an octave lower to make a tenor aria from a soprano one), and of the material itself, changing some passages in the middle of the piece to newly composed ones. In the first part of the aria the vocal material has been somehow simplified or adjusted rhythmically to the new text, while the bass line remains almost untouched (see Example 1).

Example 1: “Se in campo armato” (S, cemb) vs. “Siehe jene Sternen” (T, org), bars 8-13.

\(^4\) See e.g. F-Pn, D-5000, manuscript copy of the opera available online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84581965/f149.image.r, 21.12.2019; see also D-SWl, Mus. 2120 (RISM ID no. 240001955).
The next aria – “Wer vergnügte Stunden” for solo bass – turned out to be derived from Johann Adolf Hasse’s serenata *Il natal di Giove* (Hubertusburg 1749),\(^5\) however also transposed and elaborated; some passages from the vocal part have been totally changed (see Example 2).

*Example 2:* “D’atre nubi è il sol ravvolto” (S, vl 1, b) vs. “Wer vergnügte Stunden” (B, vl 1, org), bars 28-36.

The subsequent terzetto with the incipit “Ach wohin soll ich”, identified as an aria taken from another opera by Carl Heinrich Graun, this time *Ifigenia in Aulide* (Berlin 1748),\(^6\) also required a lot of ‘editorial work’ from our anonymous ‘contrafactor’, who has not

---

5 See e.g. D-LEu, N.I.10311 (RISM ID no. 200043801).

6 See e.g. D-DI, Mus.2953-F-1 (RISM ID no. 212009096).
only replaced one text with another, but also moved some melismas to other parts of the text in order to emphasize new significant words. Furthermore, as the new plot required a conversation between three actors at the same time, he changed the original duet “Sia propizia desir tuo dell’amor” into a terzet – thus the disposition of the musical material between the voices had to be changed; some phrases have been added and some others deleted to meet the new arrangement’s requirements (see Example 3).

Example 3: “Sia propizia desir” (S I, S II, b) vs. “Ach wohin soll ich” (S, T, B, org), bars 15-20.

Then follows a duet “Ach vergnügte Himmels Auen” for two sopranos, which is based on a piece from Johann Georg Schürer’s Astrea placata (Warsaw 1746). The original was also a duet, “Ah che fa la pigra Aurora”, however designed for a soprano and a tenor. In the contrafacted piece the tenor part is transposed an octave higher for the second soprano, and sometimes the disposition of the musical material between the two voices is different. The next aria, “Siehe jene offne Wunden” for tenor solo, on the contrary, has been made of a soprano aria transposed an octave lower, “Non sa il mio Nume

---

7 See e.g. D-DI, Mus.3096-F-1 (RISM ID no. 212006958).
amato”, from the already mentioned *Ifigenia in Aulide* by Carl Heinrich Graun.\(^8\) The subsequent arioso, “Ach wer giebt mir” for soprano solo, is the second piece by Johann Adolf Hasse, this time from his opera *Didone abbandonata* (Hubertusburg 1742),\(^9\) with the original incipit “Tacerò se tu lo brami”. The last solo aria, “O vermesschter Gott” for soprano solo, has been identified as a *contrafactum* of “Potea quel pianto” from Johann Georg Schürer’s oratorio *La passione di Gesù Cristo* (1746).\(^10\) The original scoring has been maintained, thus only the two flutes play in this aria, which is noted on the title page (“Flaut. traversiers 2bus pro Aria ultima”).

To sum up this overview, we can see that seven numbers of the oratorio have been derived from six different pieces of music-dramatic works, including five operas and one oratorio, all of them with Italian texts. The list of composers, however, is shorter and contains three persons, each of them being an author of at least two contrafacted pieces. Carl Heinrich Graun, Johann Adolph Hasse and Johann Georg Schürer were among the most popular composers in those times, at least in Central Europe. The first of them was active at the Prussian court, and the reception of his works in Silesia was probably to some extent connected to political changes; the region belonged to the Prussian authorities as a result of several wars between 1740 and 1763. Hasse and Schürer were at that time connected mainly to the Dresden court. In the collection of 18\(^{th}\)-century Silesian music manuscripts from the dissolved monasteries – including those from Wrocław and Żagań – there is a huge amount of sacred *contrafacta* of operatic music.\(^11\) If we made a list of composers of those pieces, we would see that the most popular among them were Carl Heinrich Graun and Johann Adolph Hasse, both with hundreds of contrafacted arias which are still preserved; Schürer, however, was much less popular in this area, with only seven records of his compositions in this collection, among them only three contrafacted arias.

\*Table 2: Sources of contrafacta (original operas and oratorios) with date of first performance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Opera/Oratorio</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Hasse</td>
<td><em>Didone abbandonata</em></td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H. Graun</td>
<td><em>Catone in Utica</em></td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.G. Schürer</td>
<td><em>Astrea placata</em></td>
<td>1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.G. Schürer</td>
<td><em>La passione di Gesù Cristo</em></td>
<td>1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H. Graun</td>
<td><em>Ifigenia in Aulide</em></td>
<td>1748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Hasse</td>
<td><em>Il natal di Giove</em></td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) See e.g. D-Dl, Mus.2953-F-1 (RISM ID no. 212009096).
\(^9\) See e.g. D-Dl, Mus.2477-F-35 (RISM ID no. 270000685).
\(^10\) See e.g. D-Dl, Mus.3096-D-9 (RISM ID no. 212006954).
We can also see that all the original operas and oratorios have been performed for the first time between 1742 and 1749. The music manuscript containing this pasticcio, dated 1764, is quite a late testimony of reception, but the printed libretto from 1752 situates the material more closely in time.

The main question here is whether the other fragments of our oratorio, which are also very likely to be contrafacted, have been derived from other trendy operas by well-known composers – as was the case with many pasticcios – or if they belonged to a more local music production, and their lack of identification is probably the result of the lack of original sources.

The arias used during the 18th century in churches were of different musical quality, style and taste. That depended obviously on the composer of the original piece, but not only. The final effect of a contrafactum included also its elaboration in terms of the new text, its correspondence with music, affect, rhetorical features etc., not to mention here the skills of the performers. Making a contrafactum – especially a convincing one – seems quite similar to a literary translation of a poetic form, where the translator has at once to observe the strict rules of metrics and rhymes, and to find the appropriate words to fill this existing form with meanings and rhetoric in the most perfect way possible. Obviously not all the authors of contrafacta were excellent musical translators, but we can observe different attempts at transforming one piece to another, depending on the musical skills of the elaborator.

Observing the arranger’s workshop leads us to the question of his identity and the context of his activity. We have plenty of contrafacted arias from 18th-century Silesian monasteries, but the authors of those contrafacta remain anonymous in most cases. Most of them seem however to work locally, in the monasteries themselves, working as cantors or regentes chori, providing musical material for everyday liturgical and non-liturgical performance practice. Some sources bear traces of their ‘contrafacting’ work, containing both the original, secular text of a piece, and a new one (or more) inserted below. The compiler of our oratorio-pasticcio might also have worked locally, in the Canons Regular Monastery in Żagań, and that was also my assumption, at least until I came across the second source, the printed libretto.

The title page of the libretto does not reveal to us the name of the composer, nor of the author of the text. It contains, however, the interesting information that the oratorio had been “conceived some years ago and set to music by a priest of the Society of Jesus” (“vor einigen Jahren entworffen und in die Music gesetzt von einem Priester der Gesellschaft Jesu”). The performance took place at 7 PM on Good Friday 1752 (31 March), in the Jesuit Academic Church in Wrocław. 12 The performers are not mentioned,
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but we may suppose that they were all – both vocalists and instrumentalists – from the Jesuit school there.\textsuperscript{13}

Our oratorio-pasticcio seems to have moved from 1752 Wroclaw to 1764 Żagań, from the Jesuits to the Canons' Regular. Let us add one or two facts to the history of transmissions and cultural relations between Wroclaw and Żagań. The music manuscript with the oratorio was written by a single person, but the copyist – according to this source only – is unknown. Fortunately, he has also written some other manuscripts, and through a comparative analysis of the handwriting, he could be identified as Anton Tintz. In the 1730s he studied in Wroclaw, and during his education he copied some music manuscripts for the Canons Regular monastery there, S. Maria in Arena.\textsuperscript{14} Some years later he became a Canon Regular himself; it is not known whether he entered the convent in Wroclaw and then moved to Żagań, but in 1753 he was certainly in Żagań, recorded as cantor and \textit{regens chori}.\textsuperscript{15}

The same family name links him to Karl Tintz, a Jesuit, born in 1718, who spent many years in Wroclaw. He was a prefect of music in Chomutov/Komotau, Żagań and Wroclaw, and his musical skills are documented in different sources.\textsuperscript{16} He also had some connections with the Canons Regular monastery in Żagań; as a theologian and Jesuit priest he was in charge of giving the \textit{imprimatur} to a catechismal publication of the Żagań monk Johann Ignaz von Felbiger.\textsuperscript{17} The coincidence seems to be very attractive, especially in the context of cultural contacts between the Wroclaw Jesuits and the Żagań Canons Regular, but to my knowledge there is no further proof that Anton and Karl Tintz were brothers or relatives. There could also be other paths of transmission between those two \textit{milieux}, as both Jesuits and Canons Regular had their houses in Wroclaw and in Żagań at that time.\textsuperscript{18}

To conclude, these two sources – the handwritten parts and the printed libretto – may be useful for at least three different research questions. The first is the question of transmission between musical genres: from operas and arias to \textit{contrafacta}, oratorios, pasticcios and finally to contrafacted oratorio-pasticcios, a hybrid form that we can observe in this case, for example in terms of relations between music and text, or in terms of selection of the repertoire used for such a performance; this question is not far from the issues of musical taste or local performance practice.

The second question is about the reception and transmission of a musical piece – in this case of an operatic aria or ensemble – through space, time and performance context. The music moved from theaters to churches, from Dresden and Berlin to Wroclaw and Żagań, from a Jesuit school to the Canons’ Regular monastery. The networks of culture

\textsuperscript{13} On the music culture of the Wroclaw Jesuits see Jeż, 2019.
\textsuperscript{14} PL-Wu, RM 5254, RM 5600.
\textsuperscript{16} See e.g. \textit{Catalogi triennales Provinciae Silesiae SJ}, I-Rar, Boh. 202, fols. 58v, 152r, 243v.
\textsuperscript{17} See e.g. Conrads, 2004, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{18} See e.g. Jeż, 2019.
functioned due to the networks of people, who through their personal acquaintances and mutual work environment shared and transferred musical repertoire as well.

The last – but not least – question is about the complementarity of the sources, which enables us to reconstruct some fragments of a lost music collection. In this case – as the music collection of the Wrocław Jesuits has been completely lost – we can reconstruct an oratorio performed there, a libretto of which has been preserved, on a basis of a music manuscript from another center. At the same time, it is also a trace of further reception of such works, proving that typical Holy Week oratorios, performed by students, could have been played more than once and more than in one center. If we had a catalogue of 18th-century printed librettos of oratorios, including lists of dramatic roles and text incip- its, it would probably turn out that not all the music for them which has been considered lost is actually lost. But at present such a catalogue remains only a prospect.

Sources

10 Proprium missae; parts: PL-Wu, RM 5600.
GRAUN, CARL HEINRICH, Due Aria del Opera Catone; parts: D-SWl, Mus.2120.
Id., Ifigenia in Aulide; parts: D-DI, Mus.2953-F-1.
Id., Opera di Catone dell’Sigr. Graun; score: F-Pn, D-5000, online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84581965/f149.image.r (and other sources).
HASSE, JOHANN ADOLF, Didone abbandonata; score: D-DI, Mus.2477-F-35.
Id., Il natal di Giove; score: D-LEu, N.I.10311.
Musicalisches Oratorium oder Christlich-vermünftige Gedancken über den Creutz-
Weeg; libretto: PL-WRu, Gabinet Śląsko-Łużycki, Yu 50/434.
Oratorium pro S. Sepulchro Domini; parts: PL-Wu, RM 5325.
Schlesische Instantien-Notitz, oder Das jetzt lebende Schlesien, des 1753sten Jahres,
zum Gebrauch der Hohen und Niederen…, Breslau: Brachvogelischen Erben [s.d.]
SCHÜRER, JOHANN GEORG, Astrea placata; score: D-DI, Mus.3096-F-1.
Id., La passione di Gesù Cristo; partial autograph score: D-DI, Mus.3096-D-9.
Vesperae solennes de Beata; parts: PL-Wu, RM 5254.
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6. Pasticcio Between Philology and Materiality
Apostolo Zeno’s Venceslao (Venice 1703) and its Pasticcio Version Vincislao re di Polonia (London 1717) 
A Case Study with Stops in Florence, Milan and Naples 

Anna Ryszka-Komarnicka

When one considers the presence of Apostolo Zeno’s Venceslao on the London stage in the first half of the 18th century, one typically thinks of the pasticcio prepared by George Frideric Handel in 1731. It consisted of arias drawn from a range of operas, principally those of Leonardo Vinci and Johann Adolf Hasse, but also one or two pieces from Nicola Porpora, Antonio Lotti, Giuseppe Maria Orlandini, Giovanni Porta and Giovanni Maria Capelli. It was performed by a set of Handel’s Italian stars – Francesco Bernardi, known as Senesino (Casimiro), Antonia Margherita Merighi (Lucinda), Francesca Bertolli (Ernando), Anna Maria Strada del Pò (Erenice) and Annibale Pio Fabri (Venceslao). The history of the use of Zeno’s libretto at the Queen’s Theatre and the King’s Theatre in London stretches back, however, to an earlier period and is connected with the pasticcios that starred – as primo uomo – one of the most celebrated castratos of all time, Nicola Grimaldi, known as Nicolini. The present article takes that period as its focus.

Venice

The first ever performance of Apostolo Zeno’s Venceslao took place in Venice in 1703 at the Teatro Grimani di San Giovanni Grisostomo. The quality of the five-act libretto confirmed the reputation of the theater as the most prestigious in the city. The ambitious subject matter, modelled on a French tragedy by Jean Rotrou, comprised a plotline of romantic entanglement and the problems of good governance (“L’arte, sì, del ben regnar”

1 Strohm, 1985, pp. 173-177.
as the eponymous king puts it in one of his arias). Celebrations of state events woven into the *dramma per musica* – the return of the king’s favorite, Ernando, from a victorious military campaign (I,1), the celebrations of peace (II,1-2) and the declaration of a new leader after the abdication of the king in the *scena ultima* – required scenes with a large cast of extras, a choir, allegorical figures, occasional instrumental pieces (marches, sounds of trumpets and drums) and *balli*. In a letter, Zeno expressed the view that in Venice *Venceslao* enjoyed more applause than it deserved. Along with the lavish staging another reason for its success was certainly the music by Carlo Francesco Pollarolo (his twentieth work for the Teatro Grimani, as the libretto print proudly notes), executed by a star-studded cast. Four characters have a particularly high number of arias (see Table 1). Zeno and Pollarolo gave Nicola Grimaldi, the *primo uomo* (Casimiro), twelve numbers (ten arias and two duets). The *prima donna* (Lucinda) came nearly next in the hierarchy of roles. The excellent soprano, Diamante Maria Scarabelli, then at the height of her powers, sang nine numbers (seven arias and two duets). Matching her tally with nine arias, the *secondo uomo* (Ernando) was played by Francesco de Grandis, a soprano castrato then enjoying nearly as much popularity as Grimaldi. Zeno assigned eight arias to the king (Venceslao) but Pollarolo set to music only seven of them. They were sung by the tenor Giovanni Buzzoleni. The *seconda donna* (Erenice), however, had only four arias, and was sung by Caterina Azzolini, whose star was evidently shining less brightly than those of some other singers. The alto castrato Giambattista Tamburini as the *ultima parte* (Gismondo) had to make the most of two arias. The unusual role of Prince Alessandro, who at one point disappears from the action (Casimiro murders him in Act III), was unconventionally assigned to a bass, Pietro Moggi (or Mozzi), who had only one aria. The peculiarities of the *Venceslao* libretto proved to be one of the main reasons why the piece would be altered dramatically when presented elsewhere.

**Florence**

As with Zeno’s earlier *drammi per musica* premiered in Venice (e.g. *I rivali generosi*, *Faramondo* and *Griselda*), *Venceslao* was quickly taken up by the Teatro Cocomero

---

2 The opera is distinguished by how carefully the subject matter of the *balli* is matched by events in the unfolding action. In the scene where Peace triumphs over Discord there is a *ballo* for Discord’s entourage (II,2) and in the *scena ultima* people are dancing to celebrate the coronation of the new king. The *ballo* of Polish sculptors, who are working on a tombstone for the murdered Prince Alessandro, serves to introduce the scene in which his widow, Princess Erenice, laments his death (IV,1).


4 This is comprised entirely of arias set to music by Pollarolo. Omissions of numbers and of verses in the recitatives are indicated in the libretto prints by open speech marks. See Dorsi, 1996, p. 166.
Apostolo Zeno’s Venceslao and its Pasticcio Version Vincislao re di Polonia

in Florence. It was performed during the 1704 carnival thanks to Zeno’s enthusiastic patron, the Grand Prince of Tuscany, Ferdinando III de’ Medici. The composition was entitled here Vincislao. A note from the publisher of the libretto (“Lo stampatore a chi legge”), written in a tone highly respectful to Zeno, explained that the original text had undergone minor changes because of the constraints of the local theater and the new cast. Out of necessity the scenes involving a large cast were shortened and the balli removed. The piece was streamlined into the three-act structure familiar to Italian audiences. There were also several instances of Zeno’s words being altered or replaced with entirely new lines (see Table 2: Venceslao, Venice 1703 and Vincislao, Florence 1704).

One new aria was given to Alessandro (I,2), sung en travesti by Giulia Falconi. Also Erenice, interpreted by Vittoria Rizzi, had one more aria to sing. The role of the secondo uomo – much more elaborate in the Venetian version, presumably reflecting the prestige of de Grandis – was performed in Florence by Francesco Bertoldi in a curtailed and less vocally demanding version. Following the removal of the arias “Abbiam vinto”, “Lo sdegno e ’l brando” and “Sarà gloria a la costanza”, he would no longer have had to sing either heroic or revenge arias, which tended to put significant demands on performers.

We do not know who was responsible for the changes. When scene buffe were added to Griselda the previous year, similar alterations were made by the famous playwright Girolamo Gigli. As we know from Zeno’s letter mentioned above, the poet accepted the changes given that they did not excessively alter his libretto.\footnote{Letter from Zeno to Antonio Francesco Marmi in Florence, 24 February 1702 [more veneto [= 1703]. Cf. SELFRIDGE-FIELD, 2007, p. 247.} We also know that its composer, Tomaso Albinoni, was involved in preparations for the performance, and may have composed new arias. No comic elements were expected to form part of the production of Vincislao in Florence. Nothing is known about the role of Pollarolo in the rehearsals. None of the four new texts for arias conformed to the meter of the original poems, so it would have been difficult to use the original music. Furthermore, one of the arias – Erenice’s “Perchè ingannarmi” – was taken from Il più fedel fra i vassalli with music by Francesco Gasparini (the premiere of this opera took place in Venice at about the same time as Venceslao, i.e. in 1702/1703 carnival, at the Teatro Tron di San Cassiano).\footnote{The production in Florence of Il più fedel fra i vassalli (autumn 1704) did not include Oron-ta’s aria “Non ingannarmi”. In its place there was a new piece “Non ti credo ingannator” (III,6), probably taken from another opera. There might be a connection with the fact that the audiences in Florence already knew Gasparini’s “Non ingannarmi” with its slightly different opening line (“Perchè ingannarmi”), having heard it several months earlier in Vincislao.} All these things suggest that not only this piece, but also the other new numbers of the Florentine Vincislao, may have been imported from other operas.
Milan

The next production of Venceslao took place towards the end of 1705 at the Regio Ducal Teatro in Milan (the dedication in the libretto bears the date 19 December 1705). One of Erenice’s numbers, which was changed in the Florentine production (see text marked in bold), was heard in Milan in the same version:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703, I,11</th>
<th>Florence 1703/04 &amp; Milan 1705/06, I,11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non amarmi:</td>
<td>Meco non giova il fingere,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non pregarmi</td>
<td>Non giova il sospirar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So che inganni: non ti amerò.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usa lusinghe e vezzi:</td>
<td>Usa lusinghe, e vezzi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenta minacce e sprezzi:</td>
<td>Tenta minacce, e sprezzi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma per te non hò.</td>
<td>Nò, non ti posso amar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Milan the crowd scenes and the balli were restored, albeit partially, as were several of the original arias. On the other hand – according to a note appended to Zeno’s foreword – “it was necessary to alter some of the arias to suit the performers, who already had some music well-suited for their talents, and those are not by the author.” The Milanese Venceslao, then, is not so much a pasticcio as an opera impasticciata, to use Giovanni Polin’s classification. The use of the word “some” (“alcune”) in the foreword does not, however, indicate the extent of the changes – almost half of the numbers are most likely not composed by Pollarolo (see Table 3).

The Milanese edition of the libretto does not give the names of the performers, which makes it more difficult to establish the sources of the interpolated arias. Nonetheless it is possible at this stage of research to identify two main dramm per musica in which numbers with identical or extremely similar lyrical content appear: L’Arminio and L’onestà nell’amori with music by Antonio Caldara, performed in Genoa in 1704-1705. The largest number of pieces identified to date relate to the roles of Diamante Maria Scarabelli and Santa Stella Lotti. It is then likely that both women took part in the Milanese production of Venceslao, the former as the prima donna, Lucinda, and the latter as the seconda donna, Erenice, making use of the arias that had most recently been written for them. The introduction of new numbers is not surprising in the instance of Erenice – the modest role assigned to the seconda donna in Zeno’s original libretto was ready to be significantly expanded. With nine arias, Erenice now made as many appearances as Lucinda and even one more than the secondo uomo, Ernando. More surprising is the number of new numbers sung, most likely, by Diamantina (seven out of nine). It seems that she left behind most of the music that almost three years earlier Pollarolo had written for her. Some of those new arias turn up again in Scarabelli’s later

---

7 “Si sono dovute mutare alcune arie a piacere de’ Signori Attori, per le quali avevano la Musica di lor genio, e queste non sono dell’Autore.” ZENO, 1705, pp. 4f.
8 POLIN, 2011, pp. 336f.
roles – Lucinda in *Venceslao* in Bologna (1708) or *Partenope* in *La Partenope* in Venice (1707), adding credence to the conjecture that she was the *prima donna* in the Milanese production. The role of the eponymous king was significantly cut back, leaving him with only four arias. In dedicating the Milanese production to the Duchess of Mantua, Suzanne Henriette of Lorraine-Elbeufs, the performance highlighted affairs of the heart rather than affairs of state.

**Between Italy and London – musical sources to 1703-1705 *Venceslao* productions**

There is a manuscript collection of twelve arias related to the Milanese production. Some of the arias are probably from Pollarolo’s original score (although – as we shall see – it is hard to be certain) and some use new texts from the 1705 printed libretto.9 A London audience – without knowing it – could have encountered a selection of arias from Pollarolo’s *Venceslao* during the 1712 carnival as eight numbers were included in the pasticcio *Ambleto*. Seven of them were published in the collection *Songs in the Opera of Hamlet* (J. Walsh, London 1712), which significantly expands the amount of material surviving from the first performance in Venice. Aside from Alessandro’s bass aria, it made use of pieces performed by stars of the Venetian stage: Grimaldi himself (Casimiro), Scarabelli (Lucinda) and de Grandis (Ernando). These were shared primarily amongst female singers at the London performance: Elisabetta Pilotti-Schiavonetti, Isabella Girardeau, Margarita de l’Epine and Jane Barbier. Grimaldi as Ambleto sang mainly Gasparini’s arias, composed especially for him on the occasion of the *prima assoluta* of *Ambleto* in Venice in carnival 1706. A number taken from the end of Act II of Caldara’s *Partenope* was added to Ambleto’s role in London – “Amanti voi, che andate” (Grimaldi appeared as Prince Arsace in the first ever performance of this opera in Venice in 1707), and also – in all likelihood – “D’ire armato il braccio forte” from Pollarolo’s *Venceslao*.

The example of this last aria demonstrates the complexity of research into pasticcios. It was at one time considered to have been drawn from Gasparini’s *Ambleto*,10 but no piece with such an opening line is included in any of the Italian editions of the libretto before the London pasticcio (Venice 1706, Florence and Verona 1707, Naples 1711). Furthermore, it has been possible to identify two different – albeit expressively similar – musical settings of this text, extant in three sources:

---

9 D-SW1, Mus.5534. The manuscript also comprises a selection of arias from *Teuzzone*. The title-pages of both collections (*Opera di Venceslao*, *Opera di Teuzzone*) are dated 1704, which is clearly a mistake. *Teuzzone* was performed at the 1706 carnival in Milan, probably shortly after the first performance of *Venceslao*. Zeno’s dedication to the Governor of Milan, Prince Charles Henri of Lorraine-Vaudemont, bears the date “Venice, 9.I.1706”.

10 ROBERTS, 1986, p. IX.
• the first setting in the Milan collection of arias from *Venceslao*;
• another setting in *Songs in the Opera of Hamlet* and in the manuscript of Act III of Nicola Fago’s *Radamisto* with the text “D’ire armata la mia sorte”\(^{11}\) (first performance at the Teatro di Piedimonte on the occasion of an aristocratic wedding in the Sanseverino family in 1707).\(^{12}\)

It appears to be the case that the Milanese collection should have included Pollarolo’s aria (the text of the aria is identical to the Venice version), and Grimaldi in London selected Fago’s piece; the reasons are unclear but perhaps not surprising as Fago was his brother-in-law.\(^{13}\) In the first edition of the libretto to *Radamisto*, with words by Nicola Giuvo and music by Nicola Fago, published in Venice in 1707, there is, however, no such aria. The piece can be found in 1709, in Florence, sung by Andrea Pacini (or Pascini) as Radamisto (in the Venice 1707 edition, we find at this point – III,11 – the aria “Tormentata se ben l’onda”, sung by the first Radamisto – Domenico Tempesti). Given the following three facts, namely that the text of the aria “D’ire armata la mia sorte” doubtlessly paraphrases “D’ire armato il braccio forte”, that the accompanying music is that sung in London by the first performer of the aria, and that Pacini himself took the role of Casimiro in Pollarolo’s *Venceslao* in Verona in 1708, it is highly likely that he brought the piece to the Florentine production of *Radamisto* in 1709. In this way Pollarolo’s number found its way into the score under the name of Nicola Fago. It is possible, therefore, that the unknown performer playing Casimiro in Milan worked with different music, adapting to it Zeno’s original text. Curiously, the Milanese aria appears to be technically more demanding, particularly taking into account the vocal power required (several bars of *tenuta*), than the hypothetical original version sung in Venice and then in London by Grimaldi (and by Pacini in Florence).

London audiences of the pasticcio *Antioco*, based on Gasparini’s *Il più fedel fra i vassalli*, would have met with two other arias that have connections with the Milanese *versione impasticciata* of *Venceslao*. The first was Leonildo’s aria “Sei mia gioia” (I,2) from the repertoire of Diamante Scarabelli, sung by Jane Barbier\(^ {14}\) and the second was Oronta’s aria “Si candida, e si bella” (I,5) interpreted by Isabella Girardeau and taken from the repertoire of Santa Stella Lotti. Both pieces were printed in the collection *Songs in the Opera Antiochus* (London 1712).

---

11 D-MEIr, F 618.
12 For more on the musical activities at the court of Aurora Sanseverino see Costantini/Magaudda, 2001.
13 Speranza, 2002.
14 The London publication of the libretto for *Antioco* features “Non ingannarmi” in I,2. Jane Barbier must therefore have decided to replace it with “Sei mia gioia” at the last moment. In the original version of *Il più fedel fra i vassalli*, that aria (“Non ingannarmi”) appeared in Oronta’s part in III,6, and in the corresponding scene in London Barbier sang “Sento nel mio piacer” (III,7).
There is a total of 20 arias bound up with the Venetian and Milanese productions of *Venceslao*, largely thanks to Grimaldi’s artistic endeavors in London. It should be emphasized that this is a large number indeed, given the generally poor survival rate of pieces in the operatic repertoire at the turn of the 18th century. There are two settings of the aria “D’irre armato il braccio forte”. There are also two arias to choose between from the repertoire of Diamantina, in the same scene (I,5) – “Torna al lido la navicella” from the Venetian production and “Come di fronda in fronda” from the Milanese version. Both pieces are simile arias, and both are attractive vocally although they differ in terms of expression. The first, virtuosic, lively (a *gigue* in 12/8 time), in a major key, brings out Lucinda’s joyous hope about her encounter with Casimiro. The second piece, more subdued, in a minor key, explores the character’s unease about how the meeting will unfold. This example demonstrates that the intention to include a more recent aria, which was presumably the main reason to choose this number, could entirely transform the way a character was portrayed in a specific dramatic situation.

The three first editions of the libretto *Venceslao* – the Venetian *editio princeps*, the Florentine version and the Milanese one – became the basis for a range of productions of the opera over at least 25 years, often with new music provided by new composers (see Table 4). It was not a unique state of affairs – a similar fate befell Zeno’s *Griselda*, where some of the changes made in Florence by Gigli shaped the subsequent reception of the libretto, appearing in later editions of the text (some of the alterations can be found in Vivaldi’s 1735 *Griselda*, with a libretto reworked by Carlo Goldoni).15

**London**

The 1717 London production of *Vincislao re di Polonia*, once again prepared with Grimaldi as *primo uomo* in mind, took as its starting point the 1714 production in Naples at the Teatro San Bartolomeo.16 The Italian castrato, during a short trip to the continent, had again tackled the role of the quick-tempered Prince Casimiro who murdered his own brother out of jealousy for Princess Erenice before undergoing a moral transformation to become a worthy ruler alongside the faithful Queen of Lithuania, Lucinda. On this occasion the music – unfortunately now considered lost – was written by Francesco Mancini. The cast was full of stars – next to Grimaldi, there were Marianna Benti Bulgarelli as Lucinda, Angiola Augusti as Erenice and Giovanna Albertini *en travesti* as Ernando.

The Neapolitan libretto constitutes an interesting pasticcio of texts from several earlier productions of the opera. Apart from the broad arc of the story and – consequently – a good deal of the recitatives, only nine numbers remained from Zeno’s original text (in other words slightly less than a quarter), seven of them being located in Casimiro’s role. The Florentine version was rather taken as one of the models here, and not the *editio princeps* – in Naples we find the characteristic aria “Perchè ingannarmi” (III,17) from the Flo-

---

15 Bizzarini, 2015, p. 11.
16 Lindgren, 1995, p. 163.
rentine variant of the text. A libretto from Palermo was also known – in the Neapolitan version the aria “Pria che Padre, assiso in soglio” (I,3) appears, taken from the Palermo production in 1708. Otherwise – fascinatingly from a geographical point of view – in the Neapolitan libretto many ‘Milanese’ numbers survive, having made the transit by way of Palermo. It is, unfortunately, difficult to establish any kind of connection between these two distant locations, all the more so as we do not know the names of the performers at either venue. In the Neapolitan libretto there were new or adapted second stanzas for two of the ‘Milanese’ texts and 14 new numbers were inserted, none of which have to date any identifiable text sources in other operas. It is, therefore, possible that these pieces were written especially for the Neapolitan production and that all the music was newly composed by Mancini. In accordance with local fashion, there was the addition of scene buffe for two characters – Gerilda and Gildo, whose role was partly based on that of Gismondo, the ultima parte in the original.

The first London production of Vincislao took place during the twilight of the Italian opera company, which was wrestling with a host of financial problems.17 There were only three performances (14 March, around 17 March and 13 May 1717 as a benefit for Antonio Bernacchi). The customary volume of Songs was not published. Several of the opening scenes from the Neapolitan libretto were removed, including the crowd scene in which Ernando returns from a successful military campaign (the other crowd scenes did not feature in the Neapolitan version). Two characters – Alessandro and Gismondo – took part only in the recitatives, and their roles may have been performed by a single singer (Mr Lawrence). The scene buffe were also taken out. The recitatives were shortened and the plotline of romantic entanglement considerably simplified. 13 new arias were included and not taken from Mancini’s score (for a comparison of both versions with a complete list of the arias and their sources, where known, see Tables 5 and 6).

Grimaldi, as primo uomo, sang eight arias and Elisabetta Pilotti-Schiavonetti, as prima donna, sang six. They had also two duets together. The pair of secondi – Antonio Bernacchi and Anastasia Robinson – had five and six arias respectively and they shared one duet. Gaetano Berenstadt as Vincislao sang four arias. Grimaldi, as the arranger of the pasticcio, probably chose numbers that for the most part had music by Mancini, recently composed to order for him. In any case such a selection seems obvious, because the castrato’s voice – as contemporary accounts make clear – had deteriorated somewhat between his first and second stint in London.18 It is therefore highly unlikely that he would have made use, even in part, of the Pollarolo arias he performed in 1703. He would certainly have preferred a repertoire better suited to his new vocal capabilities. This seems also to explain why Grimaldi chose for himself two arias: “Questo conforto solo” (I,12), which replaced the Neapolitan duet with Erenice “Chiedo sì…”, and “O morire, o del mio bene” (I,15) instead of “D’irè arnato il braccio forte”. The composer of the first piece was most likely Antonio Lotti and it was first performed by the gifted castrato Matteo Sassani. Grimaldi had sung the aria earlier in London, at the

---

17 See more in Milhous/Hume, 1999.
18 Desler, 2016, p. 63.
1711/12 carnival, in Antioco and it appeared in Songs in the Opera of Antiocchus. It is a beautiful cantabile aria in 6/8 time and in the key of B flat major, with short melismata undulating within the melodic line and demanding considerable expression. Instead of a duet where Casimiro hopes to overcome the intransigence of Erenice, “Questo conforto solo” emphasizes the prince’s suffering in love, ennobling his feelings towards the princess, which in Zeno’s original are characterized by a violent and insistent desire, rather than true love. The second aria, “O morire, o del mio bene” from Eumene with music probably by Francesco Gasparini, is also an expression of love marked by longing and sacrifice. The music does not survive, but it is hard to imagine the piece as, for example, an aria di bravura (as undoubtedly the aria of revenge, “D’ire armato il braccio forte”, the piece it replaces, would have been). It is certainly better suited to a style imbued with pathos. These arias indicate that Grimaldi – besides his vocal skills – owed his continuing success as a singer even not so much to his highly regarded abilities as an actor, but rather to his good sense in choosing roles, accompanied by careful and thoughtful selection of specific types of arias. The only detrimental effect of this solution is the fact that the character’s motivation for the imminent murder of his rival for the heart of Erenice is now absent because the spurned prince’s jealous outburst and longing for revenge has been removed.

Elisabetta Pilotti-Schiavonetti included two new arias in her role: “Tu solcasti il mare infido” (II,5), most likely an intense di bravura piece judging by its maritime analogies, from the repertoire of the soprano singer Stefano Romani from Fortunato Chelleri’s opera La caccia in Etolia, and “Per te mio caro ben” (II,13), for which the original has not been found. The third new element in her role was the aria of revenge “Col piacer di vendicarmi” (III,6), taken from the part of Erenice (in Naples sung by Angiola Augusti) and probably, therefore, set to music by Mancini. From a dramatic point of view, it was an unhappy choice – it was plausible for Erenice to desire revenge against Prince Casimiro for the death of her beloved Alessandro, but it is difficult to see Lucinda seeking vengeance for a sentence passed against Casimiro, who at this point is facing deserved punishment for his misdeeds. Lucinda’s former arias in this place (both Zeno’s and the borrowed pieces) revolved around feelings of apprehension and hope, bound up with the fate of Casimiro. A desire to perform arias with different affects, and therefore

---

19 Francesco Gasparini, who directed the production of Vincislaio in Rome with Mancini’s music (1716), similarly reused this aria, assigning it to Erenice, a role performed by his student, the young castrato Giovanni Ossi (II,17; on this occasion with the opening line “Corro lieta al caro bene”).

