Indicative for the musical thought of the young German generation is its creative leaning towards metric-rhythmic innovations and methods. The influence of Bartók and Stravinsky, and more recently of Olivier Messiaen, but also that of American jazz, has brought the latent rhythmic sensitivity of the German composers into unprecedented vitality. One has only to compare, say, the idiom of the Reger generation with that of Blacher or Klebe and Henze, and the progress will become clear. Yes, it seems that the most talented young German composers are exploring the merging of all those elements that hitherto had been played off antithetically against each other.

Perhaps this is a positive form of the reaction against the monstrous destruction of material and intellectual values, of which this youthful generation was the witness during the twelve years from 1933 to 1945. To confront the world of desolation with a world of creative syntheses and to test these syntheses in hundreds of laboratory experiments until a valid result be found—is that not an undertaking worthy of consideration?

(Translated by Abram Loft)

Orazio: The History of a Pasticcio

By Frank Walker

After Pergolesi's death from consumption at the age of twenty-six, his fame spread rapidly all over Europe. Foreign visitors to Italy, such as De Brosses and the poet Gray, acquired manuscript copies of his works and played their part in creating an extraordinary vogue, a sort of Pergolesi-fever, which seized on the Continent and reached its climax in the "Guerre des Bouffons" in Paris in 1752. One result of this seems to have been that the Italian music-copyists, making hay while the sun shone, and following the ironical advice of Marcello in Il Teatro alla moda: "They will sell to foreigners, who want good operatic arias, any old papers, under the names of the best masters," passed off all sorts of miscellaneous manuscripts as compositions of "the divine Pergolesi." Many of these spurious works survive in the great music libraries and were included in the entirely uncritical edition of Pergolesi's "Opera Omnia" published in Rome in 1940-42 by Gli Amici della Musica da Camera. In the two volumes of Arie da Camera and Frammenti di Opere Teatrali alone, works by Aresti, Bononcini, Chinzer, Lampugnani, Leo, Orlandini, Rinaldo di Capua, Alessandro Scarlatti, Giuseppe Scarlatti, Seifrti, and Terradellas have been identified. No less confusion exists among the works for the stage. The intermezzo published in the "Opera Omnia" as La contadina astuta is actually a version of Hasse's La contadina with the addition of a duet from Pergolesi's Flaminio. Il geloso schernito is by Pietro Chiarini. And the supposed intermezzo Il maestro di musica, published in Paris in 1753 under Pergolesi's name, was in reality not by him and consisted only of a condensed and adulterated version of Pietro Auletta's opera buffa, Orazio, first produced at Naples in 1737.

The history of this Orazio can be reconstructed from the surviving scores and librettos, which reveal the metamorphosis of the opera in the course of a quarter of a century, modified constantly from performance to performance, attributed to different composers in different

1 For details see Two Centuries of Pergolesi Forgeries and Misattributions, in Music and Letters, October 1949.
places, and retaining in the end less than one fifth of its original music. It is known that this sort of thing happened to 18th-century operas; it may be useful to have a detailed account of one particular case. The only serious study of pasticcio opera so far undertaken seems to be Sonneck's valuable essay on Cimaroli's Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacaueno and its relationship to Favart's parody, Ninette à la Cour. Sonneck collated the original Bertoldo libretto with three others and with the score of Ninette à la Cour. The present article is based on the examination of fifteen different librettos and two scores of Orazio, the Paris Maestro di musica libretto and score, and the libretto of La scolarà alla moda, another reduction of Orazio, performed at Florence in 1760.

Comparison of these scores and librettos forced me to the conclusion that they were one and all versions, more or less adulterated, of Auletta's Orazio of 1737, although several librettos, beginning with that of Venice, 1743, attribute the music to Latilla and Pergolesi. The orthodox view is that Pergolesi wrote an intermezzo, Il maestro di musica, in 1731 (or, as others hold, in 1734-35), and Latilla an opera buffa, Orazio, in 1738, on an expanded version of the text of Pergolesi's intermezzo, and that then elements of the two were combined for the Venetian Orazio of 1743. For the general arguments against Pergolesi's authorship of Il maestro di musica I must refer the reader to my earlier article; some aspects of my case, however, will be even more clearly demonstrated in the course of the present comparison of scores and librettos.