20 Desler, 2016, pp. 64f.

21 This aria has a characteristic metrical form – two stanzas with two verses of settenario tronco and one verse of quinario piano – but contrary to expectation this has not been helpful: early 18th-century opera repertoire contains a large number of such arias. For instance, L’Arminio by Zeno and Caldara (Genoa 1705) contained at least four such numbers, mostly with textual content implying a joyous affect, meaning that a new text could easily have been written for use with existing music.
to work with a range of types of aria, in Pilotti’s case apparently took precedence over the goal of presenting a dramatically plausible character.

In place of the aria described above, Anastasia Robinson as Erenice performed a new number, “Sospira questo cor”, probably from Luca Antonio Predieri’s *Lucio Papirio*.\(^{22}\) The text clearly calls for a *cantabile* delivery. A mention of revenge was introduced at the end of the first stanza, in keeping with Erenice’s frame of mind, but “Sospira questo cor” as a whole remains far removed from the passion of “Col piacer di vendicarmi”. The words of the second new aria she chose, “Lassa! Ch’io t’ho perduta”, also bring out the lyrical element, including a warbling bird simile in the second stanza. Compared to the earlier variants of *Venceslao*, the London Erenice in Anastasia Robinson’s interpretation was more of a lyrical heroine, which may be a consequence of certain limitations in her virtuosic gifts.

Antonio Bernacchi, playing Ernando, probably sang only two numbers from Mancini’s score – a duet and the aria “Se devo in sen’ ascondere”, relocated from the opening scenes of Act I, which had been cut, to II,13. In Act I he performed the aria “Bocca bella del mio duolo” with Zeno’s original text restored. It is highly likely that it was the only aria in the London production set to Pollarolo’s music – in 1708 Antonio Bernacchi had also sung it as Ernando in the Veronese *Venceslao* production. Curiously, none of Ernando’s other arias from this early production were restored. In the case of “Tocco il porto, e ancor pavento” Lowell Lindgren has identified again Luca Antonio Predieri’s *Lucio Papirio* as a possible source for the aria (Venice, carnival 1715).\(^{23}\) Bernacchi, however, knew the piece from another context – namely, from the *opera impasticciata I veri amici*.\(^{24}\) In autumn 1714 in Genoa he took over the part of Lagide and his colleague, Matteo Berscelli, appearing as *primo uomo* Evergete, sang “Tocco il porto”, which Francesco Gasparini had composed for him several months earlier for the *prima assoluta* of *Lucio Papirio* in Rome in carnival 1714. Bernacchi could hear this aria again at the beginning of 1715 in Florence, where he took part as Evergete and his colleague, Margherita Caterina Zani, appearing as Niceta, performed “Tocco il porto”. It is very likely that Bernacchi took “Tocco il porto” with music by Gasparini rather than by Predieri with him to London, waiting for his turn to finally have the possibility to sing this aria. “Di nubo talora” came from another opera by Gasparini, *Amor vince l’odio, overo Timocrate* (Florence 1715), and this time Bernacchi was the first person to perform it. The foregoing two numbers would certainly have been vocally arresting, which was probably the main reason for their inclusion, given that they only very loosely link up with the action

\(^{22}\) Lindgren, 1988, p. 666. It should be emphasized that the first ever performance of Antonio Salvi and Francesco Gasparini’s *Lucio Papirio* (Rome 1714) did not include this aria – in I,6 Appio (Giuseppe Ferrari) sang “Celebrate il funerale”. Perhaps in the Venetian production the aria “Sospira questo cor”, sung by Elisabetta Denzio, was a borrowing – textually, at least – from another opera.

\(^{23}\) Ibid.

\(^{24}\) The first authors of *I veri amici* were Francesco Silvani and Andrea Paulati. The first ever performance of this opera took place in Venice in carnival 1712/13.
of the *dramma per musica*. The third aria in his role – “Mio bel Nume dal tuo ardore” – probably came from the opera *Il trionfo di Camilla* with music by Stefano Antonio Fiorè (Reggio 1713). Suitably altered, its deployment was quite apt in the contexts both of the Neapolitan libretto (“Per saper, s’io sono amante”) and of Zeno’s original (“Parto amante, e parto amico”).

The origin of the four new arias in the role of the contralto castrato Gaetano Berenstadt poses the most problems. All the pieces are dramatic arias, i.e. they are closely involved with the dramatic action and the character. It may be reasonably supposed, then, that the texts were written especially for the London production with the music of specific arias in mind. The original words of those arias – presumably aside from their metrical pattern – had nothing to do with the requirements of the titular role. In this example, the different voices presented an additional obstacle to using Mancini’s arias – in Naples the part was sung by a tenor, Gaetano Borghi.

**Conclusions**

The interest provoked by the London production of *Vincislao* prompted research into the earlier reception of that libretto in Italy. This has made it possible to identify the Milanese *versione impasticciata* as a crucial one in that process. Texts of some of the numbers included in that variant – and for a time possibly also with the same musical setting – were later recycled in different Italian *drammi per musica*, and also resurfaced in the London pasticcios.

Both London pasticcios – *Ambleto*, which took up several of Pollarolo’s arias from *Venceslao* and the 1717 *Vincislao* – confirm the dominating role of Grimaldi, who mainly chose those scores that gave him the option to exploit music that best suited his vocal and dramatic skills at a given time. He also chose, with great care, arias from the repertoire of other singers. The artists he valued apparently included the contralto Giovanna Albertini, who sang with him the part of Ernando in the Neapolitan production of *Vincislao*. In total, as many as three arias from her repertoire were later used in the London *Vincislao* (from the part of Artemisia in *Eumene*, Atalanta in *La caccia in Etolia* and Lavinia in *Il trionfo di Camilla*) without counting two original numbers taken over from Mancini’s score by Antonio Bernacchi. It is highly likely that Nicolini had that music with him on his travels, and was able to offer it to his colleagues, Robinson and Bernacchi. The latter, however, also had a set of *arie di baule* accumulated over his own singing career (numbers from his own roles and from the roles of colleagues who took part in his past performances).

The example of *Vincislao* makes plain that working on a pasticcio was – contrary to general expectations – a complex process. The choice of additional music for Mancini’s Neapolitan score in all probability depended on operas written by various composers (Chelleri, Fiorè, Gasparini, Lotti, Pollarolo, Predieri) and in various Italian locations (Ferrara, Reggio, Rome, Florence and Venice). The female singers and castratos swapped their repertoires liberally. At this point it remains an open question to what ex-
tent the diversity of \textit{Vincislao}’s borrowings reflects the typical London pasticcios from the period of Grimaldi’s second stay in the city (aside from the unquestioned domination of Nicolini and music written for him in Italy).

In the London production the placement of the arias within scenes was closer to Zeno’s original version – it seems that this came about not only as a result of creative intuition, but also through Grimaldi and Bernacchi’s familiarity with the original. A sense of self-awareness about personal artistic preferences (Grimaldi, Robinson) and vocal limitations (Robinson) and the ambition to sing a variety of attractive arias (Pilotti, Bernacchi) created a situation in which the selected numbers weakened the overall dramatic effect (damaging, amongst other things, the presentation of motives; introducing incongruous emotions in dramatic situations; or giving a disproportionate number of simile arias to a character). Paradoxically, the unusual features of the title role and the casting of Berenstadt, who was still in the early stages of his career and was mostly cast as \textit{secondo uomo} rather than as a majestic ruler, meant that his new arias best reflected that figure’s portrayal.

\textit{Translation: Jon Baines and Piotr Szymczak}

\section*{Appendix}

\textit{Table 1: Apostolo Zeno, Venceslao, Venice 1703, music by Carlo Francesco Pollarolo.}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Roles and numbers} & \textbf{Musical sources} \\
\hline
\textbf{Casimiro = Nicola Grimaldi (contralto castrato)} & \\
Ti consiglio a far ritorno (I,5) & D-SWl, Mus.5534 \\
Beltà che più non piace (I,12) & \textit{Ambleto, Songs…}, London 1712, pp. 60-61 \newline (Ildegarda sung by Jane Barbier) \\
Già con l’alma più giuliva (II,1) -- \textbf{not sung} & \\
Vo guastando più veri piaceri (II,5) & \\
D’ire armato il braccio forte (II,9) & \textit{Ambleto, Songs…}, London 1712, pp. 66-67 \newline (Ambleto sung by Grimaldi) \\
Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (III,4) & \\
Dolci brame di vendetta (III,8) & \\
Da te parto, e parto afflitto (III,11) & D-SWl, Mus.5534 \\
\textit{Scena di prigione}: Dure ritorte (IV,3); Ombre squallide, furie d’Amore (IV,3a) & \\
Cas. Stringi. / Luc. Abbraccia (duetto) (IV,4) & \\
Parto: non ho costanza (IV,7) & \\
Vado costante a morte (V,3) & \\
\hline
\textbf{Lucinda = Diamante Maria Scarabelli (soprano)} & \\
Torna al lido la navicella (I,4) & \textit{Ambleto, Songs…}, London 1712, pp. 49-50 \newline (Valdemaro sung by Margarita de l’Epine) \\
Aveva l’idol mio (I,7) & \textit{Ambleto, Songs…}, London 1712, pp. 68-69 \newline (Gerilda sung by Elisabetta Pilotti-Schiavonetti) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
### Apostolo Zeno’s Venceslao and its Pasticcio Version Vincislao re di Polonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and numbers</th>
<th>Musical sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sapesti lusinghiero (II,3)</td>
<td>retexted: Con vezzo lusinghiero, <em>Ambleto, Songs…</em>, London 1712, p. 19 (Gerilda sung by Pilotti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (III,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più fedele, e più amoroso (III,6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sì, sì, godo, se trovo quel bene (aria a due) (III,13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas. Stringi./ Luc. Abbraccia (duetto) (IV,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanneggia la spene (IV,8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mi dir di amarmi più (V,8)</td>
<td>D-SW1, Mus.5534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ernando = Francesco de Grandis (soprano castrato)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbiam vinto. Amico Regno (I,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se ti offendo, tacero (I,1a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocca bella, del mio duolo (I,9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mio cor piagato (II,6)</td>
<td>D-SW1, Mus.5534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speranze più liete (III,14)</td>
<td><em>Ambleto, Songs…</em>, London 1712, pp. 62-63 (Valdemaro sung by de l’Epine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo sdegno e ’l brando (IV,2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarà gloria a la costanza (IV,2a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spunta su que’ begli occhi (V,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erenice = Caterina Azzolini (contralto)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non amarmi (I,11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non credo a quel core (II,8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricordati che padre (III,10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Può languir l’ira nel petto (V,7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venceslao = Giovanni Buzzoleni (tenore)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se vuoi dar leggi al mondo (I,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva (II,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armi ha ’l Ciel per gastigar (II,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S’errasti, o figlio (III,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nel seren di quel sembiante (III,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sì, sì, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo (III,13) (aria a due)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacì, amor: cedi, natura (V,2) – <strong>not sung</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’arte si del ben regnar (V,6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alessandro = Pietro Moggi [Mozzi] (basso)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col piacer che siate miei (I,8)</td>
<td>retexted: Col piacer di rivedervi, *Ambleto, London 1712, II,2 (Fengone sung by Mr. Bendler); no music survived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Là dell’Istro in su la riva (II,1) – <strong>not sung</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gismondo = Giambattista Tamburini (contralto castrato)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor pena di un’alma fedele (I,13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovea di amor geloso (II,10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Venceslao, Venice 1703 and Vincislao, Florence 1703/04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casimiro = Nicola Grimaldi</th>
<th>Casimiro = Caterina Azzolini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ti consiglio a far ritorno (I,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltà che più non piace (I,12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo guastando più veri piaceri (II,5)</td>
<td>= (I,17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’ire armato il braccio forte (II,9)</td>
<td>= (II,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (III,4)</td>
<td>= (II,8a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolci brame di vendetta (III,8)</td>
<td>shortened (2 verses only) (II,12) probably set as cavata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da te parto, e parto afflitto (III,11)</td>
<td>= (II,15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dure ritorte (IV,3); Ombre squallide, furie d’Amore (IV,3a)</td>
<td>= (III,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas. Stringi. / Luc. Abbraccia (duetto) (IV,4)</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parto: non ho costanza (IV,7)</td>
<td>= (III,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vado costante a morte (V,3)</td>
<td>= (III,11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucinda = Diamante Maria Scarabelli</th>
<th>Lucinda = Anna Maria Torri Cecchi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torna al lido la navicella (I,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aveva l’idol mio (I,7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapesti lusingierio (II,3)</td>
<td>= (I,15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (III,4)</td>
<td>= (II,8a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più fedele, e più amoroso (III,6)</td>
<td>= (II,10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si, si, godo, se trovo quel bene (aria a due) (III,13)</td>
<td>= (II,17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas. Stringi./ Luc. Abbraccia (duetto) (IV,4)</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanneggia la spene (IV,8)</td>
<td>= (III,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non mi dir di amarmi più (V,8)</td>
<td>= (III,16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ernando = Francesco De Grandis</th>
<th>Ernando = Fabrizio Bertoldi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbiam vinto. Amico Regno</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se ti offendo, tacerò (I,1a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocca bella, del mio duolo (I,9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mio cor piagato (II,6)</td>
<td>= (II,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico (II,7)</td>
<td>= (II,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speranze più liete (III,14)</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo sdegno e ‘l brando (IV,2)</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarà gloria a la costanza (IV,2a)</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spunta su que’ begli occhi (V,1)</td>
<td>= (III,9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erenice = Caterina Azzolini</th>
<th>Erenice = Vittoria Rizzi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non amarmi (I,11)</td>
<td>retexted: Meco non giova il fingere (I,11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non credo a quel core (II,8)</td>
<td>new text: Armerò di sdegno il core (II,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricordati che padre (III,10)</td>
<td>= (II,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new text: Di mia tradita speme (III,2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Può languir l’ira nel petto (V,7)</td>
<td>new text: Perché ingannarmi (III,15), probably from Il più fedel fra i vassalli, F. Silvani &amp; F. Gasparini, Venice, February 1703, III,6, Oronta (no cast in the libretto print)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venceslao = Giovanni Buzzoleni</th>
<th>Venceslao = Giovanni Battista Franceschini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Se vuoi dar leggi al mondo (I,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva (II,1)</td>
<td>cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armi ha ‘l Ciel per gastigar (II,3)</td>
<td>= (I,16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S’errasti, o figlio (III,3)</td>
<td>= (II,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Original Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venceslao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincislao re di Polonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3: Venceslao, Venice 1703 and Venceslao, Milan 1705.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>New Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ti consiglio a far ritorno (I,5)</td>
<td>= (I,5a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltà che più non piace (I,12)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo guastando più veri piaceri (II,5)</td>
<td>new text: Vado cangiando amor (I,19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’ire armato il braccio forte (II,9)</td>
<td>= (II,5)</td>
<td>music: D-SWl, Mus.5534 (another version than in Ambleto, Songs..., London 1712, pp. 66-67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (III,4)</td>
<td>= (II,10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolci brame di vendetta (III,8)</td>
<td>= (II,14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da te parto, e parto afflito (III,11)</td>
<td>= (II,17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scena di prigione: Dure ritorte (I,3); Ombre squallide, furie d’Amore (IV,3a)</td>
<td>= (III,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parto: non ho costanza (IV,7)</td>
<td>= (III,7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vado costante a morte (V,3)</td>
<td>new text: Vado a morir ti lascio (III,12) probably from ibid., Arminio sung by Albarelli (II,14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torna al lido la navicella (I,5)</td>
<td>new text: Come di fronda in fronda (I,5) probably from ibid., Rosmonda sung by Scarabelli: Come di Rosa, in Rosa (III,8) music: D-SWl, Mus.5534 later in: - Lucio Papirio, Salvi &amp; Predieri, Venice, carnival 1715, Sabina sung by Anna Maria Fabbri: retexted as Sento brillar quest’alma (III,11) - Il più fedel fra i vasalli, Silvani &amp; Gasparini, nuovo allestimento, Venice, carnival 1716, Arsinoe sung by Scarabelli (I,3) - Pyrrhus e Demetrios, pasticcio, London 1717, Deidamia sung by Maria Margherita Grasseti (II,2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aveva l’idol mio (I,7)  | **new text:** Mio cor / dimanda al Dio d’amor (I,7)  
| probably from *L’onestà nelli amori*, F.D. Contini & A. Caldara, Genoa, 1705, Rosmira sung by Scarabelli: Mio sen / Del mio vezzoso ben (II,14)  
| - similar aria appears also in *Arminio*, Salvi & Lotti, Genoa, 1705, Climene sung by Santa Stella Lotti: Mio ben / Più placido, e seren (II,10)  

| **new text:** T’attendo in campo armato (I,16)  
| **music:** D-SW1, Mus.5534  

Sapesti lusingiero (II,3)  | cancelled  
| Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (III,4)  | = (II,10)  

Più fedele, e più amoroso (III,6)  | **new text:** Spera anch’io l’antico nido (II,12) probably from *L’onestà nelli amori*, F.D. Contini & A. Caldara, Genoa, 1705, Rosmira sung by Scarabelli: Son d’Amor nel mar infido (I,15)  
| **music:** D-SW1, Mus.5534  
| later in:  
| - *Il Ciro*, M. Noris & F. Gasparini, Rome, 1716, Miceno sung by Francesco Costanzi (I,7)  

Si, si, godo, se trovo quel bene (aria a due) (III,13)  | **new text:** Sei mia gioia (II,19) probably from *ibid.*, Rosmira sung by Scarabelli: Sei mia speme (III,14)  
| later in:  
| - *La Partenope*, Stampiglia & Caldara, Venice, carnival 1707, Partenope sung by Scarabelli (I,9), opera impasticciata?  
| - *La Partenope*, Stampiglia & Caldara and Boniventi, Ferrara, May 1709, Partenope sung by Scarabelli (I,9), opera impasticciata  
| - *Il trionfo di Partenope*, Stampiglia & Predieri, Padua, 1715, Partenope sung by NN (I,8), opera impasticciata?  
| - *Antioco*, pasticcio, Leonildo sung by Jane Barbier (II,2), **music:** *Antioco, Songs...,* London 1712, pp. 9-10  
| same text appears also in:  
| - *La Partenope*, Handel, London 1730, Partenope sung by Anna Maria Strada del Pò (I,9)  

Cas. Stringi./ Luc. Abbraccia (duetto) (IV,4)  | **new text:** Caro/Bella questo petto (III,5) probably from *Arminio*, Salvi & Caldara, Genoa, carnival 1704/05, Duetto Rosmonda and Arminio sung by Scarabelli and Albarelli: Caro/Bella/La mia stella (I,4)  

Vanneggia la spene (IV,8)  | **new text:** Vanneggia oppresso il cor (III,8) probably from *ibid.*, Rosmonda sung by Scarabelli: Più non mi destà al cor (III,13)  
| - Più non mi destà al cor appears in *Venceslao*, Bologna, 1708, Lucinda sung also by Scarabelli (II,18)  

Non mi dir di amarmi più (V,8)  | = (III,19)
### Apostolo Zeno’s Venceslao and its Pasticcio Version Vincislao re di Polonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703 – Ernando</th>
<th>Milan 1705 – Ernando</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbiam vinto. Amico Regno</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se ti offendo, tacerò (I,1a)</td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> Se devo in sen’ascondere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocca bella, del mio duolo (I,9)</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mio cor piagato (II,6)</td>
<td><strong>shortened version</strong> (II,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico (II,7)</td>
<td>≈ (II,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speranze più liete (III,14)</td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> Se virtude al cor mi parla (II,20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo sdegno e ‘l brando (IV,2)</td>
<td>≈ (III,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarà gloria a la costanza (IV,2a)</td>
<td>≈ (III,3) <strong>not sung</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spunta su que’ begli occhi (V,1)</td>
<td><strong>cancelled</strong> (aria Erenice: Qual senza stella, III,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> Tornam men fiera, o bella (III,10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703 – Erenice</th>
<th>Milan 1705 – Erenice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> Come va dal bosco al prato (I,8) probably from <em>Arminio</em> […] Climene sung by Santa Stella Lotti (II,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non amarmi (I,11)</td>
<td><strong>retexted:</strong> Meco non giova il fingere (I,11) present also in F1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> No, no, che’l cor non crede (I,18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Non credo a quel core (II,8) | **new text:** Si candida, e si bella (II,3) probably from *L’onestà nelli amori* […] Elisa sung by Santa Stella Lotti (I,6) later in:  
- *Antioco*, pasticcio, Oronta sung by Isabella Girardeau (I,6); **music:** *Antioco*, Songs…, London 1712, p. 23 |
| | **new text:** Lasciami pur d’amar (II,4) probably from *Li equivoci del sembiante*, NN & Caldara, Casale Monferrato, carnival 1703, Silene sung by Santa Stella Lotti: Se sai, che cosa è amor (III,6) |
| Ricordati che padre (III,10) | **new text:** Si pensi a vendicarsi (II,16) probably from *Arminio*, Salvi & Caldara, […] Climene sung by Santa Stella Lotti: Io parto a vendicarmi (I,12) |
| | **new text:** Ama, sospiri, e piangi (III,2a) probably from *Orfeo a torto geloso, overo Amore spesso inganna*, Turin 1697, aria Orfeo: Amo, sospiro, e peno (II,4) or *Orfeo a torto geloso*, Genoa, carnival 1705/06, aria Orfeo: Amo, sospiro, e peno (II,4)  
- in both cases there is no cast printed in libretto |
### Anna Ryszka-Komarnicka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New text: Qual senza stella (III,9) later in:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Il trionfo di Partenope</em>, Stampiglia &amp; Predieri, Padua, 1715, Arsace sung by NN (I,11), opera impasticciata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This text appears also in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Elpidia, ovvero i rivali generosi</em>, pasticcio arranged by G.F. Handel, Ormonte sung by Andrea Pacini (II,3), aria from <em>Venceslao</em> by G.M. Capelli, dropped when Pacini was replaced by Antonio Baldi (see Strohm, 1985, p. 200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Può languir l’ira nel petto (V,7)</th>
<th>new text: Langue ne l’alma il fier (III,17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1703 – Venceslao</td>
<td>Milan 1705 – Venceslao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se vuoi dar leggi al mondo (I,3)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva (II,1)</td>
<td>= (I,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armi ha ‘l Ciel per gastigar (II,3)</td>
<td>cancelled (aria Erenice: No, no, che’l cor…, I,18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S’errasti, o figlio (III,3)</td>
<td>cancelled (II,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nel seren di quel sembiante (III,5)</td>
<td>= (II,11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si, si, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo (III,13) (aria a due)</td>
<td>cancelled (only Lucinda, II,19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit, amor: cedi, natura (V,2) – not sung</td>
<td>Tacit, amor: cedi, natura (III,11) – cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’arte, si, del ben regnar (V,6)</td>
<td>= (III,16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703 – Alessandro</th>
<th>Milan 1705 – Alessandro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new text: Ama sì, ma sempre chiara (I,2) music: D-SWl, Mus.5534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col piacer che siate miei (I,8)</td>
<td>retexted: Col pensier che mia tu sei (I,8a) music: D-SWl, Mus.5534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703 – Gismondo</th>
<th>Milan 1705 – Gismondo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor pena di un’alma fedele (I,13)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovea di amor geloso (II,10)</td>
<td>= (II,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new text: Taccian l’ire di nembi funesti (III,18) music: D-SWl, Mus.5534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4: A stemma of the related Venceslao librettos up to the end of the third decade of the 18th century (the first row tabulates the productions that worked directly from the editio princeps).

Table 5: Vincislao, Naples 1714 and Vincislao, London 1717.
N1714: new arias introduced in Naples; V1703=Venice, F1704=Florence, M1705=Milan, PAL1708=Palermo: arias present in both Naples and earlier versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples 1714</th>
<th>London 1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casimiro – Grimaldi</td>
<td>Casimiro – Grimaldi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lascia la calma all’alma (I,5a) N1714</td>
<td>Lascia la calma all’alma (I,2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltà che più non piace (I,12) V1703</td>
<td>(I,8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chiedo sì.../Mio bene, e che? (duetto) (I,17) N1714 | **new text:** Questo conforto solo (I,12) probably from *Il vincitor generoso*, F. Briani & A. Lotti, Venice, carnival 1709, Otone sung by Matteo Sassani (II,10)  
  **music:** *Antioco, Songs...*, London 1712, pp. 9f.  
  (Antioco sung by Grimaldi) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples 1714</th>
<th>London 1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D’ire armato il braccio forte (II,3) V1703 | **new text**: O morire, o del caro bene (I,15) probably from *L’Eumene*, Zeno & F. Gasparini, Reggio, May 1714, Artemisia sung by Giovanna Albertini: O morire, o al caro Eumene (I,13) also in:  
- *Nerone fatto Cesare*, pasticcio, Venice 1715, Ate sung by Giovanna Ronzani: O Morire, o in questo core (I,5)  
- *Vincislao*, Mancini with additional music by Gasparini, Rome, carnival 1716, Lucinda sung by Domenico Genovesi: as Corro lieta al caro bene (II,17)  
- *La pace generosa*, Silvani & A. Massarotti, Fano 1716, Ismena sung by Francesco Natali: as O morire, o vuol’Amore (III,11), opera impasticiata |
| Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (II,6) V1703 | *(II,3)* |
| Dolci brame di vendetta (II,11) **shortened** (2 verses only as in F1704) probably part of recitative? | *(II,7)* probably part of recitative |
| Da te parto, e parto afflitto (II,14) V1703 | *(II,10)* |
| *Scena di prigione*: Dure ritorte (III,4); Ombre squallide, furie d’Amore (III,4a) V1703 | *(III,1)*  
*(III,1a)* |
| Luc. Vieni. / Cas. Vengo (duetto) (III,5) N1714 | *(III,2)* |
| Parto: non ho costanza (III,8) V1703 | *(III,5)* |
| Basta, ch’io sia tuo figlio (III,13) N1714 | cancelled |

**Lucinda – Marianna Benti Bulgarelli**

| Quest’aura che respira (I,5) N1714 | *(I,2)* |
| Aveva l’idol mio (I,7) V1703 | *(I,3)* |
| T’attendo in campo armato (I,15) M1705 | *(I,10)* |
| Cara parte di quest’alma (duetto) (II,16) V1703 | *(II,3)* |
| Son Regina, e son tradita (II,16) N1714 | cancelled |

**new text**: Tu solcasti il mare infido (II,5) probably from *La caccia in Etolia*, B. Valeriani & F. Chelleri, Ferrara, May 1715, Meleagro sung by Stefano Romani (III,8)  
**new text**: Per te mio caro bene (II,14) – source unknown  
**new text**: Col piacer di vendicarmi (III,6) – Erenice’s aria taken from N1714, II,13  
**new text**: Bocca bella, del mio duolo (I,5) – Ernando’s aria taken from V1703 (music by Pollarolo?)

**Ernando – Giovanna Albertini**

<p>| Abbiam vinto. Amico Regno (I,1) V1703 | cancelled |
| Se devo in sen’ascondere (I,1a) M1705 | moved to II,13 |
| M’affligge una fiamma (I,9) N1714 | cancelled |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples 1714</th>
<th>London 1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per saper sio sono amante (II,1) N1714</td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> Mio bel Nume dal tuo ardore (I,13) probably from <em>Il trionfo di Camilla</em>, S. Stampiglìa &amp; S.A. Fiorè, Reggio, May 1713, Lavinia sung by Giovanna Albertini: Mio bel Nume, mio Tesoro (I,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorrei sperar ma il core (II,17) N1714</td>
<td><strong>new text:</strong> Se devo in sen’ascondere (II,13) Ernando’s aria taken from I,1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Amerò, ma sospirando (III,3) N1714 | **new text:** Tocco il porto, e ancor pavento (II,17) probably from *I veri amici*, opera impasticciata, Genoa, autumn 1714, Evergete sung by Matteo Berscelli (III,4) and Florence, carnival 1715, Niceta sung by Margherita Caterina Zani (III,10) – Bernacchi took part in both performances probable source of this aria:  
- *Lucio Papiro dittatore, prima assoluta*, A. Salvi & F. Gasparini, Rome, carnival 1714, Quinto Fabio sung by Matteo Berscelli (III,6), **music:** B-Bc 3949  
later presence:  
- *Lucio Papiro*, Salvi & L.A. Predieri, Venice, carnival 1715, Quinto Fabio sung by Andrea Pacini (III,6) |
<p>| Pensa (duetto) (III,11) N1714 | <strong>new text:</strong> Di nubo talora (III,9) probably from <em>Amor vince l’odio overo Timocrate</em>, A. Salvi &amp; F. Gasparini, Florence, carnival 1715, Timocrate sung by Bernacchi (I,1) |
| <strong>Erenice – Angiola Augusti</strong> | <strong>Erenice – Anastasia Robinson</strong> |
| Come va dal bosco al prato (I,8) M1705 | <strong>new text:</strong> Lassa! Ch’io t’ho perduta (I,4) probably from <em>La caccia in Etolia</em>, Valeriani &amp; Chelleri, […], Atalanta sung by Giovanna Albertini (II,2) |
| Meco non giova il fingere (I,11) F1704+M1705 | <strong>=</strong> (I,7) |
| Spero si.../Mio bene, e che? (duetto) (I,17) N1714 | cancelled (Casimiro’s aria Questo conforto solo, I,12) |
| Si candida, e si bella (II,2) M1705 | cancelled |
| Lasciami pur d’amar (II,2a) M1705 | <strong>=</strong> (I,14) |
| Col piacer di vendicarmi (III,10) N1714 | <strong>new text:</strong> Sospira questo cor (II,9) |
| Ama, sospiri, e piangi (III,2) M1705 | <strong>=</strong> (II,16) |
| Pensa (duetto) (III,11) N1714 | <strong>=</strong> (III,7) |
| Perchè ingannarmi (III,17) F1704 | <strong>=</strong> (III,11) [slightly retexted version] F1704 |
| <strong>Vincislaio – Gaetano Borghi (tenore)</strong> | <strong>Vincislaio – Gaetano Berenstadt (alto castrato)</strong> |
| Pria che Padre, assiso in soglio (I,3) PAL1708 | cancelled |
| Spesso vola un basso affetto (II,8) N1714 | <strong>new text:</strong> Non può Regnare (I,11) – source unknown |
| La giustizia con l’amore (III,16) N1714 | <strong>new text:</strong> S’hai nel petto un’alma forte (II,12) – source unknown |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703</th>
<th>Florence 1704</th>
<th>Milan 1705</th>
<th>Naples 1714</th>
<th>London 1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,4 Rec: Con avviso impensato…</td>
<td>I,4 Rec: Con avviso impensato…</td>
<td>I,4 Rec: Con avviso impensato…</td>
<td>I,4 Rec: Presto, presto Signor…</td>
<td>I,1 Rec: Oh’ Ciel che sia!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Venice, Milan, Naples and London versions in comparison (with new texts marked in bold).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703</th>
<th>Florence 1704</th>
<th>Milan 1705</th>
<th>Naples 1714</th>
<th>London 1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,8 Rec: Bella Erenice. / Invitto Ernando... Aria: Alessandro Col piacer che siate miei</td>
<td>I,8 Rec: Bella Erenice. / Invitto Ernando... Aria: Alessandro Perché so che mie già siete</td>
<td>I,8 Aria: Erenice Come va dal bosco al prato Rec: Taci Erenice...</td>
<td>I,8 Aria: Erenice Come va dal bosco al prato Rec: Taci Erenice... Invitto Ernando...</td>
<td>I,4 Aria: Erenice Lassa! Ch’io t’ho perduta Rec: Taci Erenice... Rec: Ern. Bella Erenice./ Eren. Invitto Ernando...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,9 Rec: Pace al Regno recasti... Aria: Ernando Bocca bella, del mio duolo</td>
<td>I,9 Rec: Pace al Regno recasti... Aria: Ernando Bocca bella, del mio duolo</td>
<td>I,9 Rec: Pace al Regno recasti... Aria: Ernando Bocca bella, del mio duolo</td>
<td>I,9 Rec: Pace al Regno recasti... Aria: Ernando M’affligge una fiamma</td>
<td>I,5 Rec: Pace al Regno recasti... Aria: Ernando Bocca bella, del mio duolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,12 Rec: Amar puossi, Gismon-do... Aria: Casimiro Beltà che più non piace</td>
<td>I,12 Rec: Amar puossi, Gismon-do... Aria: Casimiro Beltà che più non piace</td>
<td>I,12 Rec: Amar puossi, Gismon-do... Aria: Casimiro Beltà che più non piace</td>
<td>I,12 Rec: Amare, amare si puote... Aria: Casimiro Beltà che più non piace</td>
<td>I,8 Rec: Amare, amare si puote... Aria: Casimiro Beltà che più non piace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1703</td>
<td>Florence 1704</td>
<td>Milan 1705</td>
<td>Naples 1714</td>
<td>London 1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 1 Coro</td>
<td>I, 14 Rec. Figlio, nel forte Ernando...</td>
<td>I, 14 Coro</td>
<td>I, 14 Rec. Figlio, nel forte Ernando... [as in F1704]</td>
<td>I, 9 Rec. Figlio, nel forte Ernando...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comun bene, amica Diva</td>
<td>Comun bene, amica Diva</td>
<td>Comun bene, amica Diva</td>
<td>Comun bene...</td>
<td>Comun bene...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Ven. Popoli, o come fausti...</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria...</td>
<td>Aria...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Polonico Regno</td>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva</td>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva</td>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva</td>
<td>Più non vien tromba nociva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La de l'Istro in su la riva</td>
<td>Coro: Comun bene...</td>
<td>Coro: Comun bene...</td>
<td>Coro: Comun bene...</td>
<td>Coro: Comun bene...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casimiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Già con calma più giuliva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coro: Comun bene...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 15 Rec: Gran Re'...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 14 Rec. Figlio, nel forte Ernando...</td>
<td>I, 15 Rec: Del Sarmatico Cielo inclito Giove...</td>
<td>I, 15 Rec: Del Sarmatico Cielo inclito Giove...</td>
<td>I, 10 Rec: Rè la cui minor Gloria...</td>
<td>I, 15 Rec: Del Sarmatico Cielo inclito Giove...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 15 Rec: Del Sarmatico Cielo inclito Giove...</td>
<td>I, 16 Rec: Del Sarmatico Cielo inclito Giove...</td>
<td>I, 16 Rec: Del Sarmatico Cielo inclito Giove...</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>T'attendo in campo armato</td>
<td>T'attendo in campo armato [with new second stanza]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'attendo in campo armato</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapesti lusinghierno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T'attendo in campo armato [second stanza as in N1714]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 3 Rec: Parte il Rival...</td>
<td>I, 17 Rec: Al vicin giorno Ernando...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapesti lusinghierno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 16 Rec: Casimiro innocente...</td>
<td>I, 16 Rec: Bella, Mi ascolta...</td>
<td>I, 16 Rec: Casimiro innocente...</td>
<td>I, 11 Rec: Casimiro innocente...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Erenice</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armi ha 'l Ciel per gastigar</td>
<td>No, no, che 'l cor non crede</td>
<td>Non può Regnare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1703</td>
<td>Florence 1704</td>
<td>Milan 1705</td>
<td>Naples 1714</td>
<td>London 1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi morto...</td>
<td>I,17 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi morto...</td>
<td>I,19 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi morto...</td>
<td>I,17 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi morto...</td>
<td>I,12 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi morto...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo guastando più veri piaceri</td>
<td>Vo guastando più veri piaceri</td>
<td>Vado cangiando amor</td>
<td>Vado cangiando amor</td>
<td>Questo conforto solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballo di Polpi Polacchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II,5 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,17 Rec: Amor, tu mi vuoi morto...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,6 Rec: Non molto andrà, che di Erenice in seno...</td>
<td>II,1 Rec: Non molto andrà, che di Erenice in seno...</td>
<td>II,1 Rec: Non molto andrà, che di Erenice in seno...</td>
<td>I,13 Rec: Non molto andrà, che di Erenice in seno...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Rec: Ernando, a cercar vengo...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mio cor piagiato</td>
<td>Mio cor piagiato [shortened]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec: Ernando, a cercar vengo...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7 Rec: Ernando, a cercar vengo...</td>
<td>II,2 Rec: Ernando, a cercar vengo...</td>
<td>II,2 Rec: Ernando, a cercar vengo...</td>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Pier saper s'io sono amante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Aria: Ernando</td>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico</td>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico</td>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,8 Rec: S'è ver che m'ami...</td>
<td>II,3 Rec: S'è ver che m'ami...</td>
<td>II,3 R: S'è ver che m'ami...</td>
<td>I,14 R: S'è ver che m'ami...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec: Felice incontro. Arresta...</td>
<td>Rec: Felice incontro. Arresta...</td>
<td>Aria: Erenice</td>
<td>Aria: Erenice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Erenice</td>
<td>Aria: Erenice</td>
<td>Si candida, e si bella</td>
<td>Si candida, e si bella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non credo a quel core</td>
<td>Non credo a quel core</td>
<td>Parto amante, e parto amico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,9 Rec: Mie deluse speranze...</td>
<td>II,4 Rec: Mie deluse speranze...</td>
<td>II,5 Rec: Mie deluse speranze...</td>
<td>I,15 Rec: Mie deluse speranze...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td>Aria: Casimiro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'ire armato il braccio forte</td>
<td>D'ire armato il braccio forte</td>
<td>D'ire armato il braccio forte</td>
<td>D'ire armato il braccio forte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[with slightly retexted first stanza]</td>
<td>O Morire o del mio bene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10 Rec: Io mi credea...</td>
<td>II,5 Rec: Io mi credea...</td>
<td>II,6 Rec: Io mi credea...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Gismondo</td>
<td>Aria: Gismondo</td>
<td>Aria: Gismondo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovea di amor geloso</td>
<td>Dovea di amor geloso</td>
<td>Dovea di amor geloso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,18 scena buffa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1703</td>
<td>Florence 1704</td>
<td>Milan 1705</td>
<td>London 1717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 1 Rec: Sommi Dei, menti eterne...</td>
<td>II, 6 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 9 Rec: O Tu, che ancor non veggo...</td>
<td>III, 2 Rec: Sommi Dei, menti eterne...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 4 Rec: O Tu, che ancor non veggo...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Son Regarda, e son tralira</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>III, 4 Rec: Impazienza e sdegno...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 5 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 5 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 6 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 6 Rec: La notte avanza, e’l Prencipe non vien ancora. Ei solo...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 7 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 7 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 8 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 9 Rec: O Tu, che ancor non veggo...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 9 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 10 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 11 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 11 Rec: Fugge la mia presenza...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 12 Rec: La notte avanza, e’l Prencipe non vien ancora. Ei solo...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 12 Rec: La notte avanza, e’l Prencipe non vien ancora. Ei solo...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 13 Rec: La notte avanza, e’l Prencipe non vien ancora. Ei solo...</td>
<td>II, 8 Rec: Sensi d’un Re...</td>
<td>II, 10 Rec: Deh mi lascia tormento penoso</td>
<td>III, 13 Rec: La notte avanza, e’l Prencipe non vien ancora. Ei solo...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td>Aria: Venceslao</td>
<td>Aria: Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1703</td>
<td>Florence 1704</td>
<td>Milan 1705</td>
<td>Naples 1714</td>
<td>London 1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,8 Rec: E pur cresce nel seno...</td>
<td>II,12 Rec: E pur cresce nel seno...</td>
<td>II,14 Rec: E pur cresce nel seno...</td>
<td>II,11 Rec: E pur cresce nel seno...</td>
<td>II,7 Rec: E pur cresce nel seno...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,9 Rec: A’ tuo’cenni...</td>
<td>II,13 Rec: A’ tuo’cenni...</td>
<td>II,15 Rec: A’ tuo’cenni...</td>
<td>II,12 Rec: A’ tuo’cenni...</td>
<td>II,8 Rec: A’ tuo’cenni...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Erenice Ricordati che padre</td>
<td>Erenice Ricordati che padre</td>
<td>Erenice Ricordati che padre</td>
<td>Erenice Ricordati che padre</td>
<td>Erenice Ricordati che padre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,11 Rec: Reo convinto, la spada...</td>
<td>II,15 Rec: Reo convinto, la spada...</td>
<td>II,17 Rec: Reo convinto, la spada...</td>
<td>II,14 Rec: Reo convinto, la spada...</td>
<td>II,10 Rec: Reo convinto, la spada...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Casimiro Da te parlo, e parto afflitto</td>
<td>Casimiro Da te parlo, e parto afflitto</td>
<td>Casimiro Da te parlo, e parto afflitto</td>
<td>Casimiro Da te parlo, e parto afflitto</td>
<td>Casimiro Da te parlo, e parto afflitto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,12 Rec: Non so’ più padre...</td>
<td>II,16 Rec: Non so’ più padre...</td>
<td>II,18 Rec: Non so’ più padre...</td>
<td>II,15 Rec: Non so’ più padre...</td>
<td>II,11 Rec: Non so’ più padre...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria a due Venceslao Sì, sì, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo Lucinda Sì, sì, godo, se trovo quel bene</td>
<td>a due Venceslao Sì, sì, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo Lucinda Sì, sì, godo, se trovo quel bene</td>
<td>a due Venceslao Sì, sì, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo Lucinda Sì, sì, godo, se trovo quel bene</td>
<td>a due Venceslao Sì, sì, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo Lucinda Sì, sì, godo, se trovo quel bene</td>
<td>a due Venceslao Sì, sì, godi, che’l dolce tuo sposo Lucinda Sì, sì, godo, se trovo quel bene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,14 Rec: Di così strani casi/ Il fin qual sia? Sarà pietoso o’ giusto...</td>
<td>II,20 Rec: Di così strani casi/ Il fin qual sia? Sarà pietoso o’ giusto...</td>
<td>II,17 Rec: Di così oscuri accenti/ I sensi non comprendo...</td>
<td>II,13 Rec: Di così oscuri accenti/ I sensi non comprendo...</td>
<td>II,13 Rec: Di così oscuri accenti/ I sensi non comprendo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria: Ernando Speranze più lie</td>
<td>Ernando Speranze più lie</td>
<td>Ernando Speranze più lie</td>
<td>Ernando Speranze più lie</td>
<td>Ernando Speranze più lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 1717</td>
<td>Naples 1714</td>
<td>Venice 1703</td>
<td>Florence 1704</td>
<td>Milan 1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anna Ryszka-Komarnicka
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| III,7 | Oggi morrai? Dirlo ha potuto un padre?
| III,6 | Aria: Casimiro
| Parla: non ho costanza |
| III,5 | Aria: Lucinda
| Vaneggia la spene |
| III,4 | Col piacer di vendicarmi
| III,3 | Pensa… ma si confonde |
| III,2 | Tutta cinta è dal popolo… |
| III,1 | Aria: Erenice
| Qual senza stella |
| III,0 | Duetto: Erenice+Ermanno
| Pensiamo… |
| V,1  | Aria: Casimiro
| Vado a morir ti lascio |
| V,0  | Aria: Venceslao
| Tornai non fiera, o bella |
| IV,11 | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| IV,10 | Aria: Ernando
| Torna non fiera, o bella |
| IV,9  | Aria: Erenice
| Spunta su que’ begli occhi |
| IV,8  | Duetto: Erenice+Ernando
| Pensiamo… |
| IV,7  | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| IV,6  | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| IV,5  | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| IV,4  | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| IV,3  | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| IV,2  | A: Venceslao
| Taci, amor: cedi, natura |
| IV,1  | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| III,13 | Aria: Casimiro
| Vado costante a morte |
| III,12 | A: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| III,11 | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| III,10 | A: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| III,9  | A: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| III,8  | Aria: Erenice
| Spunta su que’ begli occhi |
| III,7 | A: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| III,6 | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| III,5 | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| III,4 | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| III,3 | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| III,2 | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| III,1 | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| II,10  | A: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| II,9   | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| II,8   | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| II,7   | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| II,6   | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| II,5   | Aaria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| II,4   | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| II,3   | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| II,2   | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| II,1   | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| I,10   | A: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| I,9    | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| I,8    | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| I,7    | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| I,6    | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| I,5    | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| I,4    | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| I,3    | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| I,2    | Aria: Venceslao
| A me guisidi il figlio… |
| I,1    | Aria: Casimiro
| Vi prostrato al regio pie de… |
| 0      | A: Venceslao
<p>| A me guisidi il figlio… |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venice 1703</th>
<th>Florence 1704</th>
<th>Milan 1705</th>
<th>Naples 1714</th>
<th>London 1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V,4 Rec: Importuno dover...</td>
<td>III,12 Rec: Importuno dover...</td>
<td>III,13 Rec: Importuno dover...</td>
<td>III,14 Rec: Importuno dover...</td>
<td>III,8 Rec: Giorno, oh! quanto diverso...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V,5 Rec: Anch’io, Sire...</td>
<td>III,13 Rec: Anch’io, Sire...</td>
<td>III,14 Rec: Anch’io, Sire...</td>
<td>III,15 Rec: Anch’io, Sire...</td>
<td>III,9 Rec: Anch’io, Sire...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V,8 Rec: Viva, e regni Casimiro... Aria: Lucinda Non mi dir di amarmi più</td>
<td>III,16 Rec: Viva, e regni Casimiro... Aria: Lucinda Non mi dir di amarmi più</td>
<td>III,18 Rec: Viva, e regni Casimiro... Aria: Lucinda Non mi dir di amarmi più</td>
<td>III,18 Rec: Viva, e regni Casimiro...</td>
<td>III,12 Rec: Viva, e regni Casimiro...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 1703</td>
<td>Florence 1704</td>
<td>Milan 1705</td>
<td>Naples 1714</td>
<td>London 1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ballo di Quattro Elementi**
Sources


FAGO, NICCOLO, Il Radamisto, atto III; manuscript score: D-MElr, F 618.

[ASPARRINI, FRANCESCO et al.], Songs in the Opera of Antiochus as They are Perform’d at ye Queens Theatre, London, J. Walsh, 1712; copy consulted: F-Pc in F-Pn, D-4465, online: gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b90815706, 15.12.2019.

[Id. et al.], Songs in the Opera of Hamlet as They are Perform’d at ye Queens Theatre, London, J. Walsh, 1712; copy consulted: F-Pc in F-Pn, RES VS-1283, online: gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9067615n, 15.12.2019.


POLLOROLO, CARLO, FRANCESCO et al., Opera di Venceslao 1704; manuscript aria collection: D-SWl, Mus.5534.


Id., Lucio Papirio. Dramma per musica del sig. dottor Antonio Salvi da Firenze da rappresentarsi nel Teatro di Sant’Angelo il carnovale dell’anno 1715. Consegrato a Carlo Giuseppe Nomohradskij co. di Kollororath, Venezia, Marino Rossetti,


Anna Ryszka-Komarnicka


Id., Vincislao re di Polonia. Drama per musica. = Winceslaus, king of Poland. An opera. As it is perform’d at the King’s Theatre in the Hay-Market, London, J. Tonson, 1717; libretto, copy consulted: D-Rs, reproduction of copy in GB-Ob, Vet e.831 (3).

Id., Il Vincislao. Drama per musica da rappresentarsi nella sala de’ signori Capranica nel carnevale dell’anno 1716, Roma, il Bernabò, 1716; libretto, copy consulted: PL-Wn, SD XVIII.1.3530.
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COSTANTINI, DANilo/MAgAUDDA, Ausilia, Aurora Sanseverino (1669-1726) e la sua attività di committente musicale nel Regno di Napoli con notizie inedite sulla napoletana Congregazione dei Sette Dolori, in: Giacomo Francesco Milano e il ruolo dell’aristocrazia nel patrocinio delle attività musicali nel secolo XVIII (Sopplimenti musicali I: Documenti e studi musicologici 4), ed. by GAETANO PITARRESI, Reggio Calabria 2001, pp. 297-415.


The Musical and Physical Mobility of Material in Handel Sources

Annette Landgraf

Writing about the materiality of Handel sources is a fascinating opportunity to demonstrate Handel’s practice of recycling his own music, to illustrate his methods and to show the relationships between his works from different periods, which can be detected through the detailed studies of the sources.

What are the Handel sources and how do we evaluate them? The most important manuscripts are Handel’s autographs. Most of them are in the British Library in London, especially the more or less complete scores of whole works. Large portions of fragments, sketches and single movements are in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge. Some of these items were parts of the performing scores at a certain time, as I will demonstrate later. Several single autographs can be found in other places in Britain, and in Germany, Austria, Switzerland and in the United States. In most cases the autographs are the primary sources for the musical text of the Hallische Händel-Ausgabe (HHA).

The next group of principal sources are Handel’s performing scores. They were written by copyists, but Handel also added musical material, made changes to the musical text, inserted singer’s names and instructions. They were adapted for each revival. That means one may find entries which are not in the autograph, for instance instructions for transpositions, cuts, new endings for recitatives, changes in the singing text or new movements. For some works there are also scores for the keyboard player. Most of these are currently kept in the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek “Carl von Ossietzky” in Hamburg. The instrumental parts are nearly completely lost. In combination with the word-books for the several performances the performing scores can show the content of the first and the later performances.

Contemporary printed word-books are very precious sources for the content of a performance, since for the first performance, and for all later revivals, individual copies were issued. Unfortunately, not all of them have survived. Sometimes there were leaves inserted with additional texts for certain performances, such as for Deborah and Athalia,

---

1 See the article Sources and collections, in Landgraf/Vickers, 2009, pp. 604-612.
but they are hard to find. There must have been one for Esther, but none of them has been discovered so far. For some oratorios manuscript librettos for the censor have survived. In an ideal case we would have the complete autograph, the complete performing score and a complete set of word-books for all the performances.

Another big group of contemporary manuscripts are the copies made for British collectors – usually friends, patrons and admirers of Handel. They usually mirror the content of a work at a special time.

The most interesting group of sources in respect to physical mobility of material are Handel’s performing scores in Hamburg and the fragments in the Fitzwilliam Museum. For a new composition Handel often reused music he had originally written for a certain work in the past, and later he used it again in a new context with a new or even the old text. This leads to the mobility of musical material. Either the musical ideas were mentally moved and written down in their new context, or pages with music were physically moved. They could be shifted from one manuscript to another and sometimes taken out, when they were no longer needed. Occasionally they may have ended up in a convolute with other pieces sharing the same fate. Annotations in the performing scores or autographs may help to identify them, and in such cases it is possible to make really precious findings. In other circumstances, for instance when there were larger alterations, the copyists wrote out the music again, and the new pages were inserted in the manuscript.

There is no difference in Handel’s method in working with operas or oratorios. In the pasticcio Oreste from 1734, for example, Handel either transferred suitable movements directly from his former operas without changes to the sung texts, or other arias were provided with new words to suit their new dramatic context. Handel’s copyists provided the main portion of the performing score according to Handel’s instructions, movements which required more complicated revisions or new composition were written by Handel himself.

I will show the different processes by the example of Handel’s oratorio Esther HWV 50 in the versions of 1732 to 1757. Even if it is an oratorio and not an operatic pasticcio, it is an ideal case to show Handel’s practice in general.

Handel performed Esther in several seasons with different singers and in different places. We know that he produced a bilingual version of the work for 1735 and 1737 because some of his new Italian singers could not sing English.

For the new version of 1732 and onwards, seven wordbooks have survived: for London 1732, London and Oxford 1733, Dublin 1742, London 1751 and 1757. There is documentary evidence that in addition the oratorio has been performed in London in the Covent Garden Theatre in March 1735, April 1736 and April 1737, and in Lincoln’s Inn Fields on the 26 March 1740, but for the performances from 1735-1740 no word-books have been found.

---

3 See Roberts, 2009, pp. 100f.
4 For the sources see Best, 1993; Burrows/Ronish, 1994; Clausen, 1972; Larsen, 1957.
In 1732 Handel had a performing score made by his assistant Christopher Smith senior. The composer himself wrote the first *accompagnato* “Breathe soft ye gales”. This performing score has been adapted for every season, some of the original folios have been replaced. As a result, many of them are lost and with them has been lost much important information about earlier performances. Some of the detached folios of the original performing score are in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge (GB-Cfm, MU MS 251).

Very valuable are marks from the different performances like singer’s names, changes, traces of paste-overs which have been removed later, fold marks and stitches. Most of the instructions and names have been written in pencil, and some have faded. Other indications are hardly visible, nearly illegible, sometimes one can only guess what they could mean.

Moreover, Handel has obviously composed a bundle of Italian arias for the 1735 season for the soprano castrato Giovanni Carestini, which he could insert in the places of the different scores where he needed them.

He used the same practice in 1734/35 for the set of *Balli* for *Alcina, Arianna, Ariodante, Pastor fido* and *Oreste*. For these operas Handel wrote a variety of dance movements and inserted them in suitable places. Later the *Balli* were removed for reuse in another work. The same must have happened with the Italian arias for the oratorios, which he also used for the pasticcio *Oratorio* in 1738 and at least the second performance of *Israel in Egypt* in 1739. Some of the instructions for the bilingual versions have survived.

Now I will demonstrate on the basis of the performing score of *Esther* HWV 50, when, how and why it has been changed between 1732 and 1757. This will give you an insight into the practice and working method of Handel and his copyists, adapting a score to new needs.

The content of the performing score as it has been originally written in 1732 was complete until 1742. No pages have been removed or added. The only changes that have been made were names of the singers for each season, and some movements were given to a different role, for instance there were exchanges between the roles of Esther and Israelite Woman. The movements which were not performed in 1733 remained in the manuscript. There were only pencil marks, or pages folded together at the corners or sawn together, which indicate the cuts and changes (Figure 1).

---

6 HWV deest, see Burrows, 1995, pp. 11-38.
Figure 1: Performing score, D-Hs, M C/261, fol. 62r, end of the duet “Blessings descend”, stitches and fold marks.
Figure 2: Performing score, D-Hs, M C/261, fol. 115v, Italian text “I favor del primo autore”, written by Handel 1737.
Folding the corners together allowed to turn all the superfluous pages quickly at once. The section containing the recitative “I go the power of grief to prove”, the aria “Tears assist me” and the chorus “Save us O Lord”, fols. 62 to 64 were sewn together. In 1735 and 1737 Handel adapted the score for his Italian singers. Some of the arias were supplied with an additional Italian text in the score, some movements were marked with the instruction “in Italian”, Handel also wrote annotations for transpositions. For instance, the air “Watchful angels” was given the text “Pure menti” (this material is now in Cambridge), or Handel wrote in the duet “I’ll proclaim the wondrous story” for 1737 the alternative Italian text “I favor del primo autore” in the part of the performing score which is now kept in Hamburg (Figure 2).

For the recitatives, new material with the Italian text must have been provided. This was possibly only in the parts of the singers. Since nearly no performing material has survived, the Italian versions of the recitatives have got lost.

The first time that sections of material have been removed from the performing score was for the performance in Dublin in 1742. Some folios are in Cambridge, most of them are missing. Fortunately, there are some secondary copies of the arias. They are in manuscript volumes of some collections, sometimes as an appendix to Esther HWV 50a, which was composed about 1718 to 1720 for Cannons.

The complete set of new arias which were not in Esther HWV 50b – the new English and the Italian movements for Esther HWV 50b – is in a manuscript source in the Aylesford Collection of the British Library with the shelf mark R.M.18.c.5. It has been copied by the copyist S4 (Smith circle) c. 1735. The Esther movements in GB-Lbl, R.M.19.d.11 have been copied from GB-Lbl, R.M.18.c.5 in about 1750 to 1760 by the copyist S13. Both sources may be based on the contents of the performing score before 1751. The manuscript MU MS 800 in the Barrett Lennard Collection in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge was copied by the copyist S5 c. 1736 to 1741. It contains the first version of Esther, most of the arias for 1732 and the Italian arias for 1735 to 1740. “Angelico splendor” is missing. If there was a separate set of arias, the folios with “Angelico splendor” have possibly been detached at one point. Around the same time, c. 1738 to 1741, S5 also copied the manuscript which is now in the Shaftesbury Collection. Another similar source is the manuscript in the Granville Collection, GB-Lbl, Eg. 2931, written by Smith senior at the beginning of the 1740s, possibly before Handel performed Esther in Dublin 1742. This manuscript does not seem to be directly related to the manuscripts in the Barrett Lennard Collection or the one in the Shaftesbury Collection.

The first serious losses of sections of the original performing score have happened in 1742, when the two Anthems – HWV 261 My heart is inditing and HWV 258 Zadok the priest with the first movement on the new text “God is our hope” and the chorus “God save the King” were – removed.

The more significant changes were made in 1751, when Handel performed with a completely new ensemble of singers. Many of the arias and recitatives had to be transposed and were therefore newly written and the original pages were replaced. The

7 For the two manuscripts see Burrows, 1993, pp. 231-247.
choruses of the anthems were reinstated, but the original folios must have been lost. Therefore, the copyist had to write them again. Some sections of movements and some recitatives have been newly copied for technical reasons, so that the new folios would fit together with the following original ones which could be kept. Finally, Handel inserted new recitatives and arias from previous works, sometimes even with the same text. This leaves us with a huge gap of information because nearly all the annotations and instructions for the previous performances are lost, apart from those on the folios which are now preserved in Cambridge.

Already for the first version of *Esther* in 1718 Handel had reused nine movements from the *Brockes Passion* which he composed in London 1716. In most cases he substituted the original text and made a few adjustments to the melody and instrumentation, later he has worked in the same way with the pieces for *Esther* HWV 50. Normally Handel made use of specific works at a certain period. For *Esther* in 1732 he went back to HWV 242 *Silete venti* (London 1724), some music from the *Coronation Anthems* (London 1727) and HWV 74 *Birthday Ode for Queen Anne* (London 1714) – the air “Thro’ the nation” was the air “Let the rolling streams”, and the chorus “All applauding crowds” was the chorus “The day that gave great Anna birth”. Other movements from the *Coronation Anthems* were also used for *Deborah* (1733), and the *Occasional Oratorio* (1746). Some of the Italian arias, which Handel inserted in the bilingual versions were also placed in the two latter works, sometimes with a different text. A number of the original movements from the 1732 version of *Esther* where used again in *Deborah* in the following year.

“Breathe soft, ye gales” goes partly back to the *accompagnato* “Silete venti” from the same work. The “Alleluja” was taken over from there completely.

In 1735 Handel integrated more music from HWV 242: the aria “Dulcis amor” became “Cor fedele”, “Date serta” became “Bianco giglio” (and before “Meine Seele hört im Sehen” HWV 207), and its B section was turned into “Spira un aura”. For this Handel’s copyist Smith senior has written the alternative text above the system of the voice in the autograph of *Silete venti* (GB-Lbl, R.M.20.g.9). The bundle of arias I have mentioned earlier includes also the solo section for Carestini for the final chorus on three pages (GB-Cfm, MU MS 251, pp. 40-42).

In 1751 Handel again inserted an aria from *Silete venti*: “Hope, a pure and lasting treasure” (it was “Dulcis amor Jesu care”), which he also used in the 1756/57 versions of *Israel in Egypt*.

The air “Watchful angels”, which was sung with the Italian text “Pure menti” by Conti in 1737, was originally “Ferma l’ali” in *La Resurrezione* HWV 47 (Rome 1708), and the additional air “Angelico splendor” is the air “Viver e non amar” from the cantata HWV 96 *Clori, Tirsi e Fileno* (Rome 1707), which was also used in the bilingual version of *Acis and Galatea*.

---

8 HÄNDEL, 1995.
9 BASELT, 1984, p. 725.
10 Ibid., pp. 99f. and 116f.
In 1751 Handel also inserted the aria “No more disconsolate” from Deborah, and from Solomon “Sacred raptures” and “Virtue, truth and innocence”, which was originally composed on the text “When the sun o’er yonder hills”. He used both arias again in the late versions of Israel in Egypt, as well as the additional air “Tua bellezza” on the text “La speranza, la costanza” and possibly in Athalia on the text “L’innocenza, la clemenza”. Also “Cor fedele”, “Bianco giglio” and “Angelico splendor” were inserted in Athalia, and again a number of original movements from the 1732 version of Esther.

Handel has moved around a large amount of music between the different works, but there is still more to say about the use of this bundle of Italian arias in the 1730s. Handel had created a “Benefit Pasticcio” in 1738. This was an oratorio consisting of Anthems, movements from Italian cantatas and mainly movements from Esther, Deborah and Athalia. The Italian arias “La speranza” (= “Tua bellezza”), “Cor fedele”, “Bianco giglio” and “Angelico splendor” were also performed in this context. Finally, all of them have been sung by Elisabeth Duparc (La Francesina) in the second performance of Israel in Egypt on 11th April 1737: “Angelico splendor” in B-flat major (orig. A major), “Cor fedele” in G minor (orig. E minor), and “La speranza, la costanza”.

For the revival in 1757 Esther was changed again. At that time Handel was as good as blind and his assistant John Christopher Smith junior helped him to prepare the material. Some of the new pieces for 1751 have been removed, some new movements have been added. Some movements from the Cannons version were re-instated, especially because the role of Assuerus, which was originally composed for a castrato (Senesino) in 1732, had been sung by the tenor John Beard. In 1718 the part of Assuerus had also been sung by a tenor. It seems from the late secondary sources that the scribe had simply copied these versions for Beard.

The chorus “Shall we of servitude complain” from HWV 50b (no. 4) has already been included in Act I in 1751. In the previous versions it was a recitative.

Conclusion

Handel had an excellent memory and an immense knowledge of music, and he worked in a very economical way, not only through reusing and exploiting his old compositions for new works, or using the same music for several works of a certain period, but also in respect of the consumption of paper, which was expensive. From his autographs, and also from his performing scores, one can see that Handel used every possible space. And so did the copyists from the Smith circle who worked for him. They made only new copies of the pages which had to be replaced. Otherwise Handel or the copyists marked the changes directly in the original score and pasted slips of paper on the sections which

12 For the score and the sources of HWV 50b see: Händel, forthcoming.
14 Hamberger, 2006, p. 43.
were not used for a special performance. Later they were removed if not longer needed. There were also separate music pages for the movements which served in the same period as insertions in different works. Some of them have survived. A great deal of the replaced original folios has been lost.

This description illustrates Handel’s method of the use of his musical material in respect of one special work as an example. *Esther,* however, is not a single case, and I think it is clear, that this practice is a general principle of the composer’s approach.

**Sources**


Id., *Esther,* Oratorio in six scenes (1. Fassung), HWV 50a (Hallische Händel-Ausgabe II,8), ed. by Howard Serwer, Kassel et al. 1995.
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Clausen, Hans Dieter, Händels Direktionspartituren („Handexemplare“) (Hamburger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft 7), Hamburg 1972.


Pasticcios in Darmstadt?
Christoph Graupner and the Use of Non-domestic Librettos in the Early 18th Century

Ursula Kramer

It began with a clear signal: a few weeks prior to taking over as the official ruler from his mother Elisabeth Dorothea, the soon-to-be Landgrave Ernst Ludwig crowned his own wedding celebrations on 1 December 1687 with Dorothea Charlotte, daughter of the Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, with a special musical event – a performance of Jean-Baptiste Lully’s opera *Acis et Galatée*, which had been premiered around 15 months earlier in Paris.

This choice had been anything but random as far as content and music were concerned: the pastoral subject matter seemed quite appropriate for an aristocratic wedding, and while on Grand Tour two years earlier, the young regent had spent half a year in Paris where he experienced musical life at the court of Louis XIV and evidently attended musical performances as well – even if the work given afterwards in Darmstadt had not been among them.¹ It is possible that Ernst Ludwig had still been in Paris during the early stages of the work. This could have been the reason why he ordered an envoy already in early 1687 to go to Paris, buy a copy of the score and acquire drafts of costume and decoration designs as well.² Moreover, the Landgrave could not have distanced himself in more obvious and definite terms from his mother who had had theatrical ambitions and projects of her own: the customary panegyrical congratulatory musical works and their only partially fictional plots featuring the respective landgravial family and explicit references to the worlds they inhabited³ – all ‘home-made’ works in Darmstadt – were replaced with a professional musical theater that he had imported directly from else-

¹ Older publications (especially Pasqué, 1854, p. 61, and Kaiser, 1951, p. 81) are incorrect, as the premiere took place only on 6 September 1686, long after Ernst Ludwig had left the French capital. Cf. Maass, 2019.
² Kaiser, 1951, p. 81.
³ Cf. Kramer, 2019, passim.
where. Even though follow-up plans were thwarted soon after by political events (i.e. the invasion of the French and the relocation of the Darmstadt court to Upper Hessen) – Ernst Ludwig ‘kept at it’ and pursued his opera plans further.

As a frequent and evidently welcome visitor of the Hamburg Gänsemarkt opera house,\(^4\) he realized in 1708/09 that the time had come to set a new course for Darmstadt; after all, Wolfgang Carl Briegel who had been appointed Kapellmeister by his mother was already 82 years old. By choosing Christoph Graupner (1683-1760), Ernst Ludwig opted for a strong proponent of the modern music for the theater based on Italian models. Graupner had not only garnered attention as an opera composer, but also earned his spurs in practical terms as harpsichordist in Hamburg’s opera orchestra.\(^5\) Given his expertise in both areas, Graupner was, therefore, eminently suitable for what Ernst Ludwig now envisioned for Darmstadt, namely the establishment of a permanent opera house.\(^6\)

Although the project may have started ambitiously – Graupner even brought new vocalists from Hamburg (and elsewhere) with him to Darmstadt – it stalled a mere ten years later, primarily on financial grounds. Granted, Graupner’s appointment had a small but positive impact on the number of preserved sources – also as far as the reconstruction of the court’s efforts in support of musical theater is concerned – as at least printed librettos for the majority of Darmstadt operas have been identified in various libraries in the last few decades.\(^7\) These librettos have, in fact, off-set the significant number of

\(^4\) A “Prologo” was dedicated to Ernst Ludwig (“Apollo ermunterte Seine Musen, Dem Durchlauchtigsten Fürsten und Herrn Herrn Ernestus Ludewig Land-Grafen zu Hessen-Darmstadt etc. etc. in einem Prologo zu der Opera Orpheus Ihre unterthänigste Freude zu bezeugen”) (“Apollo encouraged his muses to express their most subservient joy to His Serene Highness and Lord, Lord Ernestus Ludewig, Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt etc. etc. in a prologue to the opera Orpheus”) which had evidently been performed in 1709 prior to Reinhard Keiser’s Treue des Orpheus. Cf. Marx/Schröder, 1995, p. 64.

\(^5\) A detailed biography of Christoph Graupner has yet to be published. Initial research was carried out in the 19\(^{th}\) century (see Pasqué, 1854, whose claims turned out to be unreliable at times, however). More narrowly defined studies on Graupner began to emerge in the early 20\(^{th}\) century, with scholars focusing initially on aspects related to his works. A collection of primary sources pertaining to Graupner’s time in Darmstadt is included in Bill, 1987. Bill, 2004, discusses Graupner’s biography from 1781, while Kramer, 2005, examines his autobiography from 1740. See also Kramer, 2014. Regarding Graupner’s operatic œuvre see McCredie, 1966 and 1987, as well as Drauschke, 2011.

\(^6\) Graupner’s first cantata composition for a Sunday service dates from July 1709. In February 1710 his opera Berenice und Lucilla oder Das tugendhafte Lieben provides tangible evidence of Graupner’s activities as an opera composer in Darmstadt.

\(^7\) This is true for Berenice und Lucilla oder Das tugendhafte Lieben (libretto of the 1710 version in: US-Wc, Albert Schatz Collection, ML 48 S 4119, online: https://www.loc.gov/resource/musschatz.19213.0/?sp=1&r=-0.393,0.019,1.644,0.652,0, 09.12.2019; libretto of the 1712 version in: D-W, Textb. 621; score in: D-W, Cod.Guelf.204 Mus.Hdschr) as well as for Telemach oder Die durch Weißheit im Unglück triumphirende Tugend (libretto only,
archival sources that were lost during the destruction of Darmstadt in 1944. Moreover, two previously unknown scores by Graupner that date from his Hamburg period, *Dido* and *Antiochus und Stratonica,* as well his Darmstadt setting *Berenice und Lucilla,* have been identified amongst Graupner’s extant scores and can now be examined. However, non-domestic musical works once held in Darmstadt suffered considerable losses due to war, especially the Second World War, as did secondary sources at the Hessisches Staatsarchiv relating to the theater’s organization and administration. These losses are all the more serious as the earliest reports on the Darmstadt opera house under Landgrave Ernst Ludwig have turned out to be inaccurate and unreliable. Ernst Pasqué, a Darmstadt opera singer and the first to carry out research on local theater history in the mid-19th century, was an active author of fiction and historical studies, and he did not always distinguish between the two metiers very precisely. The required vigilance is particularly regrettable because Pasqué was the only one who studied these sources before they were destroyed. As far as the former sheet music collection that used to be part of the grand-ducal court music library is concerned, it is now possible to consult instead the card catalogue begun by Friedrich Noack in the early 20th century at the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Darmstadt (D-DS) which is now available online.

This study will follow up on the above-mentioned article by Rashid-S. Pegah who undertook a critical investigation of musical works for the stage during Graupner’s tenure in Darmstadt but focused exclusively on the context and background of opera performances, rather than the music itself. The present author will discuss Graupner’s contributions to the pasticcio genre in line with the overall theme of this edited volume. Given the limited number of extant musical works, the question of whether, in addition to documented Darmstadt performances, non-domestic pasticcios were acknowledged or at least known at the court, will be addressed further via an examination of the Kat­alog der Kriegsverluste der Musikalien (Inventory of music destroyed by the war).

in: D-MZp, 3/2542; RUS-SPsc, 6.35.1.631), *La Costanza vince l’inganno* (libretto: US-We, Albert Schatz Collection, 4121; D-W, Textb. 638; score: D-DS, Mus.ms.413; D-W, Cod. Guelf.55 Mus.Hdschr.), *Adone, pastorale per musica* (libretto only: D-F, Sg. Mansk Mus II 180/931; RUS-SPsc, 6.79.257).


KAISER, 1951, p. X, was not yet aware of the existence of *Berenice und Lucilla* in the Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel (D-W, Cod.Guelf.204 Mus.Hdschr.), as it was only identified in the early 1970s.


See n. 7, *passim.*

Sometime after 1945 Friedrich Noack examined the music inventory he had prepared in the 1920s regarding losses suffered during the war and removed these works from the card catalogue. These continue to be accessible as a separate catalogue at D-DS and are now available online as well.
addition to the years in which Graupner was writing operas in Darmstadt, the periods prior to his appointment and following the discontinuation of opera performances will be investigated. Using a chronological approach, the research presented below will focus on the reign of Ernst Ludwig (1688-1739).

The decades prior to Graupner’s arrival are notable because of the large number of French works (operas, ballets) from that period that are preserved as scores in Darmstadt, mostly prints by Ballard as well as manuscripts. The prints by Ballard might be viewed as a direct link to Ernst Ludwig’s Grand Tour and his 1685/86 stay in Paris. While it is impossible now to determine when exactly these editions became part of the Darmstadt court library, there is reason to believe that it happened soon after they appeared in Paris. Ernst Ludwig’s interest in theatrical events in Paris must surely have continued after the Darmstadt premiere of *Acis et Galatée*. This corresponds with several printed librettos which, unlike the music to go with them, were not destroyed by fire in 1944 but have been preserved to this day, bound together with other non-domestic texts in 1941. In fact, the Paris librettos listed in the collected volumes appear in the Landgrave’s library collection prepared in 1768, after the death of Ernst Ludwig’s son, Ludwig VIII, for the various residences. Consequently, those printed texts from Paris must have been acquired no later than in 1768.

In the case of *Achille et Polixène* (1st act by Lully, prologue and the remaining four acts by Pascal Colasse), only a score (Ballard, Paris 1687) must have existed. In contrast, both the text and the music of the pasticcio *Telemaque, Fragments des modernes* were preserved in Darmstadt prior to 1944. According to Pasqué, the handwritten manuscript copy had allegedly been prepared by Ernst Christian Hesse in Paris prior to

---

13 D-DS, 41/1262, 41/1263, 41/1264, 41/1265. The respective flyleaf papers (printed on combed marbled paper) were included as well. Their varying patterns and colors could provide further clues on when they were acquired for the Landgrave’s library.

14 D-DSSa, D 4 398/1: “Catalogus über diejenigen Bücher welche sich in denen Garderobben des Hochf. seeligen Herrn Landgrafen Hochfürstl. Durchl. allhier und zu Cranichstein vorgefunden haben.”