First of all, something must be said concerning the supposed Orazio of Latilla, which I am convinced never existed. Loewenberg, in his Annals of Opera, lists three opere buffe by Latilla, Orazio, Madame Ciana, and La finta cameriera, as having been first performed at the Teatro Valle, Rome, in the spring of 1738. This entry in the Annals summarizes information given by the encyclopedias, libretto catalogues, and operatic chronicles. Loewenberg himself was obviously not entirely happy about it, for he suggests that the complicated histories of these operas would be worth special study, points out that there exists another setting of the Orazio text, by Auletta, produced at Naples in 1737, and gives lists of all recorded performances "to facilitate further research." This further research I have undertaken, and some of my findings had been accepted and utilized by Loewenberg in articles for the new Grove and in his own annotated copy of the Annals before his lamented death. A number of unrecorded performances of Orazio came to light in the course of a search of all the most extensive collections of librettos, and some of the attributions listed by Loewenberg were seen to be based only on guesswork by compilers of catalogues, the librettos themselves not naming the composers. The one thing that did not come to light was a libretto of the supposed production of an Orazio by Latilla at the Teatro Valle, Rome, in the spring of 1738. At one time I thought I was hot on its trail. Bellucci La Salandra, in his Saggio cronologico delle opere teatrali di Gaetano Latilla (Japiglia, 1934, Anno V, Fasc. III), lists Orazio as having been performed at this Roman theater in 1738 and adds a note that the libretto is in the Biblioteca Santa Cecilia, Rome. Bellucci La Salandra's article shows signs of hasty work, one of his avowed intentions in preparing it having been to forestall the foreign scholars who keep butting in on Italy's musical affairs, and something certainly went wrong with this entry. I flew to the Biblioteca Santa Cecilia, but found nothing. In the Cavvalàres collection is a copy of the Orazio of Auletta (Naples 1737) and a copy of the Orazio attributed to Latilla and Pergolesi (Venice 1743), but it is not true that this library possesses the Roman libretto of 1738.

The Roman Diario Ordinario for 1738 records a few works produced at the Teatro Valle in this year, but says nothing about an Orazio. What other sources of information are there? No comprehensive study of the repertory of the Roman theaters in general or of the
Teatro Valle in particular exists in print. Even Dr. Rolandi, whom I
next consulted, was at a loss. The only person who might perhaps have
been able to help me was the late Alberto Cametti, who had published
two magnificent volumes on the Teatro Tordinona and written on
Roman theaters, including the Teatro Valle, in the Enciclopedia Italiana.
Dr. Roberto Cametti, on application, very kindly searched among his
father's notes and supplied me with particulars from the libretto of
Madama Ciana and La finta camereira, but nothing definite about
Orazio. Cametti's conclusion had been the same as my own:

An Orazio, under that title, was probably never performed in 1738 at the
Teatro Valle, Rome; it is almost certain that the reference is to Latilla's
Madama Ciana, in which one of the characters is called Orazio.

It was Fétis who first recorded the supposed Orazio of Latilla,
performed at Rome in 1738, and since almost everything else he tells
us about the earlier part of the composer's life is wrong, I feel we
are justified in rejecting this piece of information along with the rest.
For me, until someone produces the original libretto, or other reliable
evidence, Latilla's Orazio does not, and never did, exist.

And now we will see how we get along without it.

The libretto of the opera buffa, Orazio, performed at the Teatro
Nuovo, Naples, during the Carnival season of 1737, names both the
author of the words, Antonio Palomba, and the composer of the music,
Pietro Auletta. It was Palomba's first libretto; his plot may be summed
arized as follows:

The action takes place in the house and garden of Lamberto, a Venetian
singing teacher. His pupils include Giacomina, who will shortly be making her
debut at Naples; to her the career of a prima donna is repugnant — her dear Orazio would not have wished it. Leandro, who is really Orazio, questions her and she tells him, seven years ago, at Genoa, their parents opposed the marriage and they eloped, only to be captured by Moorish pirates. She was rescued by Venetians but Orazio taken to Africa. Leandro (Orazio) realizes that she is still faithful to him. He says Orazio is a

friend of his and that they were both delivered from slavery together by a
gentleman of Ancona, where Orazio now lives.

Colagliani is still trying to induce Lauretta to accompany him to Naples,
Lamberto to prevent this.

Leandro, by exceptionally long-winded methods, sets about putting things right. He tells Colagliani that a certain noble admirer of Giacomina is determined that she shall sing in Lisbon this year. He threatens to kill Colagliani unless he releases Giacomina from her Neapolitan engagement. He then tells Lamberto that Colagliani intends to break the contract with Giacomina, but that she has been offered a high salary to appear at Lisbon. Lamberto fears that Colagliani has refused Giacomina out of love for Lauretta.

Further complications arise. Minor characters include other pupils of Lamberto—Bettina, a virtuosa who thinks Colagliani's favors may be profitable to herself; Elisa, who turns out to be Leandro's (Orazio's) long-lost sister; and Mariuccio, in love with Elisa. Leandro (Orazio) recognizes his sister and makes himself known to her. Ginevra (Giacomina) surprises them together and accuses Orazio of concealing his identity owing to a love-affair with Elisa, and scheming to have his old fiancée sent away to Lisbon.

After further manœuvres and counter-manœuvres on the parts of Lamberto and Colagliani for the possession of Lauretta, Elisa belatedly tells Ginevra (Giacomina) that she is Orazio's (Leandro's) sister. The Lisbon contract is revealed as a fiction and everything ends happily. Orazio marries Ginevra, Lamberto marries Lauretta.

The opera included the following musical numbers (arias except where otherwise indicated):

(Act 1)
1. Oh che proposito (Lamberto)
2. Tra li scogli e la procella (Lauretta, interrupted by Lamberto, in a
singing-lesson scene)
3. Non guasto ha da sollire (Lauretta)
4. Com'è scogli in meno all'onde (Lamberto)
5. Cara, da te mi viene (Leandro)
6. Spero dell'alma (Giacomina, in her audition before Colagliani)
7. Na cantarina (Colagliani)
8. Spero con recitare (Mariuccio)
9. Qual foco mi scotta? (Lamberto)
10. Come si lagna (Giacomina)
11. Contro i venti mai non cede (Leandro)
12. Raminga in folta selva (Elisa)
13. Se non canto a meraviglia (Bettina)
14. Comm'acci joca a le ppalle (trio—Colagliani, Lamberto, Lauretta)

(Act 2)
15. La mia contadinetta (Colagliani)
16. Quando sciolto avrò il contratto (Lamberto)
17. Caro e belle pupilette (Mariuccio)
18. Non ha una donna maggior diletto (Bettina)
19. Cantolillo mio carillo (duet—Lauretta, Colagliani)
20. Deh' non guardare in me (Elisa)
versions of
Tra li scogli e la procella
I
times a complete section, at least, of an aria, some times a mere fragment.

Leipzig in 1745, and at Lucca in 1752, as well as (Act 3)

opera of 1738. The librettos of initially in dialect were given in Tuscan versions after the opera left Naples.

Auletta, in the library of the Conservatorio at Florence. The arias originally in dialect were given in Tuscan versions after the opera left Naples.

The performances of 1742, at Milan in 1746, Bologna in 1747, Venice in 1748, Reggio in 1748, London in 1748, Brussels in 1749, Parma in 1749, Lucca in 1752, and Ravenna in 1754, and their recurrence also in Il maestro di musica at Paris in 1752, in La scolaro alla moda at Florence in 1760, and in the MS score of Orazio, attributed to Auletta, in the library of the Conservatorio at Florence. The arias originally in dialect were given in Tuscan versions after the opera left Naples.