15 No estate inventory by Ernst Ludwig is extant; the *terminus ante quem* must, therefore, be extended until the death of his son. However, it is highly likely that older librettos from the 17th and the early 18th century had already found their way to Darmstadt during Ernst Ludwig’s life time.

16 The foreword of the libretto (D-DS, 41/1262, no. 3) contains references to collaborations involving multiple composers. They have been identified as: André Campra (*Aréthuse, Le carnaval de Venise*), Pascal Collasse (*Enée et Lavinie, Astrée, Canente*), Marc-Antoine Charpentier (*Médée*), Henri Desmarests (*Circé, Les fêtes galantes*), André Cardinal Destouches (*Le carnaval et la folie*), Jean-Féry Rebel (*Ulysse*), Marin Marais (*Ariane et Bacchus*). On the fragments cf. the article by Thomas Betzwieser in the present volume, pp. 36-38.

returning to Darmstadt in 1701 at the behest of his employer Ernst Ludwig,\textsuperscript{18} and a performance of this work had taken place during a visit of the Elector of Hanover in 1707.\textsuperscript{19} However, references that would confirm an actual production of that work in addition to a physical score, have yet to come to light. A copy of Ballard’s full score of the 1704 pasticcio \textit{Iphigénie en Tauride} by Henri Desmaret and André Campra was held in Darmstadt until 1944.\textsuperscript{20}

Christoph Graupner began to deliver his very own stage productions in Darmstadt soon after taking up the position of \textit{Kapellmeister}. The first documented opera was \textit{Berenice und Lucilla}, premiered in early 1710. Vague references make it impossible to determine what an earlier production in the autumn of 1709 might have entailed.\textsuperscript{21} There is, however, reason to believe that the latter was a separate, autonomous work rather than an earlier performance of \textit{Berenice} based on the original \textit{Lucio Vero} libretto by Apostolo Zeno. This hypothesis is supported by the respective entry in an overview of invoices listing existing prints from the first two decades of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, the present author suggests in the following examination of \textit{Berenice und Lucilla} – which details Graupner’s extensive reuse of musical material from his Hamburg period – that the earlier piece from 1709 could, in fact, have been a revival of sorts of another work. After all, Graupner had only just arrived in Darmstadt and thus had even less time for this production than he had for the performance in 1710 during Carnival.

In addition to several extant printed librettos,\textsuperscript{23} a manuscript of the score has been preserved.\textsuperscript{24} Since the present author provided a detailed dramaturgical examination of the text for this new Darmstadt version of the \textit{Lucio Vero} libretto (originally in Italian, it was issued in a separate [translated] version in Hamburg in 1702 entitled \textit{Berenice}) in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[18] Since it was only premiered in 1704, the date given by Pasqué, 1854, p. 173, was likely an error on his part.
\item[19] Noack, 1967, p. 166, who does not refer to archival sources.
\item[20] The preceding “Avertissement” contained references to the collaboration of the two composers Desmaret and Campra.
\item[21] Cf. Pegah, 2011, p. 211.
\item[22] Bräuning-Oktavio, 1934. Under 1709 we read: “Komödie (11 Bogen, 1 Blatt, 400 Auflage: 43 fl. 10 xr.” (p. 90), and under 1710: “Graupner, Singspiel Berenice und Lucilla (34 Seiten)” (p. 91).
\item[23] See n. 7, for the title pages Pegah, 2011, pp. 213 and 217.
\item[24] See n. 6.
\end{footnotes}
an earlier publication,\textsuperscript{25} specific details will not be included here.\textsuperscript{26} Suffice it to say that Georg Christian Lehms was possibly involved in the preparation of the libretto and that Graupner probably knew of the earlier Hamburg performance of that particular adaptation of \textit{Lucio Vero}; after all, it is known that George Frideric Handel also studied the older Hamburg repertoire.\textsuperscript{27}

However, there are remarkable discrepancies between the 1702 Hamburg version and the Darmstadt libretto of \textit{Berenice}. The latter’s content is much closer to the Italian original, even though the plot was shortened and simplified, and several scenes have been cut altogether. Unlike in the Italian original, Lucius Verus, Berenice, and her lover Vologesus are not presented as three autonomous protagonists with individual character strengths but as suffering individuals throughout. This has musical consequences, in that the arias and duets for Berenice and Vologesus are similar in character. Furthermore, when compared to the original libretto, the cuts at the end of the third act cause dramatic problems by making Lucius Verus’ sudden return to his fiancée Lucilla and his renouncing of Berenice appear somewhat unconvincing. The original Italian libretto clearly informed the 1710 Darmstadt text version, despite occasionally necessary textual revisions and wordings, however.

Vocalists did not only sing in Italian, however; with the exception of the minor role of Claudius, all other protagonists also had to perform arias in German. Similarly, duets were based on Italian texts, but drew from German ones as well.

In contrast, there are also several additional arias included in the Darmstadt version. Based on texts that show no connection to Zeno’s original, these arias will be the focus of the present author’s examination of Graupner’s \textit{Berenice} below, using Rein-

\textsuperscript{25} Kramer, 2011. The information provided on the early reception of the \textit{Lucius Verus} text in Germany outside of Darmstadt needs to be updated as follows (I thank Rashid-S. Pegah for drawing my attention to the early versions in Germany): this libretto had already been set to music a year earlier (1701) as \textit{Lucius Verus} in Brunswick, then as \textit{Berenice} in Hamburg in 1702 (as discussed in Kramer, 2011), in Leipzig in 1703 (as \textit{Lucius Verus}), in Zeitz in 1711 (by Johann Friedrich Fasch), and in Munich in 1720 (by Pietro Torri) as \textit{Lucio Vero}. In 1728 Reinhard Keiser oversaw a new production of the 1702 Hamburg version of \textit{Berenice} at the Gänsemarkt Opera (also as \textit{Lucius Verus}), with some arias having been replaced.

\textsuperscript{26} Apostolo Zeno’s libretto is based on historical subject matter from Roman times. The protagonists are the daughter of Emperor Marcus Aurelius, Lucilla, and her fiancé, Lucius Verus. He has defeated the King of the Parthians, Vologesus, in Asia Minor and has fallen in love with Vologesus’s lover Berenice, Princess of Armenia. Because of Lucius Verus’s long absence from Rome, Lucilla travels to Ephesus with Claudius, her confidant, to join him and learns of his unfaithfulness. Lucius Verus wants to break off their relationship for good, but Berenice turns him down and prefers to die alongside Vologesus. Lucilla is willing to forgive Lucius Verus, who returns to her and not only releases the imprisoned Vologesus, but allows him to take Berenice as his wife.

\textsuperscript{27} See Marx, 2006, especially pp. 354ff.
Pasticcios in Darmstadt?

Reusing “a considerable number” (“bedeutsame [...] Anzahl”) of compositions “from different sources” (“aus anderen Zusammenhängen”) presents to him “the only valid criterion for the term pasticcio” (“das einzige stichhaltige Kriterium des Pasticcio-Begriffs”). Remarkably, a total of 16 texts were interpolated in the Darmstadt libretto of Berenice, all of which turn out to be taken from four operas written by Graupner himself for Hamburg between 1707 and 1709. (One of these aria texts was, however, replaced in Graupner’s score, see below.)

They are:

Antiochus und Stratonica, 1707
Il Fido Amico oder Hercules und Theseus, 1708
Bellerophon oder Das in die Preußische Krone verwandelte Wagen-Gestirn, 1708
Der Fall des großen Richters in Israel Simson oder Die abgekühlte Liebes-Rache der Debora, 1709

29 Ibid., pp. 351-356.
30 This discrepancy in number – 15 instead of 16 – was already taken into account in the present author’s earlier article (see n. 24).
31 L’amore ammalato || Die kranckende Liebe. || Oder: || Antiochus || Und || Strato-|| nica.|| Musicalisches Schau=Spiel/||Auff dem grossen|| Hamburgischen Theatro|| Vorgestel-
33 Bellerophon || Oder || Das in die Preußische Krone || verwandelte Wagen=Gestirn/ || An dem frohen || Vermählungs=Feste|| Sr. Königlichen Majestät von Preussen || Friderici I. || Mit der || Durchlauchtigsten Mecklenburgis. Princeßin || Sophie || Louyse || Zu unter-

34 Der Fall || Des grossen Richters in Israel/|| Simson, || Oder: || Die abgekühlte Liebes=Rache der || Debora. || Musicalisches Trauer=Spiel{ || Auff dem grossen Hamburgischen Schau=Platz || vorgestellet. || Im November des 1709ten Jahrs. || Hamburg. Gedruckt mit Spieringschen Schrifften, online: https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkans-
Graupner did not draw from *Dido* (1707), *Der Carneval in Venedig* (1707), and *Die blut-durstige Rache oder Heliates und Olympia* (1709).

Only the music for *Antiochus und Stratonica* has been preserved and can, therefore, shed light on how adopted text passages were handled. The Darmstadt version of the *Berenice* text (hereafter: *B*) includes four pieces from *Antiochus und Stratonica* (hereafter: *AS*). They are, in order:

1) “Ich verbanne, verwerfe die Schöne”: I,4, aria, Lucius Verus:
   Because of his love for the Armenian princess Berenice, Lucius Verus has tired of his fiancée Lucilla and wishes to dispose of her.
   Taken from II,6 *AS*: aria, Demetrius
2) “Durch Tugend, Rach und Güte”: I,13, aria, Lucilla:
   Lucilla has followed Lucius Verus to Ephesus and learns that he has met someone new; she reflects on her situation.
   Taken from III,1 *AS*: aria, Ellinia
3) “In einer stillen Liebes-See”: II,7, aria, Anicetus:
   Anicetus ponders his secret love for Lucilla.
   Taken from I,6 *AS*: aria, Antiochus
4) “Betrügrische Hoffnung, du heuchelst mir nur”: II,9, aria, Vologesus:
   Vologesus is in despair about the inescapable situation for himself and Berenice.
   Taken from II,11 *AS*: aria, Antiochus

This text is only included in the printed libretto, while the score contains an aria based on the Italian text “Ho un sol core” from Zeno’s Italian *Lucio Vero* libretto. It was originally assigned to the character of Berenice.

36  *Der Angenehme || Betrug{ Oder: || Der || Carneval || von Venedig, || In einem || Sing=Spiele auf den grossen || Hamburgischen Schau=Platze || vorgestelllet. || Im Jahr 1707*, online: https://www.loc.gov/item/2010665908/, 09.12.2019. The main composer was Reinhard Keiser; however, the structure of some of the arias suggests a collaboration with Christoph Graupner. D-Hs, ND VI 2889g.
Texts that were adopted from the other three operas by Graupner are listed below:

**Il Fido amico oder Hercules und Theseus** (hereafter: *FA*)

1) “Satiati o bararo”: I,3, aria, Vologesus:
   Taken from II,3 *FA*: aria, Hyllus
2) “Non hà tante stelle il Ciel”: I,3, aria, Berenice:
   Taken from II,1 *FA*: aria, Jole
3) “Spirti amanti festeggiate!” I,7, aria a 2, Lucilla, Claudius:
   Delighted, they arrive at the shore in Ephesus.
   Taken from I,4 *FA*: aria a 2, Jole, Hyllus
4) “Rallegrati, o cuore”: II,3, aria, Anicetus:
   Taken from II,12 *FA*: aria, Pelius
5) “Addio / Deh non partir!”: II,6, aria a 2, Berenice, Vologesus:
   Taken from I,6 *FA*: aria a 2: Hercules, Megara
6) “Non puo ridere il mio core”: II,7, aria, Lucilla:
   Taken from I,5 *FA*: aria, Megara

**Der Fall des großen Richters in Israel Simson oder Die abgekühlte Liebes-Rache der Debora** (hereafter: *S*)

1) “Brich nicht das Band”: II,10, aria, Berenice:
   Taken from II,13 *S*: aria, Jotham
2) “Solo per te mio dolce ben”: II,12, aria, Lucius Verus:
   Taken from II,1 *S*: aria, Elon

**Bellerophon oder Das in die Preußische Krone verwandelte Wagen-Gestirn** (hereafter: *Bph*)

1) “Vuo dar morte”: I,9, aria Claudius:
   Taken from III,11 *Bph*: aria, Jobates
2) “Vieni o caro”: I,10, aria, Berenice:
   Taken from I,6 *Bph*: aria, Philonoe
3) “Guancie belle”/“Luci vaghe”: I,12, aria a 2, Berenice, Vologesus :
   Taken from III,10 *Bph*: aria a 2 Philonoe, Bellerophon
4) “Ein Mensch kann wohl auf kurze Zeit”: II,1, aria, Lucius Verus
   Taken from I,3 *Bph*: arioso, Amisodor

This begs the question of why Graupner reused so many pieces from his own works written for Hamburg. Pragmatic reasons come into mind. Since he began composing in Darmstadt only in mid-1709 and performed his first opera that autumn, followed by *Be-
Ursula Kramer

renice in February 1710,\(^{38}\) the large geographical distance between Hamburg and Darmstadt could have encouraged Graupner even more to fall back on arias from works he had just composed; and not even the Landgrave may have remembered these Hamburg works – if he had, in fact, attended their performances at the Gänsemarkt theater at all.

The aforementioned four pieces that were borrowed from *Antiochus und Stratonica* with one evidently being discarded later on, deserve closer examination as well. A different rationale was used for each, thus shifting the focus to those individuals – composer and vocalists – who were the driving forces behind such adaptations.\(^{39}\) The text and music of two of the four adopted arias are nearly identical. Graupner even kept the original key (D minor) for Lucilla’s aria, “Durch Tugend, Rach und Güte” (\(B\)) I,13 and changed only the cadential resolution in the final four bars. Anicetus’s allegorical aria, „In einer stillen Liebes-See” (\(B\)) II,7, has been transposed from D minor to G minor, probably to cater to the vocalist’s needs.

When choosing suitable pieces to adapt, the composer would, of course, have looked for basic similarities in content and dramaturgical structure (which applies in particular to Lucilla’s aria rather than Anicetus’s).\(^{40}\) But the quality of music would have been an even more important factor. This appears to be the case in Anicetus’s aria, which, in terms of sound, is the most extraordinary piece included in the Darmstadt version. Graupner scored it for “3 Viol. e Flaut: Travers.”; based on the range of the flute, the uppermost part doubled the highest voice an octave higher. In addition to the vocal line, the music features two different textural layers, which is typical for Graupner.\(^{41}\) Specifically, he contrasts an upper part with continuous triplets that circles around itself to capture the text’s meaning, i.e. waves, with a calmer repetition of duplets in the lower parts. At times, the bass part disengages from this lower textural layer, either to play supporting fundamental notes or to reinforce the static scenery via a pedal point.

Apart from the aria’s musical quality – within the space of a few short bars, three different affects, virtue, vengeance, and mercy are integrated into a greater musical whole, without disclosing vengeance’s actual state signalled by coloraturas and extremely erratic melodic lines – Graupner’s decision to keep it may have been motivated by a personal connection. Two Hamburg vocalists, Margaretha Susanna Kayser and Anna Maria Schober, had followed him to Darmstadt. Little is known about the vocalists who performed during Graupner’s early years in Hamburg.\(^{42}\) It is likely, however, that Madame Kayser had performed the part of Ellenia (from *Antiochus und Stratonica*) in Hamburg and then sang the role of Lucilla in Darmstadt;\(^{43}\) as a result, Graupner did not have to make any revisions to cater to a different singer’s needs. Furthermore, a Ham-

\(^{38}\) Graupner’s first cantata for Darmstadt dates from the 7th Sunday after Trinity, 14 July 1709.

\(^{39}\) Cf. Strohm, 2011.

\(^{40}\) The problematic feelings experienced by the protagonist Antiochus for his stepmother Stratonica are different in nature from Anicetus’s secret feelings for Lucilla.


\(^{43}\) See Kaiser, 1951, p. 165.
burg collection of arias from Reinhard Keiser’s opera *Der Carneval von Venedig*, in whose production Graupner was supposedly involved, contains an important piece of information about the identity of the vocalist. The arias sung by Celinde contain the annotation “Mme Schober”. They do not contain any coloratura passages, just like Berenice’s music written for Darmstadt; this suggests that Anna Maria Schober may have sung this part (along with Margaretha Susanna Kayser as Lucilla). Therefore, one must assume that, in addition to the author’s and composer’s intentions, the performer’s wishes played a role as far as the reuse of this particular aria is concerned.

The above-mentioned cuts in the *Lucio Vero* libretto also affected the text of Lucius Verus’s aria “Ich verbanne, verwerfe die Schöne” (*B*) I,4, taken from *Antiochus und Stratonica*. It replaced an aria from the Italian original that had been sung by his confidante Claudius. Even though Graupner adopted the older (Hamburg) text of *Antiochus und Stratonica* without changes, he composed entirely new music for it. Different explanations come to mind. The melodic writing is much more convincing and sophisticated in the Darmstadt version, with the result that the dramaturgy of the scene becomes more precise and the protagonist comes across as more vigorous. Vocal considerations and singers’ wishes could also have made a difference. The role of Lucius Verus was taken by Gottfried Grünwald whom Graupner knew from his Leipzig days and who had also sung at the Hamburg Opera in the meantime. Perhaps, he wished to show off his special vocal skills more prominently, given that the original version of the Demetrius aria in *Antiochus und Stratonica* contains virtually none of the coloratura runs (first sixteenth notes, then sixteenth triplets) that were included in the new Darmstadt version.

A different case is the fourth aria text adopted from *Antiochus und Stratonica*. The older text, “Betrügrische Hoffnung, du heuchelst mir nur” (*B*) II,9, would have worked perfectly to depict Vologesus’s supposed hopelessness. In Graupner’s score, however, it was replaced with an Italian text, “Ho un sol core, un sol’ alma”, which had been assigned to Berenice in Zeno’s original *Lucio Vero* libretto (as II,5). Since both lovers are portrayed as victims, reassigning the text to Vologesus would not have presented a problem. The decision to favor the Italian text may have been related directly to the person who performed the role of Vologesus in Darmstadt. Guido Erdmann has examined performing materials of Graupner cantatas and drawn attention to both German (*Kurrentschrift*) and Latin scripts as well as additional phonetic aids being used in different contexts, and he argues that those could have assisted Italian singers performing

44 D-Hs, ND VI 2889g.  
45 Ibid.  
47 Immediately prior to his Darmstadt appointment, from 1707 to 1709, he had served as *Vice-Kapellmeister* in Weißenfels and performed the role of Lucius Verus in February 1710 as a guest. In 1711 he moved to Darmstadt permanently and served as *Vice-Kapellmeister* until his death in 1739.  
48 The exception in the original version are bars 15-17, a short passage of no more than six fast, consecutive notes which are vocally much less challenging.
An Italian alto (castrato) might have been at Graupner’s disposal for the first time in December 1709 as well as in February 1710, and throughout 1712. This means that Graupner would likely have finished the Berenice libretto (including the one aria from Antiochus und Stratonica in German) prior to casting the role of Vologesus and replacing the initially intended aria with a new one in Italian. This hypothesis is also supported by a reprint of the Berenice libretto for performances that took place in 1712. This source shows both the original German text and the Italian version from the score in the exact same spot as before — but the layout makes it seem as if it were simply a translation, which it is not.

The change of language from German to Italian is also accompanied by a change in the aria’s character. A multi-sectional piece featuring a multi-faceted dramatic text (signalled by changes in meter from 4/4 to — a faster — 3/8 and back, followed by 6/4 and da capo) is replaced by a continuous Adagio in 4/4. Musically, the new aria is much more unassuming, but it appears that the composer had taken into account the specific vocal skills of his (presumably Italian) performer by writing melismas and long coloraturas.

Despite the discrepancies amongst the four aria adaptations and the subsequent modifications made to the Darmstadt Berenice version, it is evident that Graupner was very probably closely involved himself in the creation of the new libretto. The lack of additional scores from his Hamburg period is most regrettable, in that borrowings — such as the ones observed in Berenice und Lucilla — could potentially have occurred on a much larger scale.

We are also still somewhat in the dark about Graupner’s other operatic output for Darmstadt: The music for Telemach (1711) and Adone (1719) has been lost; only two handwritten scores of the pastorale La Costanza vince l’inganno, performed in 1715 and in 1719, have been preserved. At present, further adaptations, borrowings, etc. are not known.

49 Erdmann, 2005.
50 Ibid., p. 28. This was evidently not the castrato Campioli, who appears in Darmstadt sources from 1718 but could conceivably have participated in earlier cantata performances. Ibid., pp. 17f., 27.
51 Ibid., p. 12. Erdmann argues in favor of that same Italian castrato having sung the role of Vologesus, rather than Johann Gottlob Renner, as suggested by Kaiser, 1951, p. 98. The fact that, with the exception of one aria in III,13 (“Ja, glaub es”), all vocal pieces (arias and duets) involving Vologesus are sung in Italian, also implies that they were performed by an Italian. In all the other major characters’ parts, there are Italian as well as German aria and duet texts given side by side.
52 See above, n. 7. Musically, La Costanza vince l’inganno is very different and even features several “Tanz-Arien” (arias with dance rhythms). Adaptations have not been identified to date; one must also keep in mind that operas with a similar libretto have frequently not been preserved. Pragmatic reasons, such as a lack of preparation time as seen with Berenice und Lucilla, do not apply here.
The discontinuation of operatic performances in 1719 meant the end of musical ‘in-house’ productions at the Darmstadt court. The theater was used only sporadically for events such as balls. Only references to works from outside of Darmstadt, possibly pasticcios, remained, as documented by the Katalog der Kriegsverluste der Musikalien held at the University and State Library in Darmstadt. Among them was music for French productions (operas and ballets dating from the 1720s and 1730s), as well as several collaborations by François Rebel and François Francœur, Pyrame et Thisbé (1726), Le Trophée (1745), and Zélindor; roi des Syphes (1745).  

Of the works that have been preserved, the Italian opera La fedeltà coronata deserves special attention because it may owe its existence to a historic mistake. In the 19th century Ernst Pasqué had attributed this work to Ernst Christian Hesse (who served at the court both as a jurist and a gambist and who, in the meantime, had also been active as music director). That may have been the reason why it was singled out by the authorities tasked with protecting particularly significant holdings (manuscripts) that were part of the Darmstadt historical court library during the Second World War. In fact, it was taken to Heppenheim an der Bergstraße together with numerous other scores. Several years ago Rashid-S. Pegah showed that this work had not been composed by Hesse or for Darmstadt. His detailed philological study of the score took into consideration earlier research presented by Reinhard Strohm regarding the identity of Antonio Vivaldi’s Argippo and its dissemination north of the Alps. Pegah also shed further light on its rather complicated links to Venice, Vivaldi, and its scribe Antonio Maria Peruzzi. Since the music has been preserved and Peruzzi was active as an impresario in Frankfurt in 1731/32, it is possible that he could have been in direct contact with the Darmstadt court, despite the absence of references to a performance of La fedeltà coronata given there. In contrast, Peruzzi’s copy of the serenata Apollo in Tempe has been identified as a work by Giovanni Porta (with the exception of three arias), thanks to another copy preserved in Dresden. The Darmstadt version contains a special dedication to

53 According to the respective entry in the Darmstadt Katalog der Kriegsverluste der Musikalien (see n. 16), the two works of 1745 had been bound together. According to Pitou, 1985, p. 555, Le Trophée is the prologue to Zélindor which was not part of the printed libretto.

54 D-DS, Mus.ms.245.

55 Pegah, 2011b.

56 Strohm, 2008.

57 Ibid., especially pp. 64-67. On Antonio Maria Peruzzi cf. the article by Berthold Over in the present volume, pp. 241-269.

58 Ibid.

59 D-DS, Mus.ms.1174. This work had also initially been linked to Ernst Christian Hesse.

Landgrave Ernst Ludwig and could have been performed in 1731 on the occasion of his birthday.\textsuperscript{61}

Finally, it remained to Grand Duke Ludewig I, the great-grandson of Christoph Graupner’s employer Ernst Ludwig, to re-establish a permanent opera for the town of Darmstadt and its court in 1810: by offering tenure to a former traveling theater troupe as well as reactivating and expanding the Hofkapelle, he became the founder of the Grand-Ducal Court Theater (Großherzogliches Hoftheater) and re-established a theater tradition in Darmstadt that is ongoing. On occasion, compositions by the former Hofkapellmeisters and other Darmstadt musicians associated with the stage – specifically Carl Wagner, Georg Joseph Vogler, Wilhelm Mangold, Carl Amand Mangold, and Willem de Haan – were also performed. However, they played a negligible role as far as overall programming was concerned, and, for that matter, the ‘Age of the Pasticcio’ had passed.\textsuperscript{62}

\textit{Translation: Barbara M. Reul}

\section*{Sources}

\textsc{Anon.} [\textit{Vivaldi, Antonio}], \textit{La fedeltà coronata}; score: D-DS, Mus.ms.245.

Card catalogue, (handwritten) of all musical works held in D-DS (manuscripts and prints), including the old court Kapelle library collection, but not those compositions that were destroyed in the Second World War: they were removed and catalogued separately in the Katalog der Kriegsverluste der Musikalien which can be accessed in person as well as online (see below).

Catalogus über diejenige Bücher welche sich in denen Garderobben des Hochf. seeligen Herrn Landgrafen Hochfürstl. Durchl. allhier und zu Cranichstein vorgefunden haben, D-DSsa, D 4398/1.

Collection of various librettos, D-DS, 41/1262, 41/1263, 41/1264, 41/1265.

\textsc{Graupner, Christoph}, \textit{Adone. Pastorale per musica}; libretto: D-F, Sg. Mansk Mus II 180/931; RUS-SPsc, 6.79.257.

\textsc{Id.}, Bellerophon || Oder || Das in die Preußische Krone || verwandelte Wagen=Gestirn || An dem frohen || Vermählungs=Feste || Sr. Königlichen Majestät von Preussen || Friderici I. || Mit der || Durchlauchtigsten Mecklenburgis. Princeßin || Sophie || Louyse || Zu unterthänigster Freuden=Bezeugung || In einer operetta,|| Auf dem || Grossen Hamburgischen Schau=Platz || aufgeführt. || Im Jahr 1708. den 28. Novem-

\textsuperscript{61} Pegah, 2011b, p. 71, refers to performance annotations in the score.

\textsuperscript{62} For further development of opera in Darmstadt see Knispel, 1910; Kaiser, 1955; Id., 1964. For the intermediate stage (traveling troupes by Leppert, Jüngling, Nestrich, Berner and Krebs) as well as the performances organized and realized by members of the landgravian family during the 1770s and 1780s cf. Kaiser, 1951, pp. 127-161.
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br.; libretto: US-Wc, Schatz 4118, online: https://www.loc.gov/item/2010665883/, 09.12.2019; see also MARX/SCHRÖDER, 1995, p. 80, for additional source locations.

Id., Berenice und Lucilla oder Das Tugendhaffte Lieben, Darmstadt 1710; libretto: US-Wc, Albert Schatz Collection, ML 48 S 4119, online: https://www.loc.gov/resource/musschatz.19213.0/?sp=1&r=-0.393,0.019,1.644,0.652,0, 09.12.2019.

Berenice und Lucilla oder Das Tugendhaffte Lieben, Darmstadt 1712; libretto: D-W, Textbuch 621.


Id., Telemach oder Die durch Weißheit im Unglück triumphirende Tugend; libretto: D-MZp, 3/2542; RUS-SPsc, 6.35.1.631.

Handschriftlicher Zettelkatalog der Musikalien (auch Altbestand), D-DS, Forschungslesesaal.
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Gluck’s Contribution to the Pasticcios
*Arsace* and *La finta schiava*

**Tanja Gölz**

Christoph Willibald Gluck began his career as an opera composer in northern Italy, where he wrote eight *opere serie* mostly on librettos by Pietro Metastasio for different theaters from 1741 to 1745. His starting point and main place of work was Milan, but operas were also commissioned from Venice, Crema and Turin, resulting in the following list:

*Artaserse* (Milan 1741)  
*La Sofonisba* (Milan 1744)  
*Demetrio* (Venice 1742)  
*Ipermestra* (Venice 1744)  
*Demofoonte* (Milan 1743)  
*Poro* (Turin 1744)  
*Il Tigrane* (Crema 1743)  
*L’Ippolito* (Milan 1745)

Most of these early operas have only been preserved fragmentarily,¹ which makes it more difficult to reliably assess the extent to which vocal pieces were reused. Nevertheless, they seem to have constituted a large source from which Gluck would borrow throughout his whole career.² In particular, the operas *La caduta dei giganti* and *Artamene*, each performed at the King’s Theatre in London in 1746, consisted largely of

---

1 Of the mentioned works, only *Ipermestra* has been preserved completely, while for *Demofoonte* at least all 27 consecutive vocal numbers as well as a march and two *obbligato* recitatives are traceable; cf. the corresponding source descriptions in GLUCK, 1997, pp. 317-321, and GLUCK, 2014, pp. 299-304. Of the remaining six *opere serie*, however, even less than half of the original material has survived; cf. GLUCK, 2017, pp. 303-314. The second volume to be published by the author, GLUCK, CHRISTOPH WILLIBALD, *Fragmentarisch überlieferte Opere serie: Demetrio (Venedig 1742), Poro (Turin 1744), La caduta dei giganti (London 1746), Artamene, (London 1746), Issipile (Prag 1752)* (Christoph Willibald Gluck. Sämtliche Werke III,2), is being prepared.

2 These borrowings have been studied in detail and were presented by HORTSCHANSKY, 1973. For further borrowings accounted for by Yuliya Shein, cf. the digital *catalogue*
borrowings, a local pasticcio practice there, which Gluck used in order to gain popularity with the English audience similar to that which he had gained in Italy for himself and for the singers by using selected arias. Aside from these two examples of a ‘self-pastiche’, Gluck also encountered pasticcios in the proper sense, as “an opera made up of various pieces from different composers or sources and adapted to a new or existing libretto”. Thus, two pasticcios were performed in northern Italy during his early period – *Arsace* (Milan 1743) and *La finta schiava* (Venice 1744) – which historical musical sources explicitly ascribe to Gluck. This paper aims to determine Gluck’s contribution to these pasticcio productions by examining the quality as well as the according validity and reliability of these musical sources.

1. *Arsace*

In 1744, Gluck made his third contribution to the Teatro Regio Ducal in Milan by submitting his opera *La Sofonisba*, which was the second and thereby more important carnival opera of the season, for which renowned composers were employed. The carnival season, however, was not opened with an opera specifically composed for this occasion but with the pasticcio *Arsace*, based on Antonio Salvi’s *tragedia per musica* *Amore e raisonné* of the Gluck-Gesamtausgabe (online: http://www.gluck-gesamtausgabe.de/gwv.html, 06.12.2019).

3 Cf. STROHM, 2009, and SQUIRE, 1915.

4 Among the performers, the soprano Teresa Pompeati, née Imer, as well as the soprano castratos Giuseppe Jozzi and Angelo Maria Monticelli worked on Gluck’s operas *Artaserse* (Jozzi), *Demetrio* (Imer) and *L’Ippolito* (Monticelli), but presented themselves in London mostly with arias composed for singer colleagues, preferably from the operas *Il Tigrane* and *La Sofonisba*, which suggests a stronger influence of the composer in this case in selecting the arias. Cf. STROHM, 2011, p. 78.

5 According to Curtis Price, this is defined as “an amalgam of a composer’s own arias in a new context”, PRICE, 1992, p. 907.

6 Ibid. Cf. also HEYINK, 1997, who emphasizes in this context: “Ob die Werkteile aus älteren Kompositionen unverändert kompiliert, bearbeitet und somit dem neuen Kontext angepaßt oder extra für diesen Anlaß neu komponiert wurden, ist für die Begriffsbestimmung zweitrangig.” (“Whether the parts of the work from older compositions were compiled and edited unchanged and thus adapted to the new context or newly composed for this occasion, is of secondary importance for the definition.”) Ibid., col. 1496.

7 The reverse case that Gluck’s adaptation of the pasticcio *Arianna*, performed in Vienna in 1762, is documented through an invoice, but the music of this work nevertheless has not even been preserved in excerpts, is described by HORTSCHANSKY, 1971.

8 In summary, the results of this study have already been presented in the preface to GLUCK, 2017, pp. XXV-XXVII.

9 As described by KUZMICK HANSELL, 1986, p. X.
maestà written in 1715. The fact that the dramma per musica performed on 26 December 1743 is an adapted version and not a new setting of the sujet is made clear by the absence of a composer’s name in the libretto of the premiere.\(^{10}\) Even the Gazzetta di Milano, the official news and publishing organ of the Habsburg government in Lombardy, does not mention a composer in its only report on the season opening with Arsace, which surely would have been done in the case of a new production.\(^{11}\) However, a presumably contemporary, handwritten addition to one of the surviving librettos indicates Giovanni Battista Lampugnani as the original author.\(^{12}\) In 1741, he had composed an Arsace for the autumn fair in Crema, which is documented through the corresponding libretto as well as through a copy of the musical score of the first act.\(^{13}\) A complete score for the production in Milan has not survived though, only single copies exist, among them eight score copies of arias and one of an obbligato recitative with Gluck’s name included in a manuscript collection in four volumes.\(^{14}\) These contemporary manuscripts of Italian provenance probably arrived at the Bibliothèque du Conservatoire de Musique in Paris together with score copies of individual parts from Gluck’s early opere serie in the late 18th century when Napoleon captured cultural artefacts during the Italian campaign. It was not until 1840 that they were bound together there with other copies of vocal and instrumental numbers from Gluck’s later works.\(^{15}\) The score copies of Arsace were all produced by the same Milanese scribe, who also copied some numbers for Demofoon-
The score is greatly shortened to the extent that the violin part is occasionally not even written out but only indicated through “Col Canto” or “Col Basso”. Some copies do not feature any dynamic and tempo specifications and only carry few articulation markings, which does not suggest a practical use. Each of the vocal numbers is preceded by a title page, displaying numberings by two different hands and containing the title of the aria as well as the composer’s name “Del Sig.: Cluch”. Specifically, the following pieces are included, listed according to their sequence in the first and third volumes of the manuscript collection:

Aria of Arsace “Benché copra al sole il volto” (I,8)
Aria of Statira “Se fido l’adorai” (I,2)
Recitativo “No, che non ha la sorte” and Aria of Arsace “Si, vedrò quell’alma ingrata” (I,12)
Aria of Artabano “Sì, cadrà con grave scempio” (I,4)
Aria of Statira “Perfido, traditore” (I,10)
Aria of Orcano “Tema quell’alma audace” (I,4)
Aria of Megabise “Quando ruina con le sue spume” (I,6)
Aria of Rosmiri “Colomba innamorata” (I,7)

All eight vocal numbers are from the first act which led to the long-standing assumption that Gluck had composed this act as part of a collaborative production. As early as 1966, Klaus Hortschansky critically investigated Gluck’s assumed collaborative authorship of this pasticcio; the following observations are conceived as continuing and complementing his considerations on the basis of current research.

Lampugnani’s personal involvement in the performances of Arsace in 1743/44 can be excluded due to the fact that he was staying in London at the time. Gluck, however,

---

16 This scribe also copied parts for Giovanni Battista Sammartini’s Sinfonia A major (J-C 62a); Newell Jenkins and Bathia Churgin refer to him as copyist B, cf. Jenkins/Churgin, 1976, p. 90, as well as ibid. the facsimile on p. 34.
17 Digital reproduction available online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52505452j, 06.12.2019.
18 Digital reproduction available online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52505457s, 06.12.2019. On the title page, this number is mistakenly labelled “l’Aria frà il rimorso e frà l’affanno”, which deviates from the correct text.
19 Digital reproduction available online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52508686c, 06.12.2019.
20 These numbers were first attributed to Arsace by Piovano, 1908, pp. 267-273, who also studied Gluck’s involvement in this production.
22 He was employed in autumn 1743 as Baldassare Galuppi’s successor at the King’s Theatre as resident composer, where his opera Rossane (an adaptation of Handel’s Alessandro) was premiered on 15 November, cf. Burney, 1789, p. 842.
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was present in order to complete and rehearse the second carnival opera La Sofonisba. It therefore seems obvious that he was also responsible for the performances of the opening opera in his function as maestro di cappella. This is proven by a balance sheet from 1744, unknown to Hortschansky, according to which 225 lire were paid “to signor Christoforo Cluck maestro di cappella as recognition for the first opera” (“Al Sig. Cristoforo Cluck Maestro di Cappella per ricognizione della prim’opera”) on 26 February. Taking the payment of 1,500 lire into account, which Gluck received for the composition, rehearsals and conducting the first performances of La Sofonisba on 7 February, this additional fee can be interpreted as a sign of appreciation for his work on Arsace. It is even conceivable that Gluck himself initiated to reuse the work by bringing back the score of Lampugnani’s setting from his stay in Crema, where he had performed Il Tigrane on 26 September 1743, and arranging it for the Milanese season, i.e. for the local singers. It has to be determined to what extent he merely arranged the opera or if he also contributed his compositions.