The performances of Orazio at Florence in 1740, at Parma in 1749, and at Lucca in 1752, as well as La scolaro alla moda at Florence in 1760, are listed in Locwenberg’s Annals as revivals of Latilla’s supposed opera of 1738. The librettos of 1740 and 1752, however, do not name the composer, while those of 1749 and 1760 ascribe the music to “diversi.” The performances at Florence in 1742, at Milan in 1746, at Reggio in 1748 and Ravenna in 1754 were not known to Locwenberg when he compiled the Annals. The libretto of 1748 ascribes the music to Auletta; the other three do not name the composer.

Study of Table 1 shows that most of the thirty-four numbers, for which Palomba’s libretto originally provided, were rapidly eliminated, but that six numbers (1, 2, 13, 15, 22, and 34) reappeared with remarkable consistency, whether the music was attributed to no-one in particular (Latilla?), to Latilla and Pergolesi, to Auletta, or to “diversi.” Precisely these six, with one other, of the original numbers survive in the Orazio score at Florence, under Auletta’s name. Four of the same six numbers are found again in Il maestro di musica, attributed to Pergolesi.

Table 2 shows the recurrence, in the same librettos and scores, of the numbers interpolated in various places, in substitution for the numbers eliminated. There were, of course, many more interpolations than appear on this table — I list only those that survived more than one revival of the opera or operas. Some of the interpolated numbers reappear fairly consistently, whatever the attribution of the music in the libretto or score. Thus Alla selva, al prato, al rio, an aria by Michele Fini, was used at Florence in 1740 in the scene of Giacomina’s audition before Colagiamni, in place of Specchi dell’alma. According to Locwenberg’s Annals this Fiorentine Orazio of 1740 was a revival of Latilla’s supposed opera; but Alla selva, al prato, al rio recurs, not only in versions of the opera attributed to Latilla and Pergolesi at Venice (1743), Leipzig (1745), and Hamburg (1745), but also in versions attributed to Auletta at Bologna (1747), Venice (1748), London (1748), and Brussels (1749), to say nothing of an anonymous version at Milan (1746) and one attributed to “diversi” at Parma (1749). Alla selva, al prato, al rio is found also in the Orazio score at Florence. Again, when the work was revived at Florence in 1742 it picked up two numbers, Mentre perbetta, from Pergolesi’s Flaminio, and Splenda fra noi, which reappear in practically all later versions, whatever the attributions; they both appear in the score at Florence; Splenda fra noi is found also in Il maestro di musica. Then in 1743 at Venice, where the work was attributed to Latilla and Pergolesi, arias were added that reappear in numerous later versions under Auletta’s name.

Study of Tables 1 and 2 makes it almost impossible not to believe that we are here concerned with a single work, frequently misattributed. The alternative is to believe that the two composers (or three, if we include Pergolesi) achieved popular success in precisely the same numbers in their supposed settings of the same text, and that the very same additional numbers that were picked up, at various times and places, by the supposed setting by Latilla, were also picked up by Auletta’s setting.

This, then, is what seems to have happened to Auletta’s Orazio:
First produced at Naples in 1737, when it included thirty-four numbers — arias, duets, a trio; and ensembles.
Revived anonymously at Florence in 1740, when nineteen of the original numbers were retained and ten new ones inserted, one of which, Alla selva, al prato, al rio, by Fini, had a great success and was in effect incorporated in the score.

Revived again anonymously at Florence in 1742, with sixteen of the original numbers, two of those added in 1740 and eleven new ones, of which Mentre l'erbetta, from Pergolesi's Flaminio, and Splenda fra noi were successful and incorporated in the score. Splenda fra noi, a little cantata for the rehearsal scene in the second act, was perhaps written especially for this revival.

Revived at Venice in 1743 and misattributed to Latilla and Pergolesi. Ten of the original numbers still survived, with five from the Fiorentine versions of the work and ten new ones. The inclusion of Mentre l'erbertta, from Pergolesi's Flaminio, and Splenda per me sereno, an adaptation of an aria from the same composer's Adriano in Siria, may have been responsible for his name being associated with the work. Similarly, some of the other interpolated arias may have been taken from operas by Latilla. But new numbers were specially written by another composer, Alessandro Maccari, for this revival, although his name does not appear in the libretto. MS R.M. 24.g.r.2, in the King's Music Library, contains twelve arias performed at the Teatro San Moisè, Venice, in 1743 and 1744. Eight of them are from Orazio (the other four from Fiammetta, another pasticcio):

Signor Lamberto caro  
"Del Sig. D. Aless. Maccari"

Delirio notte e surno  
[= Auletta's No. 22]

Alla selva, al prato, al rio  
(by Fini, added at Florence in 1740)

Nu cantarina  
[= Auletta's No. 6]

Quando vengo a recitare  
[= Auletta's No. 27]

Mentre l'erbertta  
(by Pergolesi, added at Florence in 1742)

Procuri la prego  
"Del Sig. Aless. Maccari"

Bel volto credimi  
[added at Venice, 1743, but not attributed to Maccari]

Procuri la prego is also attributed to Maccari in Walsh's selection of Favorite Songs from Orazio. Together with Bel volto credimi it was included in a number of later revivals of the opera. Two minor characters, Marucio and Bettina, were eliminated in this Venetian version of Orazio.

Revived at Genoa in 1744. I have not been able to trace a copy of the libretto.

Revived anonymously at Florence in 1744, with eighteen of the original numbers and five earlier interpolations. Ten new numbers were added, four of which recur in some later performances. The additions included Talora in su l'erbertta, from Leo's Amor vuol sofferenza; A lui donai il mio core, from Pergolesi's Flaminio; and Io ti dissi, e a dir torno, from the same composer's Lo frate 'numorato.

Revived at Bologna in 1747, under Auletta's name. Only seven of his original numbers were retained, however, with nine earlier interpolations. Twelve new numbers added, several of which became very popular and were used in later performances. Sempre attorno qua palomba, from Pergolesi's La contadina astuta, was interpolated at Bologna but not subsequently.

Revived at Vienna in 1748. No details available.

Revived at Venice in 1748, under Auletta's name. The ironical situation had now arisen that less of his music was used in this version under his own name than had been used in the version under the names of Latilla and Pergolesi five years earlier. Seven of the original numbers retained and nineteen earlier interpolations. No new numbers added. Almost identical with the Bologna version of 1747.

Revived at Reggio in 1749, under Auletta's name, with seven of the original numbers and six earlier interpolations. Ten new numbers added, one of which, Vò dirlo basso basso, was very successful and was incorporated in the score.

10 Müller, probably working with Wotquenne's Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Stücke in Versen . . . von Zeno, Metastasio und Goldoni, Leipzig, 1905, was over­hasty in assigning the words of Oh che sproposito a Goldoni (from L'Ipocondriaco) and those of Alla selva, al prato, al rio a Metastasio (from Il Re pastore). Reference to the plays themselves would have shown him that the arias in Goldoni and Metastasio begin in the same way but continue quite differently from those in Orazio.
Revived at London in 1748, under Auletta’s name, with six of his original numbers and eleven earlier interpolations. Ten additions. Walsh’s selection of Favourite Songs from Orazio includes Fini’s *Alla selva, al prato, al rio*, added at Florence in 1740, Maccari’s *Procuri la presog*, added at Venice in 1743, and Orlandini’s *Giovinotti d’oggidi*, added at Bologna in 1747, but nothing of Auletta’s. It also includes three of the arias added in London—*Pulfle amabili*, by Jommelli, *Quanto è dolce*, by Resta, and *Mentre gioconde*, by Pulli, together with another, *Se non sai, che cose è amore*, by Paradis, which, although it does not occur in the London libretto, was probably added at some performances.

Revived at Copenhagen in 1749 by the Mingotti company. No details available.

Revived at Brussels in 1749, attributed on one page of the libretto to Auletta and on another page to Galuppi. Five of the original numbers retained and fourteen earlier interpolations. Three additions. Follows the London version of 1748 fairly closely.

Revived at Parma in 1749, attributed correctly to “diversi autori.” Six of Auletta’s original numbers retained, with eight earlier interpolations. Thirteen additions, including *Io non so dove mi sto*, from Leo’s *Amor vuol sofferenze*.