Two of the arias associated with Gluck, “Se fido l’adorai” (I,2) and “Perfido, traditore” (I,10) are musically and textually identical with Lampugnani’s version as documented in the copied score of the first act. These are the first two arias of Statira, composed for the soprano Caterina Aschieri, who had already performed this role in Lampugnani’s Arsace in Crema (cf. Table 1) and who therefore will have sung these arias again in Milan. Like Giovanni Carestini, Aschieri had worked on another Arsace production immediately beforehand. It was performed for the first time in Venice on 16 November 1743 and is presumably also a pasticcio, for which no composer’s name and score have been preserved. Aside from the aforementioned arias, the accompanying libretto, however, is textually identical to all of Statira’s numbers in the Milanese textbook (cf. Table 2). This suggests that Aschieri took over all the vocal pieces for the

23 Quoted from Vezzosi, 1999, p. 339.
24 Ibid., p. 337.
25 It is incomprehensible why Dale E. Monson lists this opera among Galuppi’s works; cf. Monson, 2001, p. 487. Although Galuppi returned to Venice from London in the summer of 1743, there is no indication that he was responsible for the Arsace production of the autumn season, even though this cannot be ruled out. This attribution is corrected in Reinhard Wiesend’s revised list of Galuppi’s works where the opera is not even listed under “Zweifelhafte Bühnenwerke” or “Bearbeitungen”; cf. Wiesend, 2002, cols. 482-485. However, Wiesend, 1984, pp. 307 and 357, attributes two arias of the pasticcio to Galuppi (“Voi, che languite” and “Voi, che regnate”) presumably because of identical texts, but he does not elaborate any further. That notwithstanding, there is no evidence in favor of Gluck’s involvement in this production or of the use of his individual compositions; cf. also Hortschansky, 1966, pp. 58-60.
26 Only the aria “Forse vedrai placato” (II,10) in place of Megabise’s aria “Spero veder placata” can exclusively be found in the libretto of the Venetian production: I-Mb, Racc. dramm.3803 (digital reproduction available online: http://www.braidense.it/rd/03803.pdf, 06.12.2019).
performance in Milan from the two previous *Arsace* performances, not least due to time reasons.

The arias “Colomba innamorata” (I,7) and “Sì, vedrò quell’alma ingrata” (I,12) are not part of the score of Lampugnani’s *Arsace* but are included in surviving single copies with his name.\textsuperscript{27} While Hortschansky concedes that ascribing these arias to Lampugnani could have been just as erroneous as ascribing them to Gluck, it has been possible to confirm Lampugnani’s authorship by determining that the arias originated from two of his previously written operas: “Colomba innamorata” comes from his setting of *Semiramide riconosciuta*\textsuperscript{28} performed in Rome in 1741 and was possibly already taken over into the Venetian *Arsace* production, the libretto of which also contains the aria text. The text “Già vedrai quell’alma ingrata” from the score copy F-Pn, Vm\textsuperscript{4} 880 slightly deviates from “Sì, vedrò quell’alma ingrata” and refers to the identical aria from Lampugnani’s *Ezio*,\textsuperscript{29} in which Carestini sang the title role in Venice in May 1743. He presumably carried over the aria to the Milanese performance of *Arsace*, where he also played the title hero. It is hardly surprising that this number does not occur in the libretto of the Venetian pasticcio as Carestini could not perform the same aria only half a year later in the same place.\textsuperscript{30} This is different in the case of the corresponding recitative “No, che non ha la sorte”, included in the librettos of all three *Arsace* productions but which Lampugnani had set to music as a *secco* recitative for the performance in Crema. Whether Gluck composed a new *obbligato* recitative for the performance in Milan or whether Carestini used the recitative he had sung shortly beforehand in Venice cannot be determined. In the latter case, however, Gluck would have been responsible for adapting to the possibly diverging key of the now different subsequent aria.

It was possible to identify Andrea Bernasconi as the composer of the aria “Sì, cadrà con grave scempio” (I,4). The aria comes from his opera *Temistocle*, premiered in Padua

\textsuperscript{27} F-Pn, Vm\textsuperscript{4} 879 and 880, as well as a further score copy of the aria “Sì, vedrò quell’alma ingrata”: A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17680/4 Mus.

\textsuperscript{28} According to RISM ID no. 000118354 (online: https://opac.rism.info/search?id=000118354&View=rism, 14.02.2019), the aria is preserved in another score copy in D major (US-SFsc, M2.5 v.55), which contains the name of the singer from *Semiramide*, Gioacchino Conti, detto Gizziello in addition to the composer, place and year of performance.

\textsuperscript{29} The text is not by Metastasio and can be found in place of his original aria “Recagli quell’acciaro” (II,6) in the libretto of the *Ezio* setting of 1743, cf. libretto: I-Mb, Racc. dramm.3231 (digital reproduction available online: http://www.braidense.it/rd/03231.pdf, 06.12.2019).

\textsuperscript{30} For the aria “Torbida notte intorno” used in the Venetian *Arsace*, he probably used the composition of the same name by Giovanni Battista Sammartini from his opera *L’Agrrippina moglie di Tiberio*, in which Carestini had participated during the premiere in Milan in February 1743.
in 1740, and was sung to the text “Serberò fra ceppi ancora” (II,8) by the title hero.\textsuperscript{31} The tenor Settimio Canini, who played the role of Artabano in the Milanese \textit{Arsace}, did not participate in this opera, but rather in Bernasconi’s \textit{Bajazet} (Venice 1742). He possibly became familiar with the aria this way, which he sang with a different text in the \textit{Arsace} pasticcio. The vocal progression shows no changes compared to the original aria aside from two omitted bars to be repeated at the end of the A’ part, indicating that the Milanese librettist had ideally adapted the new text.\textsuperscript{32}

While it is certain that Gluck did not author the aforementioned five arias, it has not been possible to identify a different composer for the remaining three arias. The text of the aria “Benché copra al sole il volto” (I,8) from Metastasio’s \textit{azione teatrale Endimione} can be found in the librettos of all three \textit{Arsace} productions. Whereas the setting attributed to Gluck differs from Lampugnani’s setting, it is identical to the musical text of a further contemporary copy, containing short scores of five transposed arias for transverse flute.\textsuperscript{33} These are all pieces from Venetian productions from 1743/44,\textsuperscript{34} so that it can be assumed that Carestini also brought the setting of “Benché copra al sole il volto” from the \textit{Arsace} performance in Venice to Milan and sang it there again. Accordingly, this aria seems to have been wrongly attributed to Gluck as well, whereas the other two remaining vocal numbers could indeed be his compositions. The aria “Tema quell’alma audace” (I,4) belongs to Orcano’s part, which had not been included in the preceding productions but was created for the first time for the Milanese performance of \textit{Arsace}, presumably in order to match the number of actors of the second carnival opera, \textit{La Sofonisba}. The role was performed by the \textit{secondo tenore} Francesco Trivulzi, who was employed for the first time during this season and therefore was not able to draw on earlier performed pieces. As a result, it is very likely that Gluck composed the re-

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. the presumably autograph score D-Wa, 46 Alt 632, titled with his name as well as the individual parts of a sacred parody of the aria with the Latin text “Caelites beati” (A-WIL, 34).

\textsuperscript{32} The librettist can be identified using the payroll list, according to which “Al Sig. Dott. Claudio Nicola Stampa Poeta per l'assistenza prestata al Regio Ducal Teatro” was paid 600 lire on 6 March 1744, quoted from \textit{Vezzosi}, 1999, p. 339.

\textsuperscript{33} The bundle is titled “Arie d'Opera / Per il Flauto Traversiere / dell’anno 1743/4”, cf. I-Vc, B. 43 No 18.

\textsuperscript{34} The arias “Perdona amato bene” and “Pensa a serbarmi” were identified as musical settings from Lampugnani’s \textit{Ezio} version from 1743, cf. \textit{Korsmeier}, 2000, p. 553, as well as RISM ID no. 456011353 (online: https://opac.rism.info/search?id=456011353&View=rism, 14.02.2019). The aria “Cara ti lascio, addio” is from Pietro Pulli’s opera \textit{Vologeso, re de’ parti} (online: https://opac.rism.info/search?id=212008141&View=rism, 14.02.2019), which premiered in Reggio in 1741 where Carestini participated as well and from where he probably took the piece to the Venetian and subsequent Milanese \textit{Arsace} performance. The aria “Conservati fedele” comes from Domènec Terradellas’ \textit{Artaserse} (online: https://opac.rism.info/search?id=850025952&View=rism, 14.02.2019) and was sung by Caterina Fumagalli in the premiere in Venice in 1744.
citatives and Orcano’s two arias mentioned in the libretto for him. “Quando ruina con le sue spume” (I,6) is a similar case: the text of this aria, taken from Metastasio’s *festa teatrale Gli orti esperidi*, is also found in the libretto of Lampugnani’s *Arsace*, but the musical setting differs from the one attributed to Gluck. Lampugnani’s aria, composed for the alto castrato Domenico Buccella, probably did not fit the vocal demands of the soprano Giuseppa Useda, who played the role of Megabise in Milan. She had made her debut at the same theater only a year earlier and could not have sung pieces from the previous season as the audience would not have appreciated the performance of familiar arias. Therefore, it can be again concluded that Gluck set the arias provided in the libretto to music for her anew. Thus, Hortschansky’s argument has to be regarded as too much of a generalization as he assumes that if five arias had been wrongly passed down under Gluck’s name, the other three also have to be considered as doubtful. It seems to have been necessary for the responsible *maestro di cappella* to newly compose the arias “Tema quell’alma audace” and “Quando ruina con le sue spume”, resulting in Gluck being the original composer. The mistaken attribution of the remaining six arias to Gluck can probably be explained by the fact that the pasticcio *Arsace* as well as *Demofoonte* and *La Sofonisba*, three consecutive works of the Milanese carnival seasons of 1743 and 1744, were assumed to be Gluck’s original compositions during the copying process. Consequently, this does not suggest that individual copies with different composers’ names served as a basis for the process of making copies, but rather that a complete score was used, presumably drawn up for the performance, the existence of which would be indirectly proven this way.

### 2. *La finta schiava*

Unlike with *Arsace*, there is no evidence of Gluck’s personal involvement in the pasticcio *La finta schiava*, which opened the Ascension fair on 13 May 1744 at the Teatro di Sant’Angelo in Venice. The corresponding libretto does not name an author; however, a handwritten note on the cover of one of the preserved copies attributes the text to Francesco Silvani and labels the music “di Diversi”. According to Taddeo Wiel’s performance catalogue, the music is composed by “Giacomo Maccari (ed altri)”, presumably

---

35 The second aria “Sento un’acerbo duolo” (II,1) has not been passed down according to present research.
36 The second aria “Spero veder placata” (II,10) of this part has not been preserved either.
37 Cf. HORTSCHANSKY, 1966, p. 60.
38 Concerning the context and reason for creating the single copies preserved in the manuscript collection, cf. the author’s explanations on the dependency and assessment of the sources in GLUCK, 2017, pp. 320f.
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indicating him as maestro di cappella, who arranged the pasticcio and used pieces of other composers as well as his own settings. La finta schiava was performed two years later by Angelo Mingotti in Graz, Prague and Leipzig, of which the librettos contain the reference: “music mainly by the famous masters Vinci, Lampugnani and Gluck” (“Musica la Maggior parte. / Delli Celebri Maestri Vinzi Lampugnani, e Cluch.”)⁴¹ Although some arias were exchanged for Mingotti’s new performances compared to the Venetian performance, works by the aforementioned composers may already have been used for that production as well. It is currently not possible to study this in detail as no complete scores of these productions have survived. However, score copies of two arias have been preserved which refer to the Venetian performance through their title “1744 in the S. Angelo theater during the ascension fair” (“1744 In S. Angelo nella ascensa”) and name Gluck as the composer. Both are included in the fourth volume of the aforementioned manuscript collection in the Bibliothèque nationale de France and exhibit the same copyist for the text.⁴² The aria “Troppo ad un’alma è caro” (I,5) can clearly be identified as taken from Gluck’s opera Il Tigrane, as a copy of the original aria of the same title exists as well. It reads “Signora Giuditta Fabiani - in the theater in Crema 1743 - by Signor Cristoforo Gluck (“Sig.a Giuditta Fabiani – nel Teatro di Crema 1743 – Del Sig. Cristoforo Gluck”) and thereby explicitly indicates the corresponding production.⁴³ In comparison to the original aria, the copy from La finta schiava shows individual changes revealing adaptations to the singers’ needs: aside from several raised notes in the singing voice, two bars were inserted at the end of the A and B part each in order to make a cadenza possible for the performer Catterina Barberis.

The second aria “Ch’io mai vi posso” (III,5) is a vocal number for which the original cannot be identified based on the currently available information. The slightly modified text can be traced back to Metastasio’s Siroe, a dramma per musica which Gluck did not set to music. In light of the erroneous attribution on the Arsace copies, another author may be expected here as well. However, the aria could not be attributed to any other musical settings of this drama from before 1744 and thus Gluck’s authorship could not be refuted.⁴⁴ Accordingly, it can be assumed that the aria is from one of his earlier operas.

---

⁴¹ Cf. the source descriptions of the librettos published in Graz and Prague in 1746 in Gluck, 2017, p. 318, and in Müller von Asow, 1917, pp. XCVI-XCIX, as well as the description of the libretto printed for the third performance during the Easter fair in Leipzig in 1746 in Bärwald, 2016, pp. 390-393. I would like to thank Berthold Over for providing me with information from Bärwald’s study.


⁴³ This score copy is passed down in addition to further single copies of Il Tigrane in the first volume of the manuscript collection (F-Pn, D.4712); cf. the source descriptions in ibid., pp. 306f.

⁴⁴ The aria is not documented in the librettos of the Siroe productions of the following composers: Leonardo Vinci (Venice 1726, Prague 1734), Giovanni Porta (Milan and Florence 1726), Nicola Porpora (Rome 1727), Antonio Vivaldi (Reggio 1727, Ancona 1738), An-
and was carried over into La finta schiava with a different text. Of the singers involved in this pasticcio, only the soprano castrato Giuseppe Gallieni, whose part of Rodrigo includes the aria “Ch’io mai vi possa”, had collaborated on productions of Gluck’s earlier works: as Olinto in Demetrio and as Oronte in Il Tigrane. Thus, it can be presumed that he took this aria from one of these two operas. Demetrio had been performed in Venice two years earlier as well, leaving Il Tigrane as the more likely source for this aria. This is supported by the fact that “Troppo ad un’alma è caro” was taken from this opera and possibly also “Se spunta amica stella”, of which the text can be found in a slightly altered version in the libretto for La finta schiava in Rodrigo’s first aria (I,2).45

The existence of a further copy (P1) of the aria “Ch’io mai vi possa”, which has the same musical text as the one attributed to Gluck but the original wording from Metastasio’s Siroe,46 even suggests an additional step in its transfer: after performing in Gluck’s Il Tigrane, Gallieni participated in Daniele Barba’s setting of the same title in Verona during the carnival season of 1744 and took on the role of Medarse in the opening pasticcio Il Siroe, of which the music is described as “a choice made from the most virtuouso masters” (“una scelta fatta da’ più Virtuosi Maestri”).47 According to current research, no score of this production has been preserved either. The corresponding libretto, however, not only contains Metastasio’s aria “Ch’io mai vi possa” (III,12), belonging to Emira’s part, but also the text of “Nero turbo il cielo imbruna” replacing the original aria “Non vi piacque, ingiusti dei” in II,15. In particular, since the wording of this rare aria48 is identical to Gluck’s setting, it can be assumed that Gallieni transferred at least two arias from Gluck’s Il Tigrane: the favorite aria “Nero turbo il cielo imbruna” originally composed for Caterina Aschieri, with which his singer colleague from the

drea Stefano Fiorè (Turin 1729), Anonymus (Genoa 1730, Bergamo 1743), Vinci, Pescetti and Galuppi (Venice 1731), Antonio Bioni (Wrocław 1731), Johann Adolf Hasse (Bologna 1733), Giuseppe Scarlatti (Florence 1742), Paolo Scalabrin (Prague 1744). The aria settings by Domenico Sarro (Naples 1727), George Frideric Handel (London 1728), Gaetano Latilla (Rome 1740), Davide Perez (Naples 1740), Gennaro Manna (Venice 1743) and Andrea Bernasconi (? 1737-1744), however, differ from the one attributed to Gluck.

45 Hortschansky, 1973, p. 265 already supposed that this aria of the pasticcio is also composed by Gluck. However, this remains to be proven. While the original aria sung by Gallieni has been passed down, the musical text attributed to La finta schiava has not been preserved.

46 Score: F-Pn, Vm’ 119 (digital reproduction available online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b525085576, 06.12.2019). This is a copy of French provenance. The version used to make this copy probably came from Italy in the 1740s but has not been preserved.


48 With “Se il fedel compagno amato”, the libretto of Barba’s setting of Il Tigrane also uses a different text for the closing aria of Cleopatra in the first act, cf. libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.4528 (digital reproduction available online: http://www.braidense.it/rd/04528.pdf, 06.12.2019).
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**Siroe** pasticcio Anna Medici could give an excellent performance, as well as a further soprano aria which now used Metastasio’s text. Whether Tigrane’s aria “Se s’accende in fiamme ardenti” (I,4) was also included in *Il Siroe*, in which the text from Metastasio’s *azione teatrale Endimione* matches the first stanza from Medarse’s closing aria in the first act (I,17), can only be presumed. In this case, Gallieni would have tried to perform an aria originally composed for the famous soprano castrato Felice Salimbeni, which Gluck would certainly have composed in a virtuoso style as the *primo uomo*’s entry aria.

The aria “Ch’io mai vi possa” would then have been transferred from Verona to Venice⁴⁹ and the text would have been marginally modified in order to be used in *La finta schiava*. The changes apply to each of the closing lines of both stanzas: “Né men per gioco / v’ingannerò” becomes “Né men la morte / mi cangerà” and “E voi sarete, / care pupille, / il mio bel foco / fin ch’io vivrò” becomes “E lo sarete, / care pupille, / sino, che vita / in me sarà”, which puts additional emphasis on what is said in the first case while the message remains the same in the second. These changes can be found both in the score copy included in the manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de France and in a *canto e basso* reduction made by the same copyist, which thus can also be placed within the Venetian performance context of the pasticcio.⁵⁰ However, in departing from the libretto for *La finta schiava* both copies retain the original personal pronoun “voi” in the second stanza instead of the pronoun “lo”, required by the changed verse which – aside from other corresponding details in the musical text – indicates that these copies and the score copy P1 are based on a common version.⁵¹ This was probably a now lost copy of the aria originally composed by Gluck for one of his operas from before 1744, which was owned by one of the singers and could have served as the basis for other copies used in the following productions in order to write new texts or make changes.

⁴⁹ Mariano Nicolini, who like Giuseppe Gallieni participated in all three productions, could have transferred further arias from the Veronese operas *Il Siroe* and *Il Tigrane* to *La finta schiava*. This is indicated e.g. by the textual congruence between the aria “Ecco ti lascio, o cara” (I,12) of the title hero Tigrane, played by Nicolini, and Amurat’s aria – also sung by Nicolini – in *La finta schiava* (II,8).

⁵⁰ I-Vqs, MS CI. VIII.14 (1128), as part of a manuscript collection with 117 vocal and instrumental numbers of various composers. The questionable attribution of the aria in RISM ID no. 850025961 (online: https://opac.rism.info/search?id=850025961&View=rism, 21.02.2019) to a non-verifiable *Siroe* setting by Terradellas probably comes from the fact that six numbers from Terradellas’ *Artaserse* (Venice 1744) precede the aria in the manuscript collection. But despite numerous replacement arias in the libretto of this production, the text of “Ch’io mai vi possa” is not included, cf. libretto: I-Mb, Racc.dramm.3787 (digital reproduction available online: http://www.braidense.it/rd/03787.pdf, 06.12.2019).

The next step of the aria “Ch’io mai vi possa” is documented by another, musically identical copy of Slovenian provenance. Its handwriting points to a copyist from the theater in Graz, thus establishing a connection to the subsequent performances of *La finta schiava* in Graz, Prague and Leipzig under Angelo Mingotti’s direction in 1746. This assumption is also supported by minor text modifications, which repeat the verses differently than the sources of the production in Venice. These changes as well as some varying notes suggest that a different initial version was used as the basis for this copy; another intermediary source has to be assumed which may have served Mingotti for the production of his material after the Venetian performance of the pasticcio.

### 3. Conclusion

The fact that complete score copies of pasticcios have been preserved even less frequently than those of original opera compositions of the 18th century makes it both difficult to reconstruct these works as well as to correctly attribute them to the composers involved. The predominantly preserved single copies virtually depict the individual momentum of these continually used numbers, to which minor or extensive changes were made, depending on the production conditions. It is only in a few cases that the copies contain explicit ascriptions to performances and/or composers, with the result that attributing the numbers to a musical work has to draw on the involved singers, if they can be determined. Also, comparing the copies with the preserved librettos, provided that the arias are rare or contain characteristic textual differences enabling identification, has proven to be a potential solution. The presented analyses of the pasticcios *Arsace* and *La finta schiava* are consistent with this approach. In the context of *Arsace*, it was demonstrated that specifications of authors are especially prone to error as only two out of eight arias attributed to Gluck from the pasticcio are presumed new compositions. Based on *La finta schiava* and the four copies of the preserved aria “Ch’io mai vi possa”, a conceivable path was traced from the original composition to subsequent productions. In *Arsace*, it was mainly the singers of leading roles who contributed their favorite arias

---

52 SI-Mpa, SI_PAM/1857/010/00085. The copy is from the collection Gospoščina Bistriški grad (Schloss Feistritz) and therefore property of the noble family Attems, who resided in Slovenska Bistrica from 1717-1945. Especially Ignaz Maria II Count of Attems (1714-1762) and his wife Maria Josepha, née Countess of Kuehn and Auer (1721-1784) greatly contributed to cultivating music, in particular by singing contemporary Italian operatic arias. Copies from their private music collection have been preserved in various collections in the Maribor Regional Archive, cf. Kokole, 2016. See also Kokole’s article in the present volume, pp. 507-525.

53 On the connection between individual aria copies from the noble family Attems and the theater in Graz of the 1730s and 1740s, cf. ibid., pp. 362-364.

54 Reinhard Strohm’s discovery of five complete score copies of Pietro Mingotti’s pasticcio productions is rather a welcome exception than the rule, cf. Strohm, 2004.
because they either did not have enough time to rehearse new pieces or because they wanted to be successful again with preferred arias. However, the outlined transfer of arias in La finta schiava was linked to Giuseppe Gallieni, a singer of secondary roles, who not only brought his own pieces but also those of his singer colleagues from preceding productions which were then performed either by himself or by other musicians (cf. Table 3). While comparing the aria texts preserved in the respective librettos inspires further considerations on adoptions of arias or attributions of authors, these must remain speculative due to the absence of preserved music. Inherent in this problem of historical transmission is the realization that Gluck’s actual contribution to these pasticcios cannot be definitively established.

Appendix

Table 1: Singers involved in the respective Arsace productions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crema 1741</th>
<th>Venice 1743</th>
<th>Milan 1743/44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsace</td>
<td>Giuseppe Appiani</td>
<td>Giovanni Carestini</td>
<td>Giovanni Carestini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Caterina Aschieri</td>
<td>Caterina Aschieri</td>
<td>Caterina Aschieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmire</td>
<td>Albina Aschieri</td>
<td>Marianne Pirker</td>
<td>Domenica Casarini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrane</td>
<td>Giuseppe Jozzi</td>
<td>Giuseppe Jozzi</td>
<td>Rosalia Andreides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artabano</td>
<td>Francesco Arrigoni</td>
<td>Cristoforo del Rosso</td>
<td>Settimio Canini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megabise</td>
<td>Domenico Buccella</td>
<td>Lorenzo Perucci</td>
<td>Giuseppa Useda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcano</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Francesco Trivulzi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Vocal numbers in the various text versions of Arsace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crema 1741</th>
<th>Venice 1743</th>
<th>Milan 1743/44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,1</td>
<td>Coro “Col tuo cinto”</td>
<td>Coro “Col tuo cinto”</td>
<td>[Coro “Col tuo cinto”] (in virgolette)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,2</td>
<td>Statira Aria “Se fido l’adorai”</td>
<td>Aria “Sento, che l’alma mia”</td>
<td>Aria “Se fido l’adorai”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,3</td>
<td>Rosmire Aria “Non sò dirlo”</td>
<td>Aria “Non sò dirlo”</td>
<td>Aria “Non sò dirlo”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,4</td>
<td>Orcano Aria “Vada pure quell’ardito”</td>
<td>Aria “Vantar allori e palme”</td>
<td>Aria “Vanta pure quell’ardito”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,5</td>
<td>Mitrane Aria “Un’aura di speme”</td>
<td>Aria “Un’aura di speme”</td>
<td>Aria “Empio amor, onor tiranno”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,6</td>
<td>Megabise Aria “Quando ruina”</td>
<td>Aria “Quando ruina”</td>
<td>Aria “Quando ruina”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56 The text beginnings in bold print indicate preserved musical settings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crema 1741</th>
<th>Venice 1743</th>
<th>Milan 1743/44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,7</td>
<td>Rosmiri</td>
<td>“Non sò se sdegno sia”</td>
<td>Aria “Colomba inamorata”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,8</td>
<td>Arsace</td>
<td>Aria “Benchè copra al sole il volto”</td>
<td>Aria “Benchè copra al sole il volto”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,9</td>
<td>Mitrane</td>
<td>Aria “Già sento, che amore”</td>
<td>- (whole scene is missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,10</td>
<td>Megabise</td>
<td>[Aria “Se vanti un core amante”] (in virgolette)</td>
<td>without aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,11</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Aria “Perfido, traditore”</td>
<td>Aria “Perfido, traditore”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,13</td>
<td>Arsace</td>
<td>Rec. “No, che non ha la sorte”</td>
<td>Aria “Torbida notte intorno”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,1</td>
<td>Orcano</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aria “Sento un’acerbo duolo”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,3</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Aria “S’hai di morir desio”</td>
<td>Aria “Sperai da te crudele”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,4</td>
<td>Arsace</td>
<td>Aria “Fissa il guardo in questo aspetto”</td>
<td>Aria “Se mai senti spirarti sul volto”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,5</td>
<td>Artabano</td>
<td>Aria “Ah, se il rivale odiato”</td>
<td>Aria “Non temer, son la tua sposa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,7</td>
<td>Rosmiri</td>
<td>Aria “Molto vuoi, troppo un chiedi”</td>
<td>- (whole scene is missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,8</td>
<td>Mitrane</td>
<td>Aria “Voi, che languite”</td>
<td>Aria “Voi, che languite”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,9</td>
<td>Artabano</td>
<td>Aria “Non temer nel grande impegno”</td>
<td>Aria “Per far le tue vendette”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,10</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Aria “Spero veder placata”</td>
<td>Aria “Forse vedrai placato”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,11</td>
<td>Statira/Arsace</td>
<td>Duetto “Se non t’avessi amato”</td>
<td>Duetto “Se non t’avessi amato”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,2</td>
<td>Statira</td>
<td>Aria “Agitato questo core”</td>
<td>Aria “Voi, che regnate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,3</td>
<td>Megabise</td>
<td>Aria “Se usar pietà ti pace”</td>
<td>without aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,4</td>
<td>Arsace</td>
<td>Aria “Vado a morir costante”</td>
<td>Aria “Cara ti lascio, addio”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5</td>
<td>Rosmiri</td>
<td>Aria “Idol mio se tu morrai”</td>
<td>Aria “Questa, che ’l cor m’ingombra”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,8</td>
<td>Artabano</td>
<td>Aria “Vittima sanguinosa”</td>
<td>Aria “Vittima sanguinosa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,12</td>
<td>Mitrane</td>
<td>Aria “Vado costante e forte”</td>
<td>Aria “Costanza mio core”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3: Vocal numbers carried over into La finta schiava57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Il Tigrane (Gluck, Crema 1743)</th>
<th>Il Siroe (Pasticcio, Verona 1743/44)</th>
<th>La finta schiava (Pasticcio, Venice 1744)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria “Troppo ad un’alma è caro” (Giuditta Fabiani)</td>
<td>Aria “Troppo ad un’alma è caro” (Catterina Barberis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria “Se s’accende in fiamme ardenti” (Felice Salimbeni)</td>
<td>Aria “Se s’accende in fiamme ardenti” (Giuseppe Gallieni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria “Se spunta amica stella” (Giuseppe Gallieni)</td>
<td>Aria “Se spunta amica stella” (Giuseppe Gallieni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria “Nero turbo il cielo imbruna” (Caterina Aschieri)</td>
<td>Aria “Nero turbo il cielo imbruna” (Anna Medici)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown aria</td>
<td>Aria “Ch’io mai vi possa” (Anna Medici)</td>
<td>Aria “Ch’io mai vi possa” (Giuseppe Gallieni)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources

Arie d’Opera / Per il Flauto Traversiere / dell’anno 1743/4; score: I-Vc, B. 43 No 18.
Bernaconi, Andrea, Serberò fra ceppi ancora; score: D-Wa, 46 Alt 632.
Gazzetta di Milano 52 from 26 December 1742; 1 from 1 January 1744; 3 from 15 January 1744; 5 from 3 February 1745.

57 The text beginnings in bold print indicate preserved musical settings.
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**Lampugnani, Giovanni Battista, Arsace, act I; score: I-Fc, B-I-141 (Collocazione B.91).**

Id., Colomba innamorata, Si, vedrò quell’alma ingrata, score: F-Pn, Vm 879 and 880.

Id., Si, vedrò quell’alma ingrata, score: A-Wn, Mus.Hs.17680/4 Mus.
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Digital Music Editions Beyond [Edited]
Musical Text

JOACHIM VEIT

The bracketed addition which I made to the original title of this article might seem to be a necessary addition, but an addition which nevertheless belongs to a still very strange title. This applies all the more to the title originally announced for this section: Digital music editions beyond musical text. This sounds as if a corrupt version had been transmitted to the organizers of the conference, or as if the author really had no clear concept of a scholarly music edition. In the second case one could clearly point him to the common opinion, that the intention of a traditional music edition is undoubtedly the creation of an ‘edited text’ and the documentation of the reasons which led to the individual decisions for choosing this or that version of a note, an articulation sign, a phrasing slur or even the form of whole bars. Producing such editions without the musical text must be labeled as completely senseless. – And why should this be different in a digital edition?

If we reconsider the development of our traditional, analogue editions, we have to admit that the ‘text’ beyond the musical one in these volumes has grown considerably over the last decades. And if we go back to the foundation stones of our Critical Editions in the 19th century this trend is even more distinct.¹ The first volume of the ‘Old Bach Complete Edition’ with ten church cantatas which Moritz Hauptmann edited in 1851 had – besides the general introductory pages and the impressive list of subscribers – only six pages describing the content, the sources and the editor’s approach.² The volume with the Mass in B flat minor, produced by Julius Rietz in 1856 at least had 14 pages of Critical Report.³ When the New Bach Edition was initiated after the Second World War, the first volume in 1954, again with cantatas, had 117 pages with music, but a separate volume with 112 pages of Critical Report.⁴ The second volume, also published in 1954 and containing Friedrich Smend’s edition of the Missa with more than 400 pages of

¹ For a more detailed description of this development cf. Kepper, 2011.
² BACH, 1851, pp. XV-XX.
³ BACH, undated [1856], pp. XIII-XXVI.
Critical Report (published in 1956) clearly outweighed the 280 pages of music. But even beyond such monuments, we can observe a similar development in recent complete editions, and I mention only three examples in a random selection here: Johannes Brahms, 4th symphony: 128 pages of music, 112 pages of text; Carl Maria von Weber, Der Freischütz: 454 pages of music versus 422 pages of text, and Robert Schumann, three Quartets op. 41 with 90 pages of music, more than 200 pages of text and 57 pages with facsimiles.

If we look at the material which has been included in these volumes, we not only find the quickly growing part with ‘readings’ in the strict sense or very detailed descriptions of the sources, but a lot of other things: performance reviews, letters, facsimiles of playbills, portraits of the performing singers, costume figurines or stage sets for scenes, reprints of librettos or other texts, sketches, and so on. So, even before the advent of digital editions, these volumes have been collections of varied materials which group around the musical text. The digital editions in the last years now have reinforced this tendency in order to embed the musical text in its original or even in various other contexts.

If you look at the two already published volumes of Thomas Betzwieser’s OPERA project with Prima la musica e poi le parole by Giambattista Casti and Antonio Salieri and Andreas Münzmay’s edition of Annette et Lubin by Marie-Justine-Benoîte Favart and Adolphe Benoît Blaise, we have – in the printed volumes – a relation of music to text of 222 to 56 in the first and 100 to 81 in the second volume – though, admittedly, the text part shrinks considerably when we take into account that the Preface is given in English, German and French or Italian here. But in this hybrid edition the printed volume is accompanied by a digital publication which on the one hand doubles the printed volume in presenting the complete Preface and the complete edited musical text. On the other hand the former ‘readings’ section is no longer contained in the appendix of the printed volume but is now included in a form much easier to use in the digital part: annotations concerning music or text are directly connected to their reference place and the explanatory text of the annotation is combined with the referenced excerpts of the mentioned sources. At the same time these sources are accessible as complete facsimiles connected to detailed source descriptions, and you have the possibility to access annotations not only from the edited text but also from the individual source. This allows you varying perspectives on your text, because you do not necessarily need to start from the editor’s text. What you lose here, is the kind of survey which you normally have when looking at a complete page with annotations – you still have the possibility to see such a list of annotations, but you are only able to perceive if they concern “Music”, “Text” or “Stage

5 Bach, 1954; Bach, 1956.
8 In both cases, the so-called Edirom software is used, which was developed in a project funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and is now continually developed at Paderborn University (cf. https://www.edirom.de, 07.01.2020).
directions”.9 Certainly this disadvantage is clearly outweighed by the transparency of editorial decisions based on the access to the sources now possible, which, besides, are accessible in a very fine-grained form by simply entering bar-numbers (see Figure 1), which even allows you to compare the same bars from different sources simultaneously.

Figure 1: OPERA, vol. 1: Antonio Salieri, Prima la musica e poi le parole, Kassel 2013: Accessability of the sources in the Edirom software in a collation bar by bar; example: no. 6, Rondò, Terzetto Poeta, Maestro, Eleonora: “Cari oggetti”, bar 5.

But there is a second big advantage: In both operas the “degree of allusion and quotation”10 in music and text is extremely high and in Casti’s libretto we can observe “different intertextual modes of increasing complexity”.11 In Betzwieser’s volume these modes are described in the printed text, while at the same time the digital version presents fac-similes of the most important arias and the text of the central intertextual reference work here, Giuseppe Sarti’s dramma per musica Giulio Sabino. In Münzmay’s edition of the new compositions of the “comédie […] mêlée d’ariettes et de vaudevilles” Annette et Lubin, “recourse to vaudeville tunes”, parodies and “textual quotations and allusions”12 are intermingled in a form which is not easy to sort out. As Erik M. Paffett emphasized in his review in Notes, Münzmay did this in an admirable form and there is a fine table of “Textual quotations and musical borrowings” in the printed volume.13 This textual list

9 Cf. the list entries in the menue “Critical Report / Annotations”.
10 Casti/Salieri, 2013, p. XVI.
11 Ibid., p. XVII.
12 Favart/Blaise, 2016, p. XIX.
13 Cf. Paffett, 2018, pp. 687-691, especially p. 690; in the printed opera volume cf. the table on pp. XXIX-XXXII.
has its counterpart in the digital edition, but now not only with more extensive commentaries but also with the original text of the model and with facsimiles of these reference sources (at least in those cases in which they could be identified). In both volumes the edition opens a space for the integration of reference or contextual material beyond the edited text.