Revived anonymously at Lucca in 1752, with nine of the original numbers and four earlier interpolations. Fourteen additions.

Revived at Leiden in 1752. No details available.

Revived in a very much condensed version, as Il maestro di musica, at Paris in 1752. From 1743 onwards the number of characters had varied, according to the number of singers available, between six, seven, and eight. Sometimes both Mariuccio and Bettina were eliminated, sometimes only Bettina. An additional dumb character appeared sometimes. Now in Paris the characters were reduced to three, Giacomina, Leandro, and Elena disappearing, together with Mariuccio and Bettina, and the plot being reduced to a struggle between Lamberto and Colagiansi for possession of Lauretta. Four of Auletta’s original musical numbers were retained, and three of the numbers Orazio had picked up in its wanderings. Four new numbers were added, one of them by G. M. Capelli. The libretto does not name any composer, while it is clear from the account of the performances in the *Mercure de France* for November 1752 that the work was known to be nothing more than a pasticcio.

Orazio: The History of a Pasticcio

One may confidently assert that there are in this intermezzo several ariettas worthy of comparison with the best ones in *La Serva Padrona*. They are by different authors, and the performers have made a very good selection.

This did not prevent Il maestro di musica being published shortly afterwards under Pergolesi’s name.

Orazio revived at Ravenna in 1754, with six of the original numbers and five earlier interpolations. Nine new numbers.

Revived at Trieste in 1756, the music attributed to “diversi celebri Autori.” My information about the libretto (Biblioteca Civica, Trieste) is incomplete, but this version included five of the original musical numbers (1, 2, 15, 22, and 34), *Mentre l’eretta e Splenda fra noi*, added at Florence in 1742, *Fra piacer e giubili*, added at Milan in 1746, and *Giovinotti d’oggidi*, added at Bologna in 1747.

Revived at Munich in 1758. No details available.

Revived in a very much condensed version, as *La scolar alla moda*, at Florence in 1760. The music attributed to “diversi Celebri Autori.” This was a reduction to true intermezzo dimensions, with only three singing characters—Lamberto, Lauretta, and Colagiansi. There were only nine musical numbers, of which three were survivals from Auletta’s Orazio and three were earlier interpolations.

The score in the library of the Conservatorio at Florence, attributed to Auletta, contains just seven of his original thirty-four numbers. Of twenty-one additional numbers eighteen can be traced from librettos as having been interpolated between 1740 and 1749. Seven of the additional numbers can be assigned to their true composers.

The contents of the score at Florence are as follows:

- Oh che sproposito
- Fra gli scogli (fragment)
- Ha un gusto da stordire
- Benche frema
- Alla selva, al prato, al rio
- Vò dirlo basso basso
- Se non canto con bravura
- Io non so dove mi sto

*(= Auletta’s No. 1)*
*(= Auletta’s No. 12)*
*(= Auletta’s No. 2)*
*(first added at Bologna, 1747)*
*(by Michele Fini, according to Walsh’s Favourite Songs. First added at Florence, 1740)*
*(first added at Reggio, 1748)*
*(= Auletta’s No. 13)*
*(by Leonardo Leo. First added at Parma, 1749)*
The truth seems to be that in the earlier part of the 18th century after an *opera buffa* had been in circulation for a few years nobody was at all sure whose it was, and only a fraction of the original music was left. After ten years or so even an attribution to the original composer was misleading, since four-fifths of the music was by then by other people. It was a case of the survival of the fittest of the musical numbers.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS Score</th>
<th>La Scuola de' Filmati</th>
<th>Florence, Biblioteca</th>
<th>Oratorio (Score)</th>
<th>Florence, Conservatorio</th>
<th>Bologna, Conservatorio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Scuola de' Filmati 1742</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Bologna, Conservatorio</td>
<td>Bologna, Conservatorio</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Bologna, Conservatorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3 &amp; 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 This score has the same arias, etc., as the first and third acts of the score at Florence, except for the aria *Caro belf'idol mio*, in place of *Trova pace il mio dolore*. The only composer named is Pescetti, as author of *Rasserena i mesti rai*. 