This is also true for the Max Reger Work Edition\textsuperscript{14} where we find a special entry: “Environment or Context of the Works” which, besides information about the works such as their dates of composition and the sources, contains a lot of other details concerning the reception of the works, the churches and organs for which Reger wrote his works, articles about Reger’s working procedures or writing habits and so on (cf. the list in Figure 2).\textsuperscript{15} In the case of the organ works you find, e.g., biographical information about Reger’s friend, the organist Straube, information about the organ in one of the Berlin churches, a list of performances of Reger’s organ works, a review of one of these in the \textit{Neue Musik-Zeitung}, a letter by Reger, an essay about tempo in Reger’s works and even a family tree of the Regers. This is really a kind of encyclopedia about Reger which surrounds the edition of his music – and indeed, this is really called an ‘encyclopaedia’ which is accumulated from edition to edition and in near future will be published separately on the Reger website\textsuperscript{16} and further developed.

A similar concept can be found in the \textit{Freischütz Digital} project.\textsuperscript{17} The contextualization of the work in this case goes so far that it is directly connected to the digital part of the Complete Edition of the composer’s ‘textual output’.\textsuperscript{18} To mention only a few examples: from the detailed description of the genesis of the work\textsuperscript{19} the hyperlinks lead directly to Weber’s diary entries or letters which are edited independently from the \textit{Freischütz} project.\textsuperscript{20} And a list of performance reviews of almost 60 theaters in Weber’s time\textsuperscript{21} is linked to transcriptions of these texts on the Weber website.\textsuperscript{22} There is a wealth of documentation concerning the musical sources (see the 15 sources listed in the menu of the \textit{Edirom} part of \textit{Freischütz Digital}) as well as the libretto and its reference texts

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{15}] Illustration from vol. I,7 of the RWA, Critical Notes (DVD).
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] Online: https://www.max-reger-institut.de/de/, 07.01.2020.
\item[\textsuperscript{17}] Online: https://www.freischuetz-digital.de, 07.01.2020.
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] Online: https://www.freischuetz-digital.de, 07.01.2020.
\item[\textsuperscript{19}] Online: https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/de/Register/Tageb%C3%BCcher, or: ... /letters, 07.01.2020.
\item[\textsuperscript{20}] Online: https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/de/Register/Schriften, 07.01.2020.
\item[\textsuperscript{22}] Online: https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/de/Register/Schriften, 07.01.2020.
\end{itemize}
(28 sources in the same list). And you even find audio documents which are linked to facsimiles or to a rendered musical text.\footnote{Online: https://demos.freischuetz-digital.de/syncPlayer/test/syncPlayer.xhtml, 07.01.2020.}

Figure 2: Reger-Werkausgabe (RWA), series I, vol. 7: Organ Pieces III, Hybrid-Edition, Stuttgart 2015: survey of the context information.

But the most important aspect in our context here is the – unfortunately only partially realized – idea to present the musical text not as an edition in the normal sense (such an edition has meanwhile been published within the analogue Weber Complete Edition),\footnote{Weber, 2017.} but to represent the individual sources in a diplomatic transcription in order to be able to automatically compare those transcriptions. This has to some extend been realized for three numbers of the opera and ten of the sources. All these sources are encoded in MEI (Music Encoding Initiative) and thanks to Laurent Pugin’s Verovio\footnote{Laurent Pugin developed his rendering library Verovio in the last years at a breathtaking pace (version 1.0 was released in May, 2017) and thus contributed much to the quick acceptance of MEI as an encoding standard for scholarly purposes; cf. online: https://www.verovio.org, 07.01.2020.} could be rendered in a form that also allows individual comparisons by the reader. The intention here was to use Weber’s Freischütz only as a proof of concept – and many details still have to be fixed; but nevertheless, this new form leads to new possibilities based on
the flexibility of the encoding format. To mention only one example (cf. Figure 3): the encoding of original abbreviated forms of notation can coexist with the written-out version as in this passage from the terzetto no. 9 of the *Freischütz*. Experimenting with notation in this way in the end leads to more flexible forms of presenting, exploring and analyzing the musical text. Thus, the future Digital Mozart Edition, for example, will combine the re-edition of the text of the New Mozart Edition with editions of individual sources such as the autograph or the first print in order to allow the musician to choose between these versions. And this is really important in the realm of opera, as Martin Albrecht-Hohmaier’s and Kristin Herold’s contribution demonstrates.

But that’s not my topic here because my title promises to deal with editions beyond the musical text. I’ll return to that presently, but please allow me first to add some remarks on the *Beethovens Werkstatt* project, because in this project there is really no ‘edited text’ in the strict sense. The final version of a work by Beethoven is completely out of scope there because the focus has been shifted to a close examination and description of the genesis or development of a work and the compositional strategies and methods of the composer as witnessed by his often barely legible manuscripts. And again, the MEI encoding here helps to realize presentations which facilitate the understanding of these processes. The encoding has been linked here to the individual shapes of entries in the manuscript (cf. Figure 4; this is realized through SVG, another XML format) and, if desired, the encoding is rendered as human-readable musical text. This readable text in turn is linked via MEI to the entries in the document. The encoding thus allows different perspectives on the text: in the example of Beethoven’s song “Neue Liebe, neues Leben” op. 75/2 (the third one in the so-called VideApp on the project’s website) you find cleartext transcriptions of the different steps in the development of the final bars in Beethoven’s song. If you select in the menu of this visualization the entry “Invarianzanzeige”, the software marks with colors those details which were taken over

---

26 The example comes from no. 9 of *Der Freischütz*, bars 75-79; abbreviation marks in the upper strings and in the violoncellos in the upper example, written out in the example below.
27 Cf. online: https://mozarteum.at/digitale-mozart-edition/; meanwhile some examples of the digital-interactive Mozart edition have been published, cf. online: https://dme.mozarteum.at/movi/en, 07.01.2020.
28 Cf. ALBRECHT-HOHMAIER/HEROLD, in this volume, pp. 733-753.
30 The example from the autograph of the second movement of the String Quartet op. 59/3 is published on the project website as prototype 2 (online: https://beethovens-werkstatt.de/prototyp-2-0/, 07.01.2020). A short explanation of SVG (Scalable Vector Graphics) is to be found in the technical glossary online: https://beethovens-werkstatt.de/glossary/svg/, 07.01.2020.
from versions before: by using these colors you are able to recognize in the last version which notes go back to the very first version Beethoven wrote down.

*Figure 3:* Freischütz Digital, fragment from no. 9: Terzetto Agathe, Ännchen, Max: „Wie! Was! Entsetzen!“, bars 74-79, vocal parts and upper strings; version 1 above: with abbreviation signs; version 2 below: with expanded abbreviations.
So, if I try to summarize the examples up to this point, I think it is very important to emphasize the central role of the MEI standard as a kind of controlling system in the middle of all the different views which I mentioned. MEI is rendered as readable music notation by the mentioned Verovio library, it is connected to individual bars or even individual note entries in facsimiles via SVG, it is possible to produce MIDI sounds from MEI, and MEI helps to navigate in real sound or video recordings, and finally there is a close connection between MEI metadata or annotations to the TEI (Text Encoding Initiative) world. The second important topic is that all these mentioned things have something to do with internationally accepted standards (mostly based on XML), and these standards are one of the crucial prerequisites for the long-term availability of the results of our work and at the same time the base for interoperability. And if you want to handle the intertextual musical and textual references of the pasticcios in a project, you will find here a broad spectrum of possibilities for doing this. And again: I refer here to Martin Albrecht-Hohmaier’s and Kristin Herold’s text for more details concerning aspects of the music.

The last part of my own contribution here is devoted to the non-musical aspects of the pasticcio edition and thus moves from the MEI standard to the text encoding standard TEI. My aim here is to demonstrate for you, with a few examples from the Carl Maria von Weber text edition, the advantages of standards and authority files for this part of work which aims at an infrastructure which is able to connect these separate research results to music editing, and enables the editor to realize digital visualizations which

32 Concerning this function of MEI cf. RICHTS/VEIT, 2018, pp. 292-301.
combine scores, maps and biographical entries in order to make the circumstances of musical composition and performance transparent. *PASTICCIO* wants to introduce a further aspect: mobility – in order to contextualize the music horizontally and vertically, so the speak, by delivering data not only on singers and their repertoire, but also on their travels and other skills and connecting this with information about the modifications of the music which these singers used on their travels (musical arrangements, text changes, consideration of other local conditions etc.). A lot of work has already been carried out in research on music migrations in the *Musicisti europei* and the *Music Migrations* project,\(^{33}\) and this work should be the point of departure for new and instructive combinations of the material which is already available or will be included in future work.

In the world of the Weber digital edition, ‘persons’ are regarded as the agents of all ‘events’ which we want to describe, and it is important that one could switch between the perspective of these different agents. The events point back to the persons involved, which is to say, each event has an originator or several originators. If, for example, Weber writes a letter to Friedrich Rochlitz, this is an act of correspondence, involving two persons, the sender and the receiver of the letter. In the case of the main person of our edition, we have a tab bar on our website with tabs concerning ‘events’ in a very general sense: biographical events, letter or article writing events, diary entries, composition of works, and even passive events like being mentioned in a bibliography. Weber as a person is, in a way, part of these events which in the individual files point back to the personal file for Weber. At the same time the receiver of an individual letter, in this case Friedrich Rochlitz, is dealt with according to the same principles – so that all ‘events’ pointing to his person are collected in the same tab system. Thus, when he is in the focus of our view, we can, for example, have a look at his correspondence (naturally only within the world of our editorial scope). The important point here is that we do not actively point from the person to the event (because that would result in the necessity of actively changing the biographical entries with each new finding), but the other way round: the events point to the persons, so each new event which we add and which has this person as an active or passive agent points to the person and is automatically added to this person’s file. At the same time, we are able to automatically harvest electronic mentions of this person in contexts outside our own through the standard identifier in an

authority file like GND or VIAF.\textsuperscript{34} Based on the GND Beacon technique articles referring to this GND can be added to our own information.\textsuperscript{35}

*Figure 5: Carl Maria von Weber Complete Edition, Online-Edition of the textual parts of his œuvre; diary entry of 1st May 1810 with links to some of the mentioned persons, letters, works and writings.*

Another example from Weber’s diary, which is given in Figure 5, shows the entry of 1 May 1810. In the first two lines of this entry we have a very dense documentation of events: Weber mentions several persons, the word “an” (to) means that he has written letters to these persons, and he mentions an article which he wrote on Peter Ritter’s opera *Der Zittherschläger*. The word *Zitthersch:* points to an entry about the work which is attributed to Peter Ritter. In the rendering there is a tab “Rückverweise” (“backlinks”) which collects all mentions of this work (in this case nine). This is more interesting in the case of persons: in the article which Weber wrote, the singer Catharina Gervais is

\textsuperscript{34} The “Gemeinsame Normdatei” (GND) deals with persons, organizations, localities, keywords etc. and is managed by the German National Library (cf. https://www.dnb.de/gnd/, 07.01.2020); the “Virtual International Authority File” (VIAF) combines multiple national name authority files into a single one (cf. online: https://viaf.org/, 07.01.2020).

\textsuperscript{35} Cf., e.g., in the case of Weber: online: https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/de/A002068.htm l#bs-tab-gnd-beacon, 07.01.2020; concerning the Beacon format cf. online: https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Dynamic_links_to_external_resources, 07.01.2020.
mentioned – in this case we have 58 backlinks to our own database. At the moment we only refer to this singer within the edited texts by adding a <persName/> element and a key attribute. Thus, when we point from a locality (a town or a theater) back to the persons mentioned with special events occurring in this place, that leads in our case to a simple accumulation of mention marks and is not very informative. With a growing amount of mentions or annotations of any kind these links certainly should be classified in some way, e.g. with such categories as those employed in the Music Migrations mappings,\(^\text{36}\) where, for example, a distinction is made between simple sojourns, real employments and training or schooling. There we even have the resolvable “Cluster of Markers” visualization, which clearly offers the fine possibility to avoid the uninformative accumulation of uniformly colored markers.

This is only one example of the urgent need for developing ontologies or thesauri for different forms of ‘annotations’ in the growing editorial universe. The narrative texts within digital ‘editions’ clearly are on a descending branch and are more and more replaced by individual annotations which are fixed directly to their reference point. Even if we have the means of ‘linking’ details – the huge amount of single topic annotations drowns the user in an ocean of information if there are no means to sort and connect these individual bits and bytes in a way that helps the user to find the answer for his or her individual question. Ontologies or controlled vocabularies for annotations and a classification of linking instructions might help to pave the way for a more useful presentation of our research results.\(^\text{37}\)

When discussing annotation-processes with the Dvořák edition in Prague in the early phase of our Edirom software, there was a vote for a separate species of ‘general’ annotations besides the ‘normal’ ones in order to not completely loose interdependencies between these atomistic annotations. In our digital Weber text edition, we introduced so-called “thematic commentaries”\(^\text{38}\) which summarize more complex events referred to in a lot of different edited texts, e.g. a text concerning the development of the German-speaking ensemble at the theater in Prague.\(^\text{39}\) This is a return to a narrative which is fed from information which the editor found in the scattered texts of his edition. Through its embedded links this text is highly transparent but nevertheless it is still a sort of construction based on the database. If we want to avoid a huge proportion of construction we should endeavor to formalize as much of the information as possible – but at the same time this formalization has to be made completely transparent in order

\(^{36}\) Cf. the project Music Migrations in the Early Modern Age (online: http://www.musmig.eu/database/, 07.01.2020), where you can search for groups or individual musicians and from the biographical data go to “load map” in order to have a visualization with different markers for the different categories.

\(^{37}\) Cf. on this topic HADJAKOS, 2017.

\(^{38}\) Online: https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/de/Register/Themenkommentare, 07.01.2020. These commentaries are continually being expanded.

\(^{39}\) Online: https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/de/A009005/Themenkommentare/A090005.html, 07.01.2020.
to avoid an apparent objectivity which in reality already depends on the decisions about which information enters your database and which is sorted out. For our digital editions beyond the musical text it is highly recommendable to search for new structures for semantically meaningful accumulations of data – these, at the same time will make it easier to interchange data and to build corpora beyond individual projects. And using internationally established encoding standards is the basic prerequisite in order to make this new information network possible.
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In the fourth edition of the *Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca*, printed by Domenico Maria Manni starting in 1729, we find the entry “pasticcio” recorded exclusively with a culinary meaning: “Vivanda cotta entro a rinvolto di pasta” (“A food wrapped in dough”).¹ 30 years later, the manager of the San Moisè theater in Venice, in the dedication to a *dramma giocoso* with the very title *Il pasticcio* declared “A’ gentili leggitori” that he had sketched out a kind of compilation, choosing successful arias which had met with common approval (“comune approvazione”), stitching them together (“nic-chiarle”), in other words putting them appropriately in a comic action (“in una comica azione”) along with a recitative.²

As is well known, together with this kind of extreme stratification, comparable to *lasagne bolognesi* or aubergine parmesan, much-loved by Italians and held together not by dialogue or monologue but by *béchamel* sauce or tomato, we find other types of *collage*: the single acts of the libretto, entrusted from the outset to different composers; the interpolation of arias, demanded by the singers, the theater manager or by theatrical necessity; the revival in a prestigious venue, when the author himself writes some new important pages, as occurs in *Don Giovanni* by Mozart, which is still performed in a version contaminated by that of Prague and that of Vienna. Essentially, it is almost impossible to find two identical performances, while in general a draft agreeing roughly with the *princeps* of the text ends up in the edition meant to be read and not in the one to be listened to.

In this triumph of tampering stage operators, ignorant of the future romantic and positivistic concept of the Author with a capital *A*, and with the conviction that identical performances are rather unlikely, we find the basis of the construction of the charts rela-

---

1 *Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca*, vol. 3, p. 517, agrees with the third edition (1691); however, in the first and second editions (1612, 1623), “pastelliere” or “pasticcio” indicates the person making it.

tive to four among the many librettos by Goldoni, plus one by Zeno, which we treat here in ascending order from the simplest situation to the most complex. In order to sketch out the family tree manually in a reasonable time frame, let us say around an hour, we have taken into account the main loci: the changes in title ($t_1, t_2$ etc.) and the journeys of the cast in part or whole ($c_1, c_2$ etc.), in addition to the concordant arias ($1a, 2a$ etc.) and errors in common ($e$), noting them only in relation to their direct antecedent. Uncertainties are highlighted by an arrow or by a question mark in bold italics (?) placed on the line of derivation. Editions are always marked with the RISM initial of the venue where the performance took place, no matter where the drama was printed, followed by the final figures of the date.

The results obtained in this way by homo sapiens can be compared to those achieved by a machine, in the form of Synopsis software, to be read paroxytone in Latin (but not in Greek nor even less in English). The software has been producing numerous automatic results for some time, thanks to the work of Luigi Tessarolo. It was developed 20 years ago as a sophisticated search engine for opera study, able to provide the lexis and the incipits of the arias in a corpus of librettos. The system has been gradually developed so as to highlight errors coinciding between versions, promoting critical tools, both in terms of the collating of all the versions of a single libretto, including the princeps and the handwritten texts of the surviving scores. Aside from these solutions, we recently thought of also acquiring through Synopsis the genealogical tree of the spread and family connections linking the multiple versions of an opera, more or less re-worked or scrambled.

To draw up the stemma, Synopsis processes the results of a vast amount of simultaneous comparisons between editions of librettos, set out in electronic form; it first performs a whole collation verse by verse and then compares the arias, considering two types of response: positive (present) and negative (absent). To the greater or lesser exclusivity of these concordances the software assigns a relative score, in other words a greater or smaller number measuring the degree of parentage between the editions. As a secondary function, Synopsis examines those micro-variants in common which turn out to be less significant. For example, in the presence of misprints generating hypometric or hypermetric lines, easily recognizable by the printing editor and the scribe who copies or misrepresents the score, the possibility of amending, although not necessarily in univocal terms, is within the grasp of anyone who knows the elisions and apocopations of the Italian language. This is why a stemma obtained by traditional means, which takes into account mono- or polygenetic errors, diverges from the automatically-generated one.

3 See http://www.rism.info/sigla.html.
4 See the sites http://www.progettometastasio.it, http://www.carlogoldoni.it and http://www.variantiallopera.it, 18.11.2019, where we find a detailed description of the undertaking and above all we read the names of the participants; we refer to the same site http://www.carlogoldoni.it for the texts quoted and for an analysis of the software’s performance.
In the charts produced by *Synopsis*, the continuous green segments highlight certain filiations while the broken red segments denote the existence of two possible alternative hypotheses, with the straight line indicating the more probable. The thin, curved blue links, if present, highlight the adoption of an aria in common exclusively between two performances, substituted in the same scene of the original text. These results are provisional, on the one hand because the software needs testing, improving and possibly bolstering with additional functions, while on the other the *recensio* is never certain, since new sources, unexpected and absent from the repertories, emerge from libraries near and far. Yet if a reconstruction is correct and makes sense, it needs to be possible to insert a surprise element in the graphic without upsetting the original one.

**First example: *Il negligente***

The endless success of other Goldoni titles is not reflected in *Il negligente*, printed for the first time by Modesto Fenzo, performed at the San Moisè theater in the autumn of 1749, with the music of Vincenzo Ciampi, and repeated seemingly only seven times. Presented with titles differing from the original (*t1*), it became *Lo spensierato* in Lodi (*t2*) and *Il trascurato* in Florence (*t3*), with two titles always indicating the absent-minded and senile old man, the *buffo caricato*, tricked by the servant Pasqualino, played by Francesco Baglioni in its debut (I-V49), in Lodi in 1752 (I-LO52) and in Trieste in 1756 (I-TS56). Here he plays alongside Giacomo Caldinelli, who the following year brought to Turin the *mezzo carattere* Cornelio (I-T57), with Francesco Carattoli as the gaga old man in all four performances. However, apart from these and other close links among the cast, confirmed by the coincidence of errors and some arias, the evidence for locating the printing of Leiden (NL-L52) is too weak, not to mention the fact that we lack information to situate the last editions of St. Petersburg (RU-SP58) and Brunswick (D-BS60).

*Figure 1: Il negligente (traditional stemma)*
Second example: *La favola de’ tre gobbi*

In the manual tree of this Goldoni *intermezzo*, set to music again in Venice by Ciampi for the San Moisé in 1749, it is easy to group the families together on the basis of the titles which change according to the venue or the strength of each performer: *La favola de’ tre gobbi* (*t1*); I *tre gobbi rivali in amore* (*t2*; I-T50) abbreviated to I *tre gobbi rivali* (*t3*; I-F51) and further shortened to I *tre gobbi* (*t4*; D-POT54, I-MO, undated); I *tre gobbi rivali amanti di madama Vezzosa* with the full troupe mentioned above, Madama Vezzosa with the only woman in the leading role and *Li tre gobbi o sia Gli amori di madama Vezzosa*, again with the full cast. The score used for the premiere, here inserted between square brackets [P-x49], appears to be lost, although a later manuscript of that title has been preserved, described by Giovanni Polin and here indicated with the acronym of the library (P-F-Pn) where it is kept:

“In the watermark [of the P-F-Pn manuscript], wire lines and chain lines present themselves respectively as horizontal and vertical instead of the contrary, as is com-

---

5 The title associates the *princeps* (I-V49), three performances (I-VE50, I-M50, I-P50), the only surviving score (P-F-Pn) and all the literary collections (Tevernin I-V53, Olzati I-T57, Savioli I-V70 and Zatta I-V94); in the stemmas and in the abbreviations, “P”, derived from “partitura”, indicates a score.

6 Respectively *t5* (I-FE56, I-V56, D-M58), *t6* (A-W59, CZ-P60, D-BN64) and *t7* (D-GO67, D-H72).
mon in typical oblong scores. This allows us to suppose that the paper used had been cut to be initially utilized with the longest edge placed vertically, presumably to copy detached parts. This hypothesis [...] is based on a comparison with [...] Il geloso schernito by Pietro Chiarini (F-Pn, D. 2043), identical in binding but above all in the handwriting and type of paper [Massip, Catherine, La bibliothèque musicale du baron Grimm, in: Jean Gribenski et al. (eds.), D’un opéra l’autre. Hommage a Jean Mongrédien, Paris 1996, pp. 289-305]. However, Massip does not record in F-Pn the intermezzo by Ciampi nor the one by Chiarini. Our hypothesis is that such products were made by an Italian bouffon (perhaps Giuseppe Cosimi [who acted in the premiere with Francesco Carattoli, and Carlo and Angiola Paganini]) on French paper, following a request by Grimm.”

It is again thanks to Giovanni Polin that we owe the recent discovery of two librettos of the Favola hitherto unknown: I due gobbi rivali (I-R52), printed in Rome by Ottavio Puccinelli, obviously with one protagonist less (t8 but similar to t3), and I tre gobbi rivali (t3), a “comic drama without serious elements” (“drama giocoso senza mesuglio [sic] di serio”), published in London by the printer George Woodfall (GB-L61) with an English translation on the opposite page, for the “monetary benefit of signor Carlo and of signora Angiola Paganini” (“benefizio del signor Carlo e della signora Angiola Paganini”). The British performance, the takings of which went into the pockets of the couple, ploughs the furrow of the tradition conditioned and tampered with by the two actors (cl), who, to add the third act to the pièce, non-existent in the Goldoni original, recycle some pieces from Il mondo alla roversa, performed by them in Turin in 1751 shortly after the intermezzo. In contrast, it is difficult, if not impossible, to apply the shortcut of the above criteria to find a place for the editions when devoid of the necessary evidence, those published in Modena with no date (I-MO), Vienna in 1759 (A-W59) and Gotha in 1767 (D-GO67), with the names of singers which never appear in the preceding performances.

“Nella filigrana [del manoscritto P-F-Pn] filoni e vergelle si presentano rispettivamente orizzontali e verticali invece che al contrario, come d’uso nelle tipiche partiture oblunghe. Questo fa suppare che la carta utilizzata fosse stata tagliata per essere inizialmente usata con il lato più lungo in verticale, presumibilmente per copiare delle parti staccate. L’ipotesi [...] si basa sul confronto con [...] Il geloso schernito di Pietro Chiarini (F-Pn, D. 2043) identico per rilegatura ma soprattutto per mano di scrittura e tipologia di carta [Massip, Catherine, La bibliothèque musicale du baron Grimm, in: Jean Gribenski et al. (eds.), D’un opéra l’autre. Hommage a Jean Mongrédien, Paris 1996, pp. 289-305]. Però Massip non censisce in F-Pn l’intermezzo di Ciampi né quello di Chiarini. L’ipotesi è che tali manufatti siano stati prodotti da un bouffon italiano (forse Giuseppe Cosimi [interprete della prima con Francesco Carattoli, Carlo e Angiola Paganini]) su carta francese, in base a una richiesta di Grimm.” Polin, Giovanni, Scheda, in: http://www.variantiallopera.it/public/schede/scheda/id/14, 18.11.2019; of the two scores in D-Hs, one is in German while the other contains one aria only.
The chart produced by the software excludes for now the scores ([P-x49], P-F-Pn) and the new editions (I-R52, GB-L61), which have not yet been added to the database. To compensate, it does clarify the doubts surrounding the Florentine libretto performed by the cast of the premiere (I-F51), the one of Ferrara (I-FE56) and the monumental compendium edition published at the end of the century by Antonio Zatta (I-V94). It also highlights a link between the text from Emilia with no date (I-MO) and the Habsburg one (A-W59), deriving from the same Munich edition (D-M58). Moreover, the Thuringia printing (D-GO67) has a direct descent taken from the distant Venetian original, as shown by the green segments. A blue curved line marks a single aria traveling from Florence (I-F51) to Potsdam (D-PO54) about 1,200 kilometers away.
Figure 4: La favola de’ tre gobbi (computer-based)
Third example: *L’Arcadia in Brenta*

Decidedly more successful than *Il negligente* and comparable to *La favola*, the international acclaim of *L’Arcadia in Brenta*, the famous “drama [sic] comico” by Goldoni, repeated around 20 times always with the music by Baldassare Galuppi and with the same title, depends most likely on the careful layout of the text and the exhilarating score that was popular from London to Bonn, Munich to Bratislava. We have a second arrangement thanks to the author himself who revises his own libretto in 1750 on the occasion of the Milan performance, attested to in an edition by Giuseppe Richino Malatesta:

> “Since this *operetta* was cut to suit the actors who performed it in Venice, now that it had to be performed in this theater with different actors, it was the author himself who varied it in certain parts to match the precise characters of the new actors.”

In her Venetian debut, Costanza Rossignoli, in the role of the mawkish madama Lindora, outlines her recipe for a small lunch, which seems the caricature of the *sopa coada*, a popular dish typical of Venetian cuisine, based on stock, stale bread and white meat. Among the new actors of the Milanese cast there stands out the enterprising Angiola Paganini, who plays the part of the same gentlewoman, greatly modified in a sparkling, comic vein. The girl, having become suddenly ravenous, stuffs herself with game, knocking back a half-bottle of wine which had to be a full-blooded red to properly accompany the feast.

---


9 “Siccome quest’operetta fu tagliata la prima volta sul dosso degl’attori che l’hanno rappresentata a Venezia, così, dovendosi ora rappresentare in questo teatro da personaggi diversi, è stata dall’autore medesimo in qualche parte variata per uniformarsi al preciso carattere de’ nuovi attori.” *L’Arcadia in Brenta*, 1750, [p. 7].

off all the provisions at his country residence, Lindora should ask for news of the pigeon she had demanded some scenes previously. However, in the subsequent performances, with the exception of that of Leiden, which displays the opposite error (NL-L52), and that of Bonn which corrects it (D-BN71), the woman contradicts herself, insisting on the capon of the princeps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>edition</th>
<th>I occurrence</th>
<th>II occurrence</th>
<th>fast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capon</td>
<td>pigeon</td>
<td>capon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-V49</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-P49</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-CRE49</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-M50</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-M51</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-B51</td>
<td>pizone</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-VE52</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL-L52</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-FZ53</td>
<td>III, 1</td>
<td>III, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-CR54</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB-L55</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-H55</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-BN57</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-NOV58</td>
<td>pizzone</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-R59</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK-BR59</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-M60</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-G64</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-BN71</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different roles and the menu of the colazione, eaten from the prima buffa, suggest the construction of a tripartite stemma involving the Venetian capon, the Lombard pigeon and the silent fast of the other women. It is clear that Bologna (I-B51) and Novara (I-NOV58) are indissolubly united in the Gallo-Italic dialect pizzone or pizzone in the place of the Tuscan piccione. Yet in reality the manual tree, which in any case leaves certain questions unanswered, presents itself as a more complex network than the meal would have us believe, as demonstrated by the contaminations and uncertainties, always highlighted here with an arrow. The coincidence in errors is weak between the two Bonn librettos (D-BN57, D-BN71) or that between the Cremasco and the Habsburg (I-CRE49, D-H55), linked to Verona (I-VE52) by a single secondary member of the cast, as in other cases. In addition, we do not know where to insert the Rome edition (I-R59), the one from Munich (D-M60) and the one from Genoa (I-G64), which lack the necessary indications.
Figure 5: L’Arcadia in Brenta (traditional stemma)

Figure 6: L’Arcadia in Brenta (computer-based)
On the other hand, the computer-generated version, while still tripartite, highlights secondary progenitors which have less to do with Lindora’s appetite, and displays more numerous contaminations, indicated as usual by broken or else by thin, curved red lines, in part corresponding to the uncertainties of the traditional stemma. As in the case of *La favola*, a blue link lets us see an aria migrating from Bologna (I-B51) to Leiden (NL-L52).

**Fourth example: *Il filosofo di campagna***

*Figure 7: Il filosofo di campagna (computer-based)*
As always, machines produce in a reasonable amount of time those results which *homo sapiens* cannot easily obtain and for which he or she has no intention of sacrificing energy, starting with the tiring laundering of sheets, generally assigned to the washing machine from the 1950s, onwards, but ending up in our case with the tree of *Il filosofo di campagna*, performed around 60 times from 1754 to 1774. Even though it is not worth compiling by hand the entire stemma of such a varied and complex tradition, with the new computer program it is possible to plot the adventures of Goldoni and Galuppi’s most fortunate *dramma giocoso*, tampered, reduced and performed with different titles from Barcelona to Hamburg, from Moscow to Dublin, from London to Malta.\footnote{Polin, 1994-1995.} The intersection of green segments (direct derivation) with curved or straight red lines (near or far contamination) shows the importance of the dust of the stage boards.

**Fifth example: Venceslao by Apostolo Zeno**

*Figure 8: Venceslao (computer-based)*
To end on a high note, we have chosen to take on a serious drama, *Venceslao* by Apostolo Zeno, the object of Silvia Urbani’s doctoral thesis,\(^\text{12}\) taken up several times and written by the author himself in two versions, one in Venice for the San Giovanni Grisostomo theater with the music of Carlo Francesco Pollarolo, now almost completely lost (I-V703), and the second in the Habsburg capital for the name day of Carlo VI (A-W725). It emerges quite clearly that the Zeno revision (on the far right), connected both to the surviving score by vice-Kapellmeister Antonio Caldara (P-A-Wgm) and to the shelf edition published by Gasparo Gozzi (I-V744), is completely separate from theatrical tradition, expounded here only until 1725. Compared to the charts of comic genre, in *Venceslao* the thin, continuous and curved blue lines increase, describing a greater tendency towards contamination, due to the independent circulation of *arie di baule*, taken from other pièces of the serious repertoire.

Naturally, a *recensio* of the later editions of the 1725 imperial performance, extended at least as far as the literary printing of 1744 but still *in fieri*, could leave some surprises in store in terms of the fair success of the *Venceslao* updated for the Habsburg court. It must also be pointed out that in the automatic chart there lacks the step documented by a libretto missing from the database: the autograph revision held in the Marciana among the Zeno papers.\(^\text{13}\) This witnesses the shift from I-V703 to A-W725, leading to the Vienna printing and the P-A-Wgm score. Hence the right-hand part of the stemma should be corrected as follows:

*Figure 9: Venceslao (part of traditional stemma)*

In conclusion, we can cite a saying widespread in the Veneto-Romance linguistic area: “Fraca boton, salta macaco” (“Push the button and a monkey jumps out”). This expression refers to those little boxes for children with a button which when pushed allows a little mechanical monkey to jump out and not that stuttering, hunched, stupid character named Macaco Tartaglia in Goldoni’s politically incorrect *Favola*. Perhaps a real *cercopithecus*, cousin to the *homo* genus belonging to the order of primates, would pop out with a more elastic adroitness compared to a little automatic animal. Yet we would have


\(^{13}\) I-Vnm, Cod.It.CL.IX.478 (= 6237), fols. 63r-97v.
to run the risk of training him and persuading him to perform, while Synopsis merely requires certain preliminary, albeit vital, actions: recensio, scanning and editing of the texts, and error recognition. Although it was conceived for Italian opera, the tractable procedure can be applied, without moving a finger, to any corpus in any language, from brief lyrics to interminable poems, from the sparkling theater of Plautus to the boring drama of Manzoni, from a simple popular nursery rhyme to a complicated six-line stanza for the elite. The model, developed with total awareness that the last word lies with the philologist, is naturally available to anyone wishing to try it out.

**Sources**

OLIVIERI, PROSPERO, A’ gentili leggitori, in: Il pasticcio, Venice 1759, p. 3.  
L’Arcadia in Brenta, Milan 1750.  
ZENO, APOSTOLO, Veneslao (revised version), libretto: I-Vnm, Cod.It.Cl.IX.478 (= 6237), fols. 63r-97v.
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**Ways of Replacement – Loss and Enrichment**

**Martin Albrecht-Hohmaier/Kristin Herold**

Meanwhile, it is a well-known fact that operas of the 18th century experienced various changes not only of performing participants but also of musical numbers and libretto text in the course of every new production. Musical numbers were excluded and at the same time others were inserted or replaced.\(^1\) Each exclusion can be a loss, but every new substitution or exchange in the opera can be an enrichment as well. Pasticcios – as works created out of already pre-existing music – are on the one hand an extreme example for this way of creating operatic works because they extend the amount of exchanged musical numbers to a maximum; on the other hand, they are completely different from other forms of operas of this period because they make terms like ‘single authorship’, ‘originality’ or especially ‘opus’ inappropriate or at least problematic. It is one of the goals of the project *PASTICCIO. Ways of Arranging Attractive Operas* to explore these topics.

Even this little spotlight on the relation of opera and pasticcio shows the manifest problems that arise while trying to clearly define these two genres. There are many examples of operatic works where it is nearly impossible to decide whether a given work is an opera or a pasticcio. That is the reason why we think it is better to speak of practices than of genres. This iridescent character of pasticcios was one of the reasons why our project edits two groups of works showing different kinds of pasticcio practices in the 18th century.

**Editing two groups of works**

The subject of these two groups of works is music compiled for Metastasio’s librettos *Catone in Utica* and *Siroe re di Persia*. Each group of works has a different focus, due to the very different conditions of genesis. In the case of *Il Siroe* by Johann Adolph Hasse the edited group of works contains the version that Hasse originally composed as an opera in 1733 and the one as a pasticcio compiled by the same composer produced 30

\(^1\) See (besides others) Konrad, 2007, or Strohm, 2011.
years later in 1763. It is one of the very rare opportunities where the original composer and the arranging artist are the same person and the results will give insight into the practice of arranging a pasticcio.

_Catone in Utica_, which was first set to music by Leonardo Vinci for Rome in 1728, is edited in two very different pasticcios, one produced by George Frideric Handel (performed as _Catone_, London 1732, based on the opera by Leonardo Leo, Venice 1728/29, but with an ending that was revised by Metastasio himself on this occasion), and the other arranged by the Mingotti opera troupe (_Catone in Utica_, Hamburg 1744, with the original ending). The research and editions will show these works to be two very different but equally paradigmatic examples of what is normally understood as a pasticcio, both with respect to music as well as to the socio-cultural background of the time.

**Database and edition**

One main interest of our project is to connect information from an XML database of research results, e.g. careers of singers (designed and maintained by ZenMEM) with the digital editions of the groups of works using the _Edirom_ tools, which will show relevant connected sources too (musical as well as textual). The database will collect and show the results of all the individual projects, and the collected data will enable the reconstruction of the cultural-historical context of the pasticcio as seen, for example, in the itineraries of singers and opera troupes, the aria transfers (arrangements of text and music), the role of the agents involved in the production, and the materiality of the sources.

The connection between database and edition is a tribute to new basic research and will be done by an interface which links the musical editions of the project with the database. This can be done because all of the data in the database as well as the content in the digital editions, presented with the _Edirom_ tools, are based on XML. The connecting points will be, for example, entries concerning information about the performances (year, place, institution); about singers, vocal ambit and biographical information or about the relevant works; other junctures are information about a single aria (its provenance and differences compared to the model version), connected music and libretto sources accompanied with philological descriptions like information about writers, provenance, watermarks, and so on. The aim is to demonstrate the complex aria networks within single pasticcios in relation to the various actors of the early modern opera business.

These different connections between database and edition have different qualities and they make different ways of linking necessary. Two principle examples: as long as it

---

2 Manuscript scores of these versions are accessible online at D-Dli: The earlier one is represented by call number Mus.2477-F-16, https://digital.slub-dresden.de/werkansicht/dlf/89822/4/0/, 17.06.2019; the later one by call number Mus.2477-F-17, https://digital.slub-dresden.de/werkansicht/dlf/243121/5//, 17.06.2019.

3 On the title page of the libretto and the music manuscript (D-B, Mus.Ms.22376) it is named a “Tragedia”.  
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concerns concrete musical details a clickable dot in the score (in the edition as well as in
the source) can be linked to the data entry directly. If arias with the same text have only
smaller musical readings (like the aria of Emilia in *Catone* “Vede il nocchier la sponda”
which is used by Handel in Act III and by Mingotti in Act II), or those with the same
text but completely different music (like the very first aria sung by Catone “Con si bel
nome in fronte”), there will be entries in the database which will be linked to the pages
of the edition and/or the scans of the sources (music and librettos) to enable the user of
the editions or the database to compare these arias easily. The other kind of links con-
cern rather general information contained in meta-texts (like source descriptions, work
introductions or more specific scientific elaborations, e.g. about a performance context),
and they have to be linked to the *Edirom* in those cases where the edition can function
as an example or illustration for the text. This will be done via a dropdown menu on our
project internet appearance (www.pasticcio-project.eu) showing a list of relevant topics
which will be elaborated within the project.

**Examples**

After these rather general introductory notes we will give some concrete insights into
the genesis of the two *Catones* with examples taken from the complex philological con-
text of the first scenes up to Emilia’s first aria. This will show the multiple possibilities
and necessities to connect the edition and the sources to the database.

Because the replacement of arias could be strongly connected to the interpretation
of the involved characters, and because Handel omitted the role of Fulvio completely,
it may be helpful to review the beginning of the plot as it was conceived by Metasta-
sio. The persons involved are Catone, the Roman senator, one of the last defenders of
republican ideas, Cesare, his opponent and an opponent of republican ideas in general,
Marzia, Catone’s daughter and secret lover of Cesare, Emilia, the widow of Pompeius,
who was killed fighting against Cesare’s army, Arbace, the Prince of the Numidians,
and follower of Catone who is in love with Marzia, and finally Fulvio, an envoy of the
Roman senate, who is in love with Emilia.

At the beginning Cesare has besieged Utica and Catone, the Numidians being the
only remaining opponents. In the first scene their prince Arbace proposes marriage to
Catone’s daughter Marzia. Catone likes the idea but Marzia thinks it a very inappro-
priate question. Nevertheless, even though she is the secret lover of Cesare, she finally
agrees to the proposal, as long as Arbace does not hope to be loved by her in return.
Then Cesare and Fulvio enter the city as negotiators wanting to parley about peace with
Catone. This upsets Emilia as she is now being confronted with her enemy Cesare in a
place where she believed herself to be safe. Cesare shows nobleness, but Emilia only
thinks of revenge for her killed husband. When she realizes that Fulvio is admiring her,
she pretends to have feelings too, but wants Fulvio to kill Cesare as a proof of his love.
This is the moment of Emilia’s first aria, but a lot of interesting changes can be observed in these first scenes and our rough outline of the aria replacements show the philological complexity we have to deal with.

In the first performance of Handel’s pasticcio in London in 1732, Catone was sung by Senesino (Francesco Bernardi), and by Giuseppe Nicola Alberti in Hamburg in 1744 during the performances of the Mingotti pasticcio (all participating singers are mentioned by name in the librettos). In both works Catone’s aria is addressed to Arbace, his son-in-law to be, and preserves at least the text of the model, “Con si bel nome in fronte”, but with different music.

The tenor aria on the same text by Vinci was pompous with a majestic character; for the performance in London Handel used (like he did with all the other arias sung by Catone) a composition identical to the one in Leonardo Leo’s Catone, where the aria’s first part is also majestic, but gets rapid and delighted in its second part, allowing the famous castrato Senesino to show his abilities in a more effective way. The unknown composer of the correlating aria in the Mingotti pasticcio is closer to the aria by Vinci in terms of vocal ambitus and character. So already the first aria sung by Catone offers a lot of the confusing details that pasticcio research has to cope with.

For Marzia’s first aria (addressed to Arbace, but keeping him at a distance) Handel again kept the aria by Leo “Non ti minaccio sdegno”, this time sung by Anna Maria Strada del Pò, a quick, vivid number full of fervor. For the Mingotti performance, an aria by Paolo Scalabrin with a rather complex form was chosen, a number changing between a constrained Adagietto and a fast Allegro with extensive coloratura, sung by Rosa Costa (“A si gentile amante”).

Arbace’s response has been changed in both pasticcios in comparison to the model(s) or predecessors causing slight alterations in expression. Handel omits Leo’s unhappy affected „Mi lusinga il cor d’affetto“, composed for the soprano castrato Farinelli by his brother Riccardo Broschi, replacing it for the alto Francesca Bertolli with Johann Adolf Hasse’s „Un raggio di speme” from the opera Dalisa, a vivid and elegant number, tragic only in its middle section. Mingotti uses the same text as Vinci „Che legge spietata“, but replaces the lively lamento with a composition by the mentioned troupe member Alberti, whose aria is similar in character but more complex regarding form and harmony.

Then Emilia appears on stage but without an aria. Like Cesare she has to wait for Catone’s second aria admonishing both of them with “Pensa di chi sei figlia”, which Handel took again from Leo (but who probably isn’t the composer either), while Mingotti completely cuts this number.

5 Like the Catone arias all those sung by Strada were taken from Leo’s Cato. For more details on Handel’s practice on arranging in respect of the performing artists see Over, 2019; Over, 2020.
6 I thank Berthold Over for this interesting hint.
7 See Over, 2019.
For Cesare’s subsequent first aria Vinci and Leo composed different numbers with the same text “Nell’ardire che il seno ti accende”, but Handel and Mingotti preferred to use different ones. Mingotti inserted an *Andante* “Chi mai d’iniqua stella” (for the soprano Giovanna della Stella) with rather complex rhythms and a very short lament *Allegretto* as a middle section. On the top of the first page there is a hint written in ink – as it seems added at the same time as the music notation – ascribing the number to Andrea Bernasconi. The text of the aria is taken from the opera *Temistocle*, which exists in two versions (Padua 1740 and Venice 1744) but this aria (I,6, sung by Aspasia, soprano) exists isolated in several sources, showing the same text and music, always ascribed to Bernasconi.\(^8\) But since all the scores of the complete opera we have seen so far have the same text, though different music, it seems apparent that a score of the complete opera *Temistocle* by Bernasconi containing this aria version (text and music) used in the Mingotti’s *Catone* is lost.\(^9\)

Handel’s insertion was composed by Nicola Porpora, “Non paventa del mar le procelle” from the opera *Siface* in the revised version performed in 1730 in Rome, sung in *Catone* by the *basso* Antonio Montagnana. The exalted and furious expression of Porpora’s music fits perfectly into the new context, showing Cesare’s anger because Emilia is still thinking of revenge, but also expressing his confidence of victory.

The handwritten score of Handel’s *Catone* shows changing ideas about the sequence of arias at this point, beginning in I,5 with Catone’s “Pensa di chi sei figlia”. An earlier idea was to have an aria by Cesare instead of the one by Catone. This idea can be detected underneath the pasted over version of the preceding recitative, “Tu taci Emilia”, where only the text is notated, but no music. This succession would have meant to jump to Scene 6 and to an aria by Cesare indicated as well by “Ces.”; but the crossing out, the missing musical notation and the pasting are traces of the cancellation of the idea (Figure 1).

*Figure 1: Catone by Handel, D-Hs, M A/1012, p. 69.*\(^{10}\)

---

8 Like the single handwritten aria in B-Bc, 3719, which also has the remark “1740. In Padova.”.

9 The scores of *Temistocle* by Bernasconi we checked are: F-Pn, D-1005, pp. 101ff; D-Mbs, Mus.ms.187, pp. 96ff.; D-B, Mus.ms.1603, pp. [105ff.] (there is no pagination or foliation).

10 Page numbers are taken from our *Elirom* presentation of the sources, which will be available at the end of our project.
Then, with the pasting “Catone Aria” is added, which indeed starts on the verso page (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Catone by Handel, D-Hs, M A/1012, p. 70.

But uncertainty continued: at the end of the next recitative after Catone’s aria there is a remark “Segue l’aria di Cesare Emilia.” Both names are crossed out, but Cesare’s is also underlined. This suggests that the first idea was to continue with an aria for Cesare, the second idea to have no aria for Cesare, but to jump to Scene 7 with an aria for Emilia. Finally, Handel reverted to the original idea of an aria by Cesare, which is in fact notated on the verso page (Figure 3).

The role of Fulvio is, as already mentioned, completely cut in Handel’s Catone, Mingotti inserts an aria for the contralto Angela Romani “Mio cor non sospirar” of uncertain provenance, but according to RISM it could have been composed by Bernasconi,11 Giovanni Battista Pergolesi12 or Geminiano Giacomelli.13

11 B-Bc, 3724, RISM ID no.: 703001891.
12 D-MÜs, Sant.Hs.3090 (Nr. 14), RISM ID no.: 451018395.
13 I-Mc, Noseda L.40.25; Berthold Over found further details: The aria is also contained in F-Pn, Vm’ 7262, no composer name is mentioned, but it is entitled with „Per la Sig:” Fumagalli”. Caterina Fumagalli sang the aria 1736 in Pisa (N. Porpora, Arianna e Teseo, II, 6); but the text already appeared in Mingotti’s Didone abbandonata in 1734 (Brno, III,4), reappared in the troupe’s La fede ne’ tradimenti in 1736 (Graz, II,4) and Rosmira in 1740 (Ljubljana, II,8). According to Müller von Asow (1917, p. LXXVf.) and hand-
Finally, it is time for Emilia’s first aria. She is alone on stage begging her dead husband for his forgiveness of her feigned love to Fulvio. She hopes to share his destiny soon, wherever he is she wants to be too, but not before she has taken revenge on Cesare.

This text and situation is set to music rather differently in the numerous *Catone* operas, sometimes fast, sometimes rather solemn.

In contrast to Mingotti, Handel didn’t keep the original text “O nel sen di qualche stella”, but inserted another aria. The role of Emilia was sung by Celeste Gismondi, identical to the Neapolitan *buffo* singer Celeste Resse.\(^\text{14}\) Emilia is her first documented appearance on stage in London, and maybe this is one of the reasons why Handel decided or agreed not only to insert a new aria but also to subsequently replace the replacing aria. The first insertion was “La cervetta timidetta” from Vivaldi’s opera *Giustino* (Rome

written annotations in the libretto of *Catone in Utica* (Dresden 1747, Mingotti) in US-We (ML50.2.C315) the composer is Albinoni. ANGELA ROMAGNOLI (see her article in the present volume, pp. 367f.) mentions this aria in the context of performances with Fumagalli in Naples (1734) and Maria Camati in Bologna (1734). However, the text can be located for the first time in *La Zoe* (Vienna 1732) and Ignazio Fiorillo’s *L’Egeste* (Trieste 1733, “Mio ben, non sospirar”) where it was sung by Camati. The aria was included once again in a Vienna production in 1740 (*Don Chisciotte credendosi all’inferno*; all information on the Vienna productions derive from personal communication of Judit Zsovár and Reinhard Strohm). On Over’s findings cf. also ALBRECHT-HOHMAIER et al., 2020.

1724), a sad *Adagio ma non troppo*, mostly calm (sung in this slow tempo) and addressed to the dead husband (Figures 4 & 5).

*Figures 4 & 5: Catone by Handel, D-Hs, M A/1012, pp. 91, 102.*

Maybe “La Celestina” was not pleased with this slow aria with reduced instrumentation and it was replaced again for one by Porpora, “Priva del caro sposo” (from the opera *Germanico*)
in Germania, Rome 1732), an upset and moving Allegro. It was done by crossing out the first and the last page, leaving pages of this aria as a part of the score, but inserting the pages with the new aria between the first and the second page of “La cervetta” (Figures 6 & 7).

Figures 6 & 7: Catone by Handel, D-Hs, M A/1012, pp. 92f.
When looking at the text only, it is interesting that the preferred textual alternatives omit or at least weaken Emilia’s desire for revenge, which is articulated in the second part of the aria; a tendency which is musically reduced by the second replacement, too:¹⁵

---

Vinci, Leo, Mingotti (Graun)  Handel (Vivaldi)  Handel (Porpora)
O nel sen di qualche stella  La cervetta timidetta  Priva del caro sposo
o sul margine di Lete  corre al fonte, al colle, al monte,  la tortora si lagna,
se m’attendi anima bella,  e trovando il suo diletto  non trova mai riposo,
non sdegnarti, anch’io verrò.  l’accarezza, lo consola.  vola per la campagna
e fa del suo lamento  il vento risonar.

Si verrò ma voglio pria  Così spero anch’io, mio core,  Priva dell’idol mio
che preceda all’ombra mia  negl’elisi del mio amore  Peno e mi lago anch’io,
l’ombra rea di quel tiranno  darti un pegno  deh voi porgeto, o numi,
che a tuo danno il mondo armò.  già quest’alma a te sen vola.  conforto al mio penar.

The fact that this tendency of weakening the affection in the libretto is not musically supported by the chosen music corresponds with Emilia’s subsequent arias, where the music constantly increases her vindictiveness.¹⁶

In their pasticcio the Mingottis kept the text of Emilia’s first aria, but they chose another composition, an aria by Carl Heinrich Graun from his opera *Catone*. “O nel sen di qualche stella” comprises a long, solemn *Larghetto* A section which is interrupted by a short (Mingotti even reduced it by seven bars from 23 to 16) and dramatic ‘excitement’ in the B section (*Allegro*) with leaps, vivid accompaniment and chromatic lines in the last bars (Figures 8 & 9).

*Figures 8 & 9: Catone by Mingotti, I-MOe, Mus.F.1590, fols. 111f.*

---

¹⁵ See Over, 2019.

¹⁶ I thank Berthold Over for this interesting hint.
Catone by Graun had its first performance in the same year of Mingotti’s pasticcio in 1744, so it could have been one of the opera troupe’s intentions to include a new, up-to-date aria. Comparing the Mingotti version with the one/s by Graun it is eye-catching that the only instructions at the beginning of the Mingotti score, under the first violin system read “Larghetto Sordini e Flauti”, and there are no systems for the flutes throughout the aria. It is very unlikely, and atypical for contemporary instrumentation, that the flutes should play the whole aria *colla parte* with the violins, especially because some passages are out of the playable range. But this closer look offers as well insights into the possible reasons for Mingotti’s modifications. After a first search, eight manuscript scores of Graun’s opera were found, all more or less identical, containing the same differences in comparison to the Mingotti score. The flute parts are more precisely written (playing the *ritornelli* only) and at two passages Mingotti’s version is a few bars shorter. But there is another difference: In some passages, the figuration in the Mingotti score is metrically a little simplified (Figures 10 & 11).
Figure 10: Catone by Graun (bars 37 to 43) set according to F-Pn, D-5000.

Figure 11: Catone by Mingotti (bars 37 to 43).

In the bars immediately following, Mingotti’s version (bar 43 to 52) is shortened and the counterpoint of the flutes is missing (in our edition the flute parts in the Mingotti aria are adjusted to the practice of only playing during the *ritornello*, Figures 12 & 13).
Figures 12 & 13: Catone by Mingotti (bars 43 to 51) and the corresponding 13 bars in the Graun source set according to F-Pn, D-5000.
The B section Allegro is also shortened (by seven bars) and shows a slightly simplified vocal part as well. Resuming these differences, the Mingotti version is less exactly notated, shortened and simplified. As long as there is not somewhere another, yet unknown source which might have served as model, the differences can be interpreted as changes by Mingotti or by the Kapellmeister of the troupe Paolo Scalabrini. But what could have been the reasons for these changes? Considering the vocal abilities of the singer of the 1744 performance, Regina Valentini (the later wife of Pietro Mingotti) and her later engagements, it seems to be improbable that the simplifications were made because of her. But nevertheless – as usual for a traveling opera troupe – the simplifications could have been induced by the cast of other performances which may not have been as gifted as the mentioned singers, or due to local preferences in the city where the performance took place.

This necessary flexibility could as well be the reason for the deficient flute parts, which were only sketched or implied. It is known that the Mingottis had their own music library with them which they used for their performances, adjusting and arranging it to local conditions. At least some of those were short scores, less detailed in instrumentation, dynamics and articulation. And every insertion depends on the quality of the source of the aria. In contrast to modern thinking, where one would have searched for the original version to use as an insertion, for the Mingottis and their musical needs maybe just a corrupted version of an aria could have been first choice.

**Linking of database and edition**

With these rather open thoughts and some more philological and historical details in mind we come back to the linking of edited music to the entries of the database and how we are organizing it. In his article, Joachim Veit mentions a topic which provides a good transition to this final point: the classification of editorial annotations and – related, but more general – the search for new structures for semantically meaningful accumulations of data. Veit gives insights into the development of the critical apparatus of critical editions and the way editorial projects of this nature have to find a way to organize and structure its editorial annotations. It is no doubt that detailed annotations lead the user to a better understanding of the edition and the sources. The monumental critical editions of single composers are honored and burdened with the duty to save no less than the musical heritage of the composer’s work, a duty which is performed by documentation and fastidious descriptions and annotations of divers and numerous documents. But this is a duty which cannot be fulfilled by short term projects with a different focus, like ours on the pasticcio, where this problem is solved – as Veit demands – by classification

---

18 See e.g. Lipowsky, 1811, p. 211, online: https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/ob ject/display/bsb10933158_00229.html; Burden, 2013.

19 See Daniel Brandenburg’s article in the present volume, pp. 271-283.

20 See Joachim Veit’s article in the present volume, pp. 705-717.
based on the central goals of the scientific approach. The editions serve as examples for musical pasticcio practices in the 18th century, and that is why our annotations are reduced to primary musical variants which unveil the context of sources. In contrast to secondary variants (like articulation or dynamics, which are annotated in general remarks in prefaces), primary variants are those of pitch, duration and instrumentation. Only they will be annotated, in addition to all other details which are of advanced interest, giving information on insertions or other philological contexts. And besides the pragmatic necessity to do so, this strategy avoids the risk, mentioned by Veit, to drown in an “ocean of information”\textsuperscript{21} – in our case of less interesting annotations about (to be polemic) hundreds of wrong slurs or thousands of missing dynamics. We are allowed to do so because they are a result of the conditions of pasticcio production which will also be documented in our research findings.

Very close to the classification of annotations is the structuring of data entries. It is essential to give data a meaningful structure to enable advanced search strategies. The more detailed the classification of the data, the more informative can be the results of a search and – like Veit says – the easier it is “to interchange data and to build corpora beyond individual projects”.\textsuperscript{22} At the same time, the more detailed the data structure is the higher the risk becomes of inputting incorrect data entries. Data could get lost or fall into a deep ‘Rosebud’s sleep’ (‘Dornröschenschlaf’) if they are entered under wrong parameters. But this is a risk that is absolutely negligible regarding the advantages of well-structured data. But how do we merge our database and edition and what is the additional value in combining them? Especially when one is confronted with a materiality, as in the case of the pasticcios already discussed in more detail here, the linking of database and edition appears to be particularly profitable. We suggest three levels – 1. Machine-readable links, 2. Explicit description of links and 3. Systematic processing of a specific single phenomenon – how such a consolidation can take place.

But before we can talk about details of our suggested three levels, first of all, it has to be clarified what kind of data one wants to deal with, and how and with which standards one can and/or should collect them. Owing to the characteristics of a pasticcio, one is not dealing with a finished work that has been composed in this form by the composer on her or his own. The pasticcio is characterized in particular by the fact that the most distinct components were combined as individual components in the most different ways and for the most different reasons in a pasticcio. This can be done by the arranger’s decision, or by the preferences of a singer who wants to sing a favorite aria from an opera she or he has sung in another theater to be integrated into the current pasticcio. Thus, the interplay of the people involved, the individual components of a pasticcio and the resulting overall arrangement as a pasticcio is very exciting. Of course, the individual components of this complex interplay can be recorded very well in a database. The resulting pasticcio is then processed in a digital edition. And in order to be able to present the aforementioned links and explanations in a semantically richer way than the pure annotations within an edition

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Veit, in the present volume, p. 715.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. ibid.
would make possible, we propose that these two areas are brought together. In order to facilitate a later connection, it is of course advisable to remain in one language family that makes this possible, i.e. XML in the present case. Thus, theaters, persons, etc. can be awarded TEI (Text Encoding Initiative) – of course with distinction of corresponding standard data sets if available – and information regarding the works MEI (Music Encoding Initiative). Since the contents of the edition can also be coded in XML, linking is relatively easy. Due to the possibility to implement FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) in MEI, this format is particularly suitable for mapping the characteristics of pasticcios. Since the contents of the edition can also be coded in XML, a link to the data is easily possible. Having all these conditions in mind, the next three paragraphs will now introduce three different ways regarding the use of linking possibilities which will be shown on three different levels, the machine-readable link, the explicit description of links, and the systematic processing of a specific single phenomenon.

**Machine-readable link**

Now that the basis for merging exists thanks to the common use of XML, one would like to ‘somehow’ merge the data sets. On one possible level, this can easily be done with the help of machine-readable links. Based on identifiers, data can be automatically related to each other, so, for example, notes about a singer in the edition naturally use the same identifier for this person in the database and the link can be machine-readable without any human intervention (see Figure 14). There is also information in the database, e.g. about the insertion arias sung by a singer during a production, which in turn can be linked to the respective work component in the edition in the same machine-readable way using the common identifier. Via these pure references or standard data – as far as they are available for the object under consideration – these two worlds are linked together in a machine-readable way.

*Figure 14: Machine-readable links connect data from database and edition on the basis of identifiers with each other, e.g. person, works and organizations.*
Explicit description of links

Besides the pure machine-readable link, a level is also conceivable that offers an explicit description of links, i.e. comments, that are machine-readable. Thus, the use of RDF (Resource Description Framework) would be possible, which allows logical statements about arbitrary things. By not only distinguishing individuals and work components individually, but also adding a predicate, such as singing or composing, this triple can then create links, since these have been commented on in machine-readable form. These types of enriched connections are machine-readable, but the creation must of course be done by hand. So, you can approach questions like by whom, where, and when something was sung/composed, etc. In Figure 15 a small example from the pasticcio Catone – in which Celeste Gismondi was involved as a singer – is shown, that demonstrates the explicit description of links which enrich machine-readable links.

Figure 15: Explicit description of links enrich the machine-readable links.

We have here the case (first of all not very remarkable) that one aria was replaced by another. But by linking database and edition it is possible to delve much deeper into this topic. When studying the edited musical text, a link can be made to the data set of the singer who sang this aria, for example to check changing engagements at different theaters where the aria in question was sung by the same singer and thus try to answer the question of how the aria reached the present pasticcio and via which stations; e.g. it was brought along by the singer, as is assumed in the small example. For example, an ability the singer Celeste Gismondi was famous for was tone repetitions. The aria “La cervetta timidetta” (see also Figures 4 & 5 and Figure 16) by Vivaldi was intended for Handel’s Catone. It was, however, replaced by Porpora’s “Priva del caro sposo” (see also Figures 6 & 7 and Figure 16), which she might have encountered during her travel to London. In this, too, she was able to demonstrate her virtuosity with regard to tone repetitions.

This tone repetition as a pure annotation in the edition would only be comprehensible to human beings, but with the aforementioned link due to coded contents and the possibility of merging both worlds, i.e. database and edition, it also becomes machine-readable.

23 See Over, 2019, p. 90.
Figure 16: The connection of Celeste Gismondi from the database to the edition can be enriched by adding more detailed information about the way an aria was replaced.

Systematic processing of a specific single phenomenon

And from the purely machine-readable link via identifiers discussed first, via the manual generation of content which is then nevertheless machine-readable, we now come to the last level. Despite all the enthusiasm for Big Data and the associated possibilities of automatic evaluation of these large data stocks, past discussions regarding the pasticcio have shown time and again that it makes sense to make specific individual phenomena accessible to humans through systematic processing. Thus, passages such as the sound repetition just shown can of course be commented on in a machine-readable way, but it is also often worthwhile – of course by making use of the existing coding and marking of various references – to do more with one finding than to enable pure automatic evaluation. Therefore, we propose not to ignore a third level, namely to make these specific individual phenomena human-readable and to offer entry points into both worlds, the database and the edition. This is indicated in Figure 17 by the rider “REMARKABLE”, who then discusses the aforementioned sound repetition in a way that can be understood by humans.
In conclusion, many things can be linked on a formal level such as the tapping via an offered Application Programming Interface (API) to connect data even with other projects, which was not addressed here, up to a conceivable level, which is manually processed for human users. This results in various usage and implementation scenarios with the rich treasure of information of database and edition. The combination of database and edition affords us the possibility of including the editing and creation processes of all the participants and related content; this is an important advantage especially if one wants to deal with this material, that shows the challenges of a pasticcio edition, the varying conditions of each performance, the different kind of insertions and omissions, cuts or changes of instrumentation, the change of aesthetical conceptions or dramatic ideas. Finally, the philological context of genealogically related sources will be visualized, as well as the complex historical, social and cultural background of pasticcio productions. Being capable of these demands our database and editions can be seen as a powerful tool to show and explore the cultural net of pasticcio production in the 18th century drawn by the research results of our project.
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Epilogue

Panja Mücke

Based on the groundbreaking work of Heinz Becker, Gordana Lazarevich and Reinhard Strohm, musicological research has increasingly focused on the pasticcio during the past three decades. It has specifically inspected the operas of George Frideric Handel and Antonio Vivaldi. In the meantime, increasing attention has been paid to this issue in the modern musical world. For instance, the performances of Bajazet (Verona 1735) with music by Antonio Vivaldi/Johann Adolf Hasse/Geminiano Giacomelli/Riccardo Broschi at the Schlosstheater Schwetzingen in 2010/11, of Ormisda (London 1730) with music by Leonardo Leo/Hasse/Giuseppe Maria Orlandini at the Händel-Festspiele 2018 in Halle/Saale and of Oreste (London 1734) with music taken from different compositions by Handel at the Theater an der Wien in Vienna in 2020 were successful. Thus, as indicated by recent research, musical life suggests that the practices associated with the technical term “pasticcio” have not been regarded as a more or less critical or even almost obscure issue. Rather, as the project PASTICCIO. Ways of Arranging Attractive Operas based at the universities of Greifswald and Warsaw in this volume suggests too, the practice of pasticcio was not exceptional but routine to the production of operas between 1680 and 1800. At that time, it influenced the performance practice of Italian opera to an extraordinary extent. Due to a mixture of composition styles, intertextual references and optimal presentation of the singer, it has been a stimulating approach for researchers and performers as well as for the audience.

In the meantime, it is fair to say that the pasticcio is located close to the core of the music theater business of the 18th century. The goal of this music theater was to perform with the best possible quality and impressiveness, but not to pay homage to the ‘work’ in the emphatic sense: previous research has illuminated the dimensions of this practice and suggests the conclusion that the pasticcio aggregates tendencies of musical

1 Becker, 1973; Strohm, 1974; Lazarevich, 1976.
2 Cf. the bibliography in the essays by Thomas Betzwieser (pp. 27-43) and Reinhard Strohm (pp. 45-67) in this volume.
life between 1680 and 1830 similar to a magnifying lens. However, we still understand the laws of the latter only in part. Nevertheless, these aggregates demonstrate that the simplifying and author-centered view on these stage works should be abandoned. The pasticcio can only be interpreted within its specific context and under the condition that it is viewed as a practice of performance, cultural transfer and mobility of artists. The concept is comprehensible only by acknowledging the modular nature of these compositions, the fragile structure of the ‘work’ and the variability of performances. Findings pertaining to the practice of pasticcio also improved an understanding of the *dramma per musica*, which – according to Reinhard Wiesend – possesses a “a weak manifestation of the work idea” (“schwache Ausprägung der Werksache”) *per se*. The libretto constitutes the connecting link between all elements of this genre – the composition serves to realize the presentation of oral text on stage, comparable to stage sets and costumes. The music is an ephemeral garment of the word text; it may be new, it may originate from one or different composers, it may also be arranged or compiled from pre-existent music. Moreover, dramaturgy may be motivated musically (through a dramaturgical arrangement of musically diverse arias) and less in an action-oriented way.

The current volume supplements and advances the research in the anthology *Responsabilità d’autore e collaborazione nell’opera dell’età barocca. Il pasticcio* in an excellent way. The contributions to the volume are able to show that different variants existed more or less in parallel and on equal terms. However, contrary to what has long since been assumed, the pasticcio is by no means the ‘little or poor sister’ of new original compositions or even some kind of a workaround solution. Moreover, contrary to what has long been suggested, the pasticcio has frequently been cultivated on touring stages, but also to varying degrees on commercial and court stages. The current volume also shows that the intentions associated with this concept have only gradually become apparent. They range from the integration of singers’ favorites, the presentation of current musical styles, the ‘competition’ of different compositional models applied to the same work, to the inexpensive arrangement of a performance. The spectrum of the practice of pasticcio ranges from the migration of arias from the opera of one and the same composer or a different composer into a new arrangement (influence of the singers, borrowing practice), from the arrangement of a foreign piece with numerous problems of authorship and joint compositions by several composers to other types of arrangement, which combine successful music from different operas into a new production. In the latter case, the word-text may be identical or edited, or may even present a completely new plot resulting in a textual contrafacture of the pre-existent music.

Moreover, to the above research on the formal and intentional diversity of the practice of pasticcio, the current volume includes two further focal points that deserve to be

---

3 *Strohm*, 2009, pp. 351ff. Cf. the essay by *Gesa zur Nieden* (pp. 153-177) in this volume.  
7 *Pitarresi*, 2011.
mentioned: four contributions\(^8\) are devoted to the fact that the practice of pasticcio was not only applied to opera seria, but also to opera buffa, the French tragédie en musique and the oratorio, a fact that has scarcely been acknowledged by research until today. They thus illuminate that the pasticcio is not a practice limited to Italy, but that it is a relatively widespread editing approach. This practice is far from being fully understood and it can be applied to a wide variety of genres. Furthermore, three contributions to this volume outline the opportunities offered by digital methods. In particular, these innovative accounts may stimulate numerous future research endeavors to analyze pasticcios and, for instance, to unravel the borrowing practice mentioned above.\(^9\)

In addition to and in connection with digitization, further research perspectives related to the pasticcio arise that may take various directions. For instance, the end of the pasticcio practice could be inspected, which is likely to be primarily associated with the advances in media history and the concept of originality. A late example of the pasticcio practice is Francesco Morlacchi’s Il barbiere di Siviglia for Dresden in 1816, which illustrates these concerns as this work tends to conceal the origin of the music. Thus, Morlacchi adapted all secco recitatives from Giovanni Paisiello’s successful opera with the same title (St. Petersburg 1782).\(^10\) This is reminiscent in a certain sense of the procedures used by the traveling musicians in the 18th century.\(^11\) However, the printed text book for the Dresden premiere of Morlacchi’s Barbiere in 1816 and the musical performance score identified Morlacchi as the only composer.\(^12\) Apparently, the practice of pasticcio was still used in the 19th century during periods of time pressure where, due to the media situation and the predominantly handwritten materiality of compositions, discovery was unlikely. Apart from this, the techniques underlying the pasticcio were applied in the early opéra-comique and ballad opera, among others, and were continued in the parody operas from the late 18th century onwards, thus ensuring continuity until the most recent times.\(^13\)

Furthermore, regarding the media-historical perspective, future research should also consider aspects of the creative process and the techniques of excerpting original sources. It seems, for instance, that the pasticcio was closely associated with a type of work studio of composers and copyists. This is illustrated by the above example of Morlacchi: the partial autograph that is archived by the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden

---

\(^{8}\) Cf. the essays of Kordula Knaus/Andrea Zedler (pp. 329-345), Daniela Philippi (pp. 575-587), Jana Spáčilová (pp. 485-506) and Katarzyna Spurgiasz (pp. 609-619) in this volume.

\(^{9}\) Cf. the essays of Anna Laura Bellina (pp. 719-732), Martin Albrecht-Hohmaier/Kristin Herold (pp. 733-753) and Joachim Veit (pp. 705-717) in this volume.

\(^{10}\) Mücke, 2018, especially pp. 138-140.

\(^{11}\) Cf. the essays of Berthold Over (pp. 241-269 and 285-328) and Daniel Brandenburg (pp. 271-283) in this volume.

\(^{12}\) Score: D-Dl, Mus.4657-F-500; libretto: D-DI, MT.541.

\(^{13}\) Cf. the essays of Thomas Betzwieser (pp. 27-43) and Klaus Pietschmann (pp. 541-552) in this volume.
demonstrates that Morlacchi notated the arias, duets and ensembles, each on a separate layer of music paper, while a copyist simultaneously copied the recitatives from Paisiello’s opera. In accordance with the notes pertaining to the position of the individual sheets of music (“dopo l’arietta di Figaro” and “segue cavatina a due di Rosina e Bartolo” etc.), Morlacchi’s sheets and those of the copyist were then put in the correct order and provided with a hard cover. Concerning other examples of pasticcios, researchers may primarily inspect the specific ‘migration path’ of the predominantly handwritten sources that could be better identified and that could be traceable with future digital tools. Thus, questions of local taste, modernity or distribution of certain handwritten sources could be approached.

The new possibilities offered by digital methods are tested by the project itself: the database with data on Persons (singers, composers, etc.), Places (cities), Organizations (theaters and other venues) and Works (operas, pasticcios, single arias, etc.) will be connected with online editions of three pasticcios (Catone, arr. by Handel, London 1732; Catone in Utica, arr. by Mingotti, Hamburg 1744; Siroe, arr. by Hasse, Warsaw/Dresden 1763) and a model opera (Siroe, Hasse, Bologna 1733). Essays stored online will highlight several research aspects combining traditional scientific writing with visualizations from data in the database as well as from editions and sources in Edirom. Common visualizations like timelines and data on maps will illustrate searches made in the database.

Finally, the results of previous research pertaining to the pasticcio in music should also be inspected from a more interdisciplinary viewpoint – the fine arts, architecture and theater are all well acquainted with this type of phenomenon. However, considering the broad spectrum of the practice of pasticcio, the only loose connections between word and text, and the recycling practice of arias, which can be observed, for instance, for the repertoire of the Gänsemarkt Theater in Hamburg and the Kärnterthor Theater in Vienna, associations may be made with the film music of the early 20th century as this genre has also alternated between compilation, adaptation (depending on the existing cast of roles) and new composition – until the new rule of original composition became standard. Both research domains might methodically benefit from each other, since pasticcios as well as film music can be viewed as a kind of Gebrauchsmusik that is frequently based on pre-existing compositions; specialized arrangers had to combine the music as effectively as possible utilizing available materials according to their own rules, which, however, are not yet fully understood.

---

14 The digital output of the project will be published on the project’s website: https://www.pasticcio-project.eu, 04.09.20.
15 Cf. the essays of Hans Körner (pp. 71-102) and Bernhard Jahn (pp. 103-116) in this volume.
16 Cf. the essay of Reinhard Strohm (pp. 45-67) in this volume.
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<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gualandi, Diamante Maria</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gualandi (Moretti), Margherita</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gualandi Moretti, Margarita Gualandi, Margherita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerra, Antonio</td>
<td>487, 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiglielmi, Pietro Alessandro</td>
<td>548, 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guimard, Madeleine (Marie-Madeleine)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulitz, Alexius</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyrowetz, Adalbert</td>
<td>547, 549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habermas, Jürgen</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habsburg (family)</td>
<td>62, 351f., 364, 689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hager, Christoph</td>
<td>429, 430f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hager, Leopold</td>
<td>426, 429, 430f., 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haibel, Jakob</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallenberg, Ann</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamann, Johann Georg</td>
<td>172f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampson, Celeste</td>
<td>Resse, Celeste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare, Joseph</td>
<td>456, 458f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrach, Ferdinand Bonaventura</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartmann, Tina</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hasse, Faustina → Bordoni, Faustina
Hauptmann, Moritz 705
Haydn, Joseph 473, 549, 591, 594, 596, 600
Haym, Nicola 56f., 231f., 426
Haynes, Bruce 236
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 99, 186
Heidegger, John Jacob 57, 448-450, 454
Heine, Heinrich 199
Heinl, Anna Friederike 583
Heinichen, Johann David 245f., 248, 251
Hempson, Celeste → Resse, Celeste
Henri (dancer) 583
Henriette (dancer) 583
Henze, Hans Werner 201
Herold, Kristin 19, 710, 712
Hervey, John, 2nd Baron Hervey, Lord 47
Hesse, Ernst Christian 672, 681
Heyink, Rainer 9, 688
Heyking, Karl Heinrich 529f.
Hippel, Theodor Gottfried von 206
Hoffmann, Ernst Theodor Amadeus 197, 203-207
Hoffmann, Georg Adam 61, 427, 439
Hoffmann, Johann Georg 257, 492
Hogarth, William 158-164
Holman, Peter 34
Holt, Thomas 468
Holzbauer, Ignaz 433
Holzbauer, Rosalia 496
Homann, Johann Baptist 336
Homer 476
Hortschansky, Klaus 33, 687f., 690-692, 694, 696
Huart (dancer) 583
Huggins, William 158
Hume, Robert 468
Hummel, Johann Nepomuk 541, 547, 549
Hüther, Johanna 20

I
Idaszak, Danuta 591-593, 595, 599
Imer, Teresa → Pompeati, Teresa
Immer, Teresa → Pompeati, Teresa
Ingarden, Roman 186
Ireland, Johan 158, 160
Ivanovich, Cristoforo 380, 386
Isaac, Mr. (dance master) 560

J
Jacobs, René 230
Jacomelli, Giminiiano → Giacomelli, Geminiano
Jahn, Bernhard 14, 200-202
Jakubowicz, Dominik 594
Jemain, Claude 95
James III Stuart 400f., 420
Jędrowski, Adam 600
Jenkins, Newell 690
Jommelli, Niccolò 60, 295-297, 318, 563f.
Jonášová, Milada 243, 487
Joncus, Berta 35
Jonveau (dancer) 583
Joseph I, King of Portugal 136
Joseph I, Holy Roman Emperor 425
Jozzi, Giuseppe 688, 699
Jullienne, Jean de 73f.
Jüngling (theater troupe) 682
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>La France ➔ Houlondel, Jean-Baptiste du</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kafka, Franz</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanne, Friedrich August</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Theodor, Elector Palatine</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayser, Margaretha Susanna</td>
<td>52, 678f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayser, Reinhard ➔ Keiser, Reinhard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Birkner, Gerhard</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Birkner, Nina</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiser (Kayser), Reinhard</td>
<td>51-54, 202, 670, 674, 676, 679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon, Lloyd, 1st Baron Kenyon, Lord</td>
<td>471, 476-480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersten, Joachim</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khuen zu Auer von Belasi-Lichtenberg, Maria Josepha ➔ Attems, Maria Josepha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiefer, Sebastian</td>
<td>201f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp, J. Merrill</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kofman, Sarah</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokole, Metoda</td>
<td>17, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>König, Johann Ulrich von</td>
<td>109, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>König, Stefan</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Königsmarck, Maria Aurora von</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopecký, Jan</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinek, Karel</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Körner, Hans</td>
<td>14, 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köster, Maik</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosuth, Joseph</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer, Ursula</td>
<td>19, 670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krebs (theater troupe)</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreisler, Johannes</td>
<td>203-207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kremer, Nathalie</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krüger, Johann Gottlob</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhnau, Johann</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küpper, Joachim</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurz, Felix</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>La France ➔ Houlondel, Robert du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labanti Batticoro, Mario</td>
<td>129f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy, Michael Rophino</td>
<td>453f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La France (Peruzzi), Anne Henriette (Ariette)</td>
<td>248f., 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalli, Domenico (Biancardi, Sebastiano)</td>
<td>360, 382, 389, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampugnani, Giovanni Battista</td>
<td>291, 293-295, 308, 314, 316-318, 689-695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot, Francine</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landgraf, Annette</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmann, Ortrun</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanfossi, Carlo</td>
<td>14, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanzetti, Lucia</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapis, Santo</td>
<td>315, 330, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Place, Charles</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laschi, Filippo</td>
<td>338f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latilla, Gaetano</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latini, Antonio</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauchery, Étienne</td>
<td>561-568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauretta, Baldassar</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval (dancer)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Mr. (singer)</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarevich, Gordana</td>
<td>29, 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leclerc, Jacques-Sébastien</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leez, Filippo</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leger (dancer)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehms, Georg Christian</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Épine, Margherita (Margarita) de</td>
<td>56, 634f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leppert (theater troupe)</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim</td>
<td>108, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levey, Michael</td>
<td>71, 73-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, David</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levinson, Jerrold</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipp, Danièle</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenberg, Georg Christoph</td>
<td>158, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebrecht, Henri</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieffle (dancer)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim, Mick</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindgren, Lowell</td>
<td>57, 632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
l’Huillier (dancer) 583
Locatelli, Giovanni Battista 428
Locke, John 467, 470, 477
Lodi, Silvia 358
Logroscino, Nicola 352, 515, 522f.
Lolli, Dorotea 426, 438f., 441
Loos, Karel 600
Lorrain, Claude 45
Lotti, Antonio 17, 235, 242, 244, 249,
251f., 355, 357f., 398f., 401, 403-406,
408-411, 420f., 493, 498, 623, 630,
633, 638, 641
Lotti, Johann Friedrich 251f.
Lotti, “Trento”, Mattio 252
Lotti, Santa ➔ Stella, Santa
Louis XIV, King of France 558, 669
Louis XV, King of France 581
Louis the Pious 156
Louise of Denmark, Princess 286
Lovatini, Giovanni 533
Lowe, Thomas 468
Lucchesino ➔ Pacini, Andrea
Lucchini, Matteo 487, 489, 500, 520
Luchini, Antonio Maria 242
Luckmann, Thomas 48
Ludewig I, Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt 682
Lully, Jean-Baptiste 36-38, 450, 669,
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Maccarani, Paolo, Marchese 124
Maccaro, Giacomo 694
Macchari, Alessandro 339
Madonis, Girolama 500
Mądry, Alina 18
Mahler, Gustav 201
Maillard, Pierre-Joseph 568f.
Maione, Paologiovanni 349
Majorano, “Caffarelli”, Gaetano 58, 
365-367
Malipiero, Tomaso 384f.
Mancia, Luigi 353f.
Mancini, Andrea 131
Mancini, Francesco 352, 355, 400, 629-
631, 633, 642
Mancini, Franco 356
Manfredi, Alessandro 486f.
Mangold, Carl Amand 682
Mangold, Wilhelm 682
Mann, Thomas 199
Manna, Gennaro 696
Manni, Domenico Maria 719
Mansfield, Lord ➔ Murray, William
Manzi, Domenico 416
Manzi, Marianna 419
Mara, Elisabeth Gertrud 472-481
Marais, Marin 672
Marcello, Benedetto 380
Marchi, Antonio 391
Marchi, Giovanni Maria (?) 62, 314
Mareschi, Marc’Antonio 231f., 500
Maria Barbara de Bragança, Princess of 
Asturias 365
Maria Casimira, Queen of Poland 361
Maria Josepha of Habsburg, Electoral 
Princess of Saxony and Royal Prin-
cess of Poland 241f., 249, 254
Maria Theresa of Austria, Holy Roman 
Empress 366
Mariani, Tommaso 367
Mariette, Pierre-Jean 99
Margolis, Joseph 186
Marmi, Antonio Francesco 624f.
Martello, Pier Jacopo 48, 368, 378f.,
384
Martin (dancer) 583
Martin y Soler, Vicente 39, 548f.
Martinelli, Francesco 190
Massarotti, Angelo 642
Massip, Catherine 723
Mattart, Isabelle 367
Matteucci ➔ Sassano, Matteo
Mattheson, Johann 51f., 108f., 153f.,
156f., 159, 164, 173, 492f.
Maul, Michael 253
Maurer, Franz 549
Mauri, Alessandro 133
Max Emanuel, Elector of Bavaria 249
Mayer, Katharina 426, 433, 439
Mayr, Giovanni Simone 548
Mazzinghi, Joseph 472f., 475, 477f.
Mazzioli, Giuseppe 500
McMahon, Shane 20
McSwiny, Owen → Swiney, Owen
Medici, Anna 697, 701
Medinaceli, Duchess → de la Cerda, María de las Nieves
Megelin, Heinrich 529, 533
Mehldau, Brad 190
Méhul, Étienne-Nicolas 549
Mellini Fanti, Eugenia 338-342
Menchelli Buttini, Francesca 356
Meneghetti, Giovanni 493
Mercier, Philippe 84
Merighi, Antonia Margherita 58f., 168, 623
Mestrasio → Negri, Antonia
Meyer, Friedrich Ludwig Wilhelm 111
Meyer, Hermann 204-206
Miča, Franz Anton 486, 497
Michaeli, Giovanni 490, 500
Micheli, Benedetto 555
Michels, Claudia 226, 230
Michelot, Marguerite Catherine (?) 583
Middlesex, Earl of → Sackville, Charles
Mihlous, Judith 478
Miller, Maximilian (Massimiliano) 426, 431f.
Milton, John 476
Minelli, Giovanni Battista 404, 412, 414, 416-420
Mingotti, Angelo 52, 256, 289f., 329f., 335, 486, 489f., 492, 501, 507, 695, 698
Mingotti (Valentini), Regina 256, 293, 314-316, 318, 747
Mingotti Valentini, Regina → Mingotti, Regina
Mira, Pietro 527
Moggi, Pietro → Mozzi, Pietro
Molière → Poquelin, Jean-Baptiste
Mombelli, Domenico 542, 548
Montagnana, Antonio 737
Monteverdi, Claudio 199
Monti, Cecilia 500
Monti, Laura 365
Monticelli, Angelo Maria 368, 688
Monticelli, Maria Marta 365
Monza, Margherita 501
Monza, Maria 501
Mordaxt, Baron Johann Siegmund von 250
Moretti, Antonio 389
Moretti, Lorenzo 491, 501
Moretti, Margarita → Gualandi, Margherita
Morigi, Pietro 50
Moritz Graf von Sachsen 250
Morlacchi, Francesco 757f.
Morotti → Corvi, Paola
Moscheles, Ignaz 547, 549
Mosel, Ignaz Franz von 547, 549
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus 39, 202, 308, 469, 541, 548f., 589-605, 710, 719
Mozzi (Moggi), Pietro 624, 635, 637
**Index of Persons**

- Mücke, Panja 14, 20
- Müller, Wenzel 549, 594
- Müller-Bongard, Kristina 20
- Müller von Asow, Hermann Erich 513
- Münzmay, Andreas 706f.
- Murray, William, 1st Baron Mansfield, Lord 465, 468
- Mutio, Michele Luigi → Muzio, Michele Luigi
- Muzio (Mutio), Michele Luigi 192, 353
- Mylius, Christlob 163

**N**
- Nadermann (composer) 549
- Nannini, Livia 357
- Napoléon Bonaparte 547, 689
- Nasolini, Sebastiano 548
- Natale (Natali), Francesco 360, 642
- Natali, Francesco → Natale, Francesco
- Negri, Anna Catarina 491
- Negri (Tomi), “La Mestrina”, Antonia 519
- Negri, Giovanni Domenico 501
- Negri, Marina 501
- Negri Tomi, Antonia → Negri, Antonio
- Nemeitz, Joachim Christoph 54
- Nelvi, Giuseppe 261
- Neri del Fantasia, Filippo 486, 497, 501
- Nestrich (theater troupe) 682
- Netscher, Caspar 93f.
- Nicolini → Grimaldi, Nicola
- Niccolini, Mariano 697
- Noack, Friedrich 671
- Nores, Matteo → Noris, Matteo
- Noris (Nores), Matteo 353, 387, 638
- Notarnicola, Salvatore 365
- Noverre, Jean-Georges 554, 562-564, 566-569

**O**
- Occhilupi (Occhilupo/Ochilupi), Domenico 528, 532, 534
- Occhilupo, Domenico → Occhilupi, Domenico
- Occhilupi, Domenico → Occhilupi, Domenico
- Oddi, Giacomo 123
- Oliverio, Giovanni Battista 121, 133
- Orefice, Antonio 352
- O’Reilly, Robert Bray 471, 475f.
- Orlandi, Chiara 491, 501
- Orsati, Giovanni → Orsatto, Giovanni
- Orsatto (Orsati), Giovanni 381f.
- Orsler, Johann Georg → Orsler, Johann Georg
- Orsler (Orseler), Johann Georg 495
- Orte, Pietro 133
- Ossi, Giovanni 412, 414, 416, 420, 631
- Over, Berthold 16, 55, 59, 191f., 349, 368, 492, 681, 695, 736, 738f., 742

**P**
- Pacchierotti, Gasparo 471
- Pacini (Pasini), “Il Lucchesino”, Andrea 628, 640, 643
- Paër, Ferdinando 541
- Paffett, Erik M. 707
- Paganelli, Giuseppa Antonio 258, 261, 298, 300f., 304, 313, 317
- Paganini, Angiola 723, 726
- Paganini, Carlo 723
- Paisiello, Giovanni 308, 469, 472, 474, 477f., 481, 543, 548-550, 757
- Paita, Giovanni 439
- Pallavicino-Attems, Victoria 516
- Palomba, Antonio 334
- Pampani, Antonio Gaetano 497
- Panini, Giovanni Paolo 27f., 40
- Pizaleoni, Antonio 501
- Papis, Giovanni 352, 356
- Paradies (Paradisi), Pietro Domenico 35, 339, 497
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Poisson, Jeanne-Antoinette, Marquise de Pompadour 581
Pokorny, František 600
Polani, Girolamo 382
Polin, Giovanni 331, 626, 722f.
Polone, Maria Domenica 54, 59
Pollaro, Antonio 388-390, 434
Pollaro, Carlo Francesco 57, 260, 353, 360f., 383-385, 493, 624-628, 630, 632-634, 642, 731
Polvini Faliconti, Giuseppe 256
Pompadour, Marquise de → Poisson, Jeanne-Antoinette
Pompeati (Imer/Immer/Cornelys), Teresa 275, 688
Poniatowski, Andrzej, Prince 528, 530
Poniatowski, Stanislaw → Stanislaw Augustus Poniatowski, King of Poland
Pontici, Giovanni Bernardino 364
Pope, Alexander 476
Popp, Susanne 708
Poquelin, Jean-Baptiste 36, 109
Porciani, Giovanni Battista 129f.
Posner, Donald 75, 84
Posterla (Pusterla/Piantanida), Costanza 58, 390, 439
Potter, John 232
Poussin, Nicolas 13
Praetorius, Johann Philipp 54
Predieri, Luca Antonio 63, 386f., 443, 496, 632f., 637f., 640, 643
Prelleur, Peter 460
Price, Curtis 9, 29, 471, 472f., 478, 688
Prokofiev, Sergei 187
Prokop, Peter 543
Prota, Ignazio 353
Proust, Marcel 199
Puccinelli, Ottavio 723
Pugin, Laurent 709
Pulli, Pietro 298, 301f., 305, 317, 693
Pusterla, Costanza → Posterla, Costanza
Q
Quanz, Johann Joachim 11
Quercioli Laschi, Anna 338f.
Questenberg, Johann Adam Graf von 61f., 427, 486, 495-497, 499
Quinault, Philippe 203
Quintavalle, Antonio 384f.
R
Rafael (composer) 549
Raguenet, François 45
Rameau, Jean-Philippe 570
Ramis (Delfini), Cecilia 490, 501
Ransea, Chris 95
Raphael (Sanzio, Raffaello; painter) 97
Rauschenbach, Bernd 197
Rebel, François 681
Rebel, Jean-Féry 672
Reemtsma, Jan Philipp 197
Reger, Max 708f.
Regnau (ballet master) 564
Régnier, Henri de 199
Reichardt, Johann Friedrich 205
Reinhardt, Johann Georg 229
Rembrandt van Rijn (painter) 13
Renan, Ernest 199
Renner, Johann Gottlob 680
Resse (Gismondi/Hampson/Hempson), Celeste 59, 362, 739, 750f.
Resta, Natale 339
Reuter, Fritz 242
Reveq, Nicolas 230
Riccoboni, Luigi 306
Ricci, Sebastiano 382
Rich, John 554, 557
Richardson, Samuel 531
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richino Malatesta, Giuseppe</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Charles Lennox, Duke</td>
<td>390, 448, 454, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice, John</td>
<td>530, 541, 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riemschneider, Johann Gottfried</td>
<td>157, 159, 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rietz, Julius</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righini, Vincenzo</td>
<td>548, 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinaldi, Francesco</td>
<td>63, 426-428, 430-433, 434, 437f., 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ristori, Giovanni Alberto</td>
<td>50, 53, 57f., 257, 259, 355, 386, 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ristorini, Caterina</td>
<td>528, 529, 530, 532-534, 535, 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ristorini, Giovanni Battista</td>
<td>528, 532-534, 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritter, Peter</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riva, Giuseppe</td>
<td>157f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivet (dancer)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizzi, Vittoria</td>
<td>625, 636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, John H.</td>
<td>58, 448, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Anastasia</td>
<td>428, 630-634, 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocchetti, Ventura</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochlitz, Friedrich</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodin, Auguste</td>
<td>75, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roissi (dancer)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger, Estienne</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogge, Jörg</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolli, Paolo Antonio</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romani, Angela</td>
<td>315f., 738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romani, Stefano</td>
<td>631, 642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondinella, Francesco</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronzani, Giovanna</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa, Salvador</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Mark</td>
<td>466, 479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum, Jose Karl</td>
<td>543, 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roser, Franz de Paula</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosselli, John</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossi, Giacomo</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossi, Giovanna</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossignoli, Costanza</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>39, 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotrou, Jean</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roubiliac, Louis François</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubens, Peter Paul</td>
<td>84, 87, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolph, Johann Joseph</td>
<td>563f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugier (Kapellmeister)</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rühmkorf, Peter</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruspoli, Francesco Maria</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryszka-Komarnicka, Anna</td>
<td>19, 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacchini, Antonio</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville, Charles, Earl of Middlesex</td>
<td>59, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddumene, Bernardo</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Évremond, Charles de</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitl, Ferdinand</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salimbeni, Felice</td>
<td>697, 701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallé, Marie</td>
<td>554-557, 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvai, Maddalena</td>
<td>426, 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvioni, Regina</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammartini, Giovanni Battista</td>
<td>690, 692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoni, Francesca</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanseverino (family)</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanseverino, Aurora</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santonio, Giovanni</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanzio, Raffaello</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarti, Giuseppe</td>
<td>472, 548f., 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sartori, Claudio</td>
<td>244, 333, 511, 529, 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santorio, Giovanni Federico</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassani, Matteo</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassano (Sassani), “Matteuccio”, Matteo</td>
<td>367, 630, 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satzenhoven, Friedrich</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunier (dancer)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Saurau, Franz Bernhard von, Count 509
Scalabrin, Paolo 52, 55f., 274, 277, 288f., 294, 308, 309, 313f., 316, 318f., 696, 736, 747
Scalzi, Carlo 60, 362-364
Scarabelli, Diamante Maria 624, 626-628, 634, 636-638
Scarlatti, Alessandro 398
Scarlatti, Domenico 355f., 360, 397
Scarlatti, Giuseppe 534f., 696
Schatborn, Peter 93
Scheibe, Johann Adolph 161
Schiassi, Gaetano Maria 58, 291
Schikaneder, Emanuel 547
Schiller, Friedrich 106f., 113, 200, 204
Schmidt, Arno 197
Schmidt, Johann Christoph 251
Schober, Anna Maria 678f.
Schoelcher, Victor 454
Schönborn (family) 405
Schrattenbach, Wolfgang Hannibal von 486, 495, 498f.
Schröder, Friedrich Ludwig 106, 110-114
Schumann, Robert 706
Schürer, Johann Georg 611, 614f.
Schütz, Alfred 48
Searle, John 186
Sechi, Giovanni Andrea 355f., 404f.
Seedorf, Thomas 225, 708
Seidl (Saitl), Ferdinand 495
Selfridge-Field, Eleanor 49
Selliers, Joseph 301, 425
Sellitti (Sellitto), Giuseppe 352, 365-367, 369
Sellitto, Giuseppe → Sellitti, Giuseppe
Senesino → Bernardi, Francesco
Senkyř, Augustin 600
Setaro, Nicola 330, 334
Setlur, Sabrina 212
Seyfried, Ignaz Ritter von 541, 547, 549
Shakespeare, William 14, 112f., 204
Shein, Yuliya 687
Sheridan, Richard Brinsley 112f.
Siegert, Christine 9, 29, 33, 36
Siegfried, Ernst Gottlob 241, 253
Sienicki, John 545
Simi, Giovanni Battista 637
Simrock (publisher) 546, 549
Smend, Friedrich 705
Smith, John Christopher 452-454, 456, 666
Smith, Christopher senior 661, 664f.
Sogrfi, Antonio 543, 548
Sommer-Mathis, Andrea 60
Spáčilová, Jana 17, 257, 287f.
Spinola Costantini, Giacinta 488, 490, 500
Sporck, Franz Anton (Francesco Antonio) von, Count 242, 485, 487
Spurgiasz, Katarzyna 18
Stabile, Barbara 362
Stamitz, Carl 596
Stampa, Claudio Nicola 31, 693
Stampiglia, Silvio 355, 368, 640
Stanislaw Augustus Poniatowski, King of Poland 17, 527-530, 534, 536f.
Steffani, Agostino 53
Steelmayer, Matthäus 541f., 549
Steiner-Grage, Stefanie 708
Stella, Giovanna della 292, 315f., 318, 737
Stella (Lotti), Santa 242, 251, 626, 628, 638f.
Stella Lotti, Santa → Stella, Santa
Sterne, Laurence 203, 206
Stile Galante (music group) 366
Stiffoni, Gian Giacomo 294
Stockhausen, Karlheinz 183
Storace, Nancy 469
Storace, Stephen 469-472, 481
Strada del Pò, Anna Maria 59, 167, 451, 453, 623, 638, 642, 736
Straube, Karl 708
Strauss, Richard 188
Stravinsky, Igor 188
Sukowaty, Wenzel 546
Suzanne Henriette of Lorraine-Elbeufs 627
Süßmayr, Franz Xaver 308, 549
Swift, Jonathan 161f.
Swiney (Swiny/McSwiny), Owen 58, 390, 448, 454f.
Swiney, Owen → Swiney, Owen

T
Talbot, Michael 379, 520
Tamburini, Giambattista 624, 635, 637
Tarchi, Angelo 548
Tardieu, Nicolas-Henri 73f.
Taselli, Domenico 501
Tassoni, Alessandro 371
Telemann, Georg Phillip 15, 52f., 109, 154-157, 161-163, 165-173, 253
Tempesti, Domenico 628
Terradellas, Domingo 62, 277, 290, 295, 313, 318, 693, 697
Tesi (Tramontini), Vittoria 50, 60, 438-440
Tesi Tramontini, Vittoria → Tesi, Vittoria
Tessarolo, Luigi 720
The Beatles (music band) 184, 190
Thurn and Taxis (family) 258, 491
Tibaldi, Maria Maddalena 358
Tieck, Ludwig 203
Tiersot, Julien 689
Timms, Colin 451f., 454
Tintz, Anton 617
Tintz, Karl 617

Titian (Vecellio, Tiziano; painter) 13
Toeschi, Carl Joseph 563, 566
Tofts, Catherine 57
Tolino, Domenico → Tollini, Domenico
Tollini (Tolino), Domenico 416
Tolve, Francesco 365
Tomatis, Carlo 528f.
Tomatis, Caterina → Gattai Tomatis, Caterina
Tomi, Antonia → Negri, Antonia
Toselli, Giuseppe 426
Torri, Pietro 674
Torri, Teresa 528f., 532, 534
Torri Cecchi, Anna Maria 636
Toutin, Valentine 95
Tramontini, Vittoria → Tesi, Vittoria
Treitschke, Friedrich 547
Trento, Mattio → Lotti, Mattio
Treu, Daniel Gottlob (Fedele, Daniele) 258-260, 488, 501
Trincera, Pietro 352, 369
Trivulzi, Francesco 693, 699
Trupi (dancer) 583
Turcotti, Maria Giustina 256, 276, 293, 314, 316, 318f., 362-365, 367

U
Uffenbach, Johann Friedrich Armand von 258, 387
Umlauf, Michael 547, 549
Umstatt, Joseph 498
Urbani, Silvia 731
Urbani, Valentino 57
Useda, Giuseppa 694, 699

V
Valentini, Regina → Mingotti, Regina
Valeriani, Belisario 358
Vanbrugh, John 56
Vanhal, Johann Baptist 600
Vanneschi, Francesco 276
Vecellio, Tiziano → Titian
Veracini, Francesco Maria 242, 251
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<tr>
<td>Verdi, Giuseppe</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergossen, Manuela</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verlaine, Paul</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verweyten, Theodor</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veit, Joachim</td>
<td>19, 747f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestriss, Gaetano</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vico, Diana</td>
<td>56f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vida, Paolo</td>
<td>257, 259, 491, 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinçon, René</td>
<td>75, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visconti, Caterina</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivaldi, Giovanni Battista</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivant-Denons, Dominique</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivoli (singer)</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogl (composer)</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogler, Georg Joseph</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volmini, Carlo</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voss, Steffen</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Carl</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Richard</td>
<td>200, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahnne de Oliveira, Olivia</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallishausser (publisher)</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, John</td>
<td>60, 279, 339, 456, 458f., 627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter, Michael</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wański, Jan</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watteau, Antoine</td>
<td>13f., 71-99, 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>103, 706, 708f., 712-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigl, Joseph</td>
<td>543, 547-550, 594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigl, Theodor</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wend, Christoph Gottlieb</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, William</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Micky</td>
<td>379, 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiel, Taddeo</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wierichs, Gero</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiesend, Reinhard</td>
<td>691, 756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildenstein (Counts)</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildenstein, Johann Christoph von, Count</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildenstein, Johann Josef von, Count</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildenstein, Maria Juliana von</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkler, Nicoline</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter, Peter (von)</td>
<td>548f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woelfl, Joseph</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodfall, George</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wranitzky, Paul</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wussin, Ludwig</td>
<td>257, 260, 287, 309, 486, 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wych, Cyrill, Sir</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X, Y, Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanardi Gavazzi, Teresa</td>
<td>426, 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane, Sebastiao</td>
<td>244, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zani, Margherita Caterina</td>
<td>632, 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaslaw, Neal</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zatta, Antonio</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zedler, Andrea</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeidler, Józef</td>
<td>596, 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelenka, Jan Dismas</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziani, Marc’ Antonio</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zingarelli, Niccolò Antonio</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zohn, Steven</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Żórawska-Witkowska, Alina</td>
<td>17, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsóvár, Judit</td>
<td>14, 368, 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zur Nieden, Gesa</td>
<td>15, 184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A
Alessandria 294f., 314, 316-318
Alps (region) 333f., 485, 489, 681
Altona 292
Amsterdam 89f., 93f., 329, 333, 339f., 343, 348, 350
Ancona 695
Augsburg 242, 255, 258, 261
Austria 228, 255, 371, 431, 507, 509, 512, 516, 528, 530, 659
Austrian Netherlands 255
Avignon 244f.

B
Barcelona 333, 343f., 730
Bassano 442
Bayreuth 248, 330
Bergamo 255, 511, 696
Berlin 13, 55, 72f., 96, 103, 183, 197, 202, 211, 403-405, 428, 517, 581, 612f., 617, 708, 743
Bialystok 529
Birmingham 452, 454, 456
Blenheim \(\rightarrow\) Blindheim
Blindheim (Blenheim) 561
Bonn 255, 292, 344, 535, 726f.
Bratislava (Pressburg) 255, 726
Brescia 343, 522
Brussels (Bruxelles) 242, 249, 255, 257-260, 288, 292, 302, 329, 338f., 343, 368, 457
Burslau \(\rightarrow\) Wroclaw
Bundesreich 255
Brunswick 53, 155f., 169, 202f., 343, 674, 721
Brynn \(\rightarrow\) Brno
Bremen 255
Brünn \(\rightarrow\) Brno
Bundesreich 255
Brussels (Bruxelles) 242, 249, 255, 257-260, 288, 292, 302, 329, 338f., 343, 368, 457
Bruxelles \(\rightarrow\) Brussels

C
Cádiz 329, 344
Caen 249
Cambridge 160, 659, 661, 664f.
Caribbean 560f.
Carthage 121-123, 127
Casale Monferrato 639
Catalonia 333f.
Central Europe 17, 489, 498, 615
Cesena 122, 137
Chantilly 84f., 95
Charlottenburg 72, 95f., 286, 581
Chomutov (Komotau) 617
Cologne 242, 288, 292
Cracow \(\rightarrow\) Krakow
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crema</td>
<td>293, 314, 316-318, 687, 689, 691f., 695, 699-701, 727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>124f., 343, 349, 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Lands</td>
<td>485-489, 492, 497, 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>252, 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Częstochowa</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmstadt</td>
<td>19, 258, 261, 491, 669-682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dornau (Dornava)</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>535, 660, 664, 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>9, 55, 58, 78, 84, 86, 109, 136, 202, 242f., 245, 248f., 251, 252-255,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>258, 263, 279, 286, 289, 291, 293f., 296, 298, 315, 319, 332f., 354, 401,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409f., 428, 438, 489, 536, 615, 617, 681, 739, 757f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>17, 153, 156f., 162f., 304, 449f., 460, 465, 467, 474, 529, 558, 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Este</td>
<td>511f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>10-17, 46f., 49, 54, 62f., 103, 136, 156, 161, 197, 211-218, 227,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>236-238, 243, 254-256, 272, 282, 300, 305, 329-332, 334f., 369, 371,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>377, 391, 420, 445, 450, 486, 489, 498, 527f., 530f., 536, 558, 567, 589-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>591, 596, 604, 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fano</td>
<td>122-127, 137, 260, 400f., 416, 420, 642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feistritz</td>
<td>Bistrica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>124, 244, 255, 293, 512, 521, 523, 633, 638, 642, 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>92, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>11, 122, 137, 154, 293, 295, 343, 553, 463f., 520, 533, 535, 623-629,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>632f., 636, 641, 643-653, 689, 695f., 721, 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foligno</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36, 47, 99, 199, 304, 450, 558, 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>242, 255, 257f., 260f., 491, 581, 681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>260, 343, 379, 401, 629, 631f., 637-639, 641, 643, 696, 727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>47, 153, 201, 212-215, 217, 304f., 438, 558, 659, 674, 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gostyń (Gostyn)</td>
<td>599f., 604, 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotha</td>
<td>113, 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343, 428, 489, 491, 507-517, 519, 521-523, 695, 698, 738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Morea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greifswald</td>
<td>13, 20, 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grodzisk Wielkopolski (Grätz)</td>
<td>591f., 594-596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groß Tschochau</td>
<td>Rehlovice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle</td>
<td>10, 294, 306, 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>53, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heppenheim an der Bergstraße</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessen</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Höchstädt</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Holešov (Holleschau)  485f., 489, 496, 498-501, 511
Holland  339
Holleschau → Holešov
Hubertusburg  136, 294, 613, 615

I
Innsbruck  244-246, 248, 531

J
Jarmeritz → Jaroměřice
Jaroměřice (Jarmeritz)  62, 427, 485f., 495-498
Jasna Góra  592f.

K
Kassel  155, 165, 438, 562-568, 707
Klagenfurt  255
Komotau → Chomutov
Krakow (Cracow)  404, 641
Kremsier → Kroměříž
Kroměříž (Kremsier)  485f., 489, 495f., 498f.
Krupka (Graupen)  252
Kuks (Kukus)  491
Kukus → Kuks

L
Laibach → Ljubljana
Laxenburg  300
Leyden (Leiden)  343, 721, 727, 729
Lisbon  124f., 136, 291, 535
Livorno (Leghorn)  363, 535, 641
Ljubljana (Laibach)  9, 255, 285f., 288, 297, 299, 304, 309, 320, 507, 738
Lodi  721
Lombardy  335, 371
Lower Saxony (Niedersachsen)  93
Lower Silesia  609
Lübeck  255, 320
Lucca  293, 338, 343, 360, 497
Lviv (Lemberg)  594

M
Macerata  295
Madrid  80, 82, 124, 127, 294f.
Mainz  13f., 20, 532
Malta  730
Mannheim  107, 562-564, 566-568
Mantua  255, 371, 384, 532, 627, 641
Maribor  514-519, 698
Messina  260
Mestre  511-513
Metz  568
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>287, 291, 360, 533, 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mons</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravia</td>
<td>255, 485f., 489, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morea (Greece)</td>
<td>244f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>122, 137, 242, 329, 333, 343f., 364, 366, 519, 563, 641, 674, 724, 726f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>39, 41, 78f., 87, 90, 98, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersachsen</td>
<td>Lower Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nové Hrady</td>
<td>495, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>63, 122, 124f., 128, 137, 227, 236, 343, 355, 438-441, 443, 454, 531, 533, 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia</td>
<td>295f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesaro</td>
<td>290, 343, 496, 502, 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>371, 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piacenza</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirna</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>241, 249, 361, 397, 527-530, 589-591, 596-598, 604f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>136, 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>591, 596-598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratolino</td>
<td>260, 353f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressburg</td>
<td>Bratislava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrmont</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td>491, 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggio Emilia</td>
<td>53, 122, 124f., 137, 227, 231, 291, 298, 301, 317, 343, 400, 633, 642f., 693, 695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Řehlovice (Groß Tschochau)</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rein</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovigo</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>107, 428, 527f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sachsen → Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagan</td>
<td>Żagań</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxe</td>
<td>Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony (Saxe, Sachsen)</td>
<td>241f., 249f., 299, 401, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwetzingen</td>
<td>10, 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>88, 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesia</td>
<td>485f., 609f., 615f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenska Bistrica (Windisch-Feistritz)</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>333f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Netherlands</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>58, 329, 428, 721, 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>27, 59, 279, 563f., 566-568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>255, 507-509, 514, 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Święta Góra</td>
<td>599, 600, 604, 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>The Hague</th>
<th>339</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thuringia</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>39, 343, 368, 542, 721, 739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>124f., 128, 136, 244f., 298, 343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>330, 659</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbino</td>
<td>400, 512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>Valenciennes</th>
<th>76, 92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>335, 731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicenza</td>
<td>11, 57, 297f., 361, 382, 489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyškov (Wischau)</td>
<td>485f., 495f., 498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>Waldeck</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>9, 13, 17, 527-537, 597, 609f., 614, 755, 758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>411, 535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weimar</td>
<td>103, 105f., 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weißenfels</td>
<td>679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiesentheid</td>
<td>403, 405, 410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windisch-Feistritz → Slovenska Bistrica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wischau → Vyškov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>53, 155, 671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X, Y, Z</th>
<th>Żagań (Sagan)</th>
<th>609f., 615-617</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeit</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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