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ABSTRACT

Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi’s *opera buffa* or *bernesca*, titled *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, premièred in Venice in 1766. It was based on another work that had successfully premièred in 1763 as a Neapolitan opera: *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*. The libretto for *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* was written by Antonio Palomba, and concerns a man who attempts to marry three women and escape with their dowries. In setting this opera, Guglielmi collaborated with Neapolitan composer Pasquale Anfossi, with the former contributing the Opening Ensemble, the three *finali* and the Baroness’s aria in the third act.

After moving to Venice in the mid 1760s, Guglielmi requested Gaetano Martinelli to re-fashion the libretto, keeping the story essentially the same for his new opera *Lo spirito di contraddizione*. Guglielmi wrote all the music for his new production, retaining some of his former ideas.

I argue that Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi was a prominent composer and significant eighteenth-century industry figure whose output should be re-incorporated into the repertory of modern performance. To this end, a critical scholarly edition to the first act of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* is provided with this thesis. The edition is produced according to the view that the historical filiation of the source should accompany an edition as well as critical and editorial methods, historical notes, sources and synopses.

In addition the thesis also explores the plot of Palomba’s libretto, how it was repeatedly appropriated between the years of 1763 and 1793, and the ways in which the thread of Guglielmi’s material continued throughout subsequent works well after the Neapolitan première.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

When I set out to study and edit Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi’s opera *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, premièred in Venice in 1766, little did I realize that I would find myself on the tip of an operatic iceberg.¹ What started out as a straightforward project to produce a modern edition of a forgotten opera by an equally-forgotten composer quickly transformed into a journey, one which revealed an intriguing labyrinth of other works connected in some way to Guglielmi’s seminal composition. Unraveling the tangled maze of inter-relationships and coincidences that link the works and their composers has not been without its own ‘spirit of contradiction’, although the purpose of this study is to free the works from the burden implicit in their name.

One of the notable features of opera throughout its history is the recurrent use of plots that have proven themselves attractive and successful, and in a way this was to prove emblematic of the entire tradition. The earliest-known operas are all settings of the classical legend of Orpheus composed within a decade of one another by Jacopo Peri (1561–1633), Giulio Caccini (1551 –1681) and Claudio Monteverdi (1567–1643). This was the genesis of an operatic *topos* that spawned over sixty additional operatic works, a list of which is readily accessible.² Among other prime examples are works as famous as Rossini’s *Barber of Seville*, which was known in earlier versions by Giovanni Paisiello (1740 –1816) and by Guglielmi’s pupil Nicolò Isouard (1775 –1818), all based on the play by Pierre Beaumarchais of 1773.³ Originating as *El burlador de Sevilla*, a theatrical work of the early-seventeenth century by Tirso de Molina, the Don Juan story has also spawned more than fifty plays, operas and other artistic works.⁴

¹ In some catalogues this title appears with the modern spelling of *Lo spirito di contraddizione*.
³ Paisiello’s opera premièred in 1782; Isouard’s version premièred in 1796.
⁴ Translated as the *Seducer of Seville*. This list of Don Juan stories is also readily accessible at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Don_Juan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Don_Juan) (accessed 12 July, 2013).
The same is true for many other operas. When W.A. Mozart was inspired at the age of nineteen to write Il re pastore using Pietro Metastasio’s (1698-1782) libretto of 1753—derived from Torquato Tasso’s Aminta and set many times before—he looked to Guglielmi’s setting of the same work as an example.\(^5\) Similarly, Pasquale Anfossi (1727 –1797) set Metastasio’s libretto ‘La Celemenza di Tito’ to music and premièred it in 1769, twenty-two years before Caterino Mazzolà’s version for Mozart’s opera of 1791. In turn, Anfossi was inspired to set the music to Giovanni Gamerra’s Lucio Silla in 1774, which had been set by Mozart two years earlier.

The starting point of this project was the manuscript of Guglielmi’s Lo spirito di contradizione, a three-act dramma giocoso per musica prepared by Venetian copyists as an opera bernesca for the première of the work in Venice at the San Moisè theatre in 1766. It is now widely available in a facsimile edition prepared by Howard Mayer Brown.\(^7\) The story, however, begins earlier.

Already an established composer, Guglielmi collaborated with Pasquale Anfossi in 1763 to produce Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna in three acts for its première in Naples. Described as a “comedy set to music” (commedia per musica) on the title page, the libretto was produced in Neapolitan dialect by Antonio Palomba. Three years later, and following the common practice of reviving old material, Guglielmi called upon the skills of Gaetano Martinelli to write a new libretto in Italian based on Palomba’s plot, and reset the music to produce Lo spirito di contradizione, retaining some of his former ideas. Both of these comic operas, the latter described as a “comic drama set to music” (dramma giocoso per musica) on the title page, revolve around a central figure, Don Cesarino (in Guglielmi’s 1766 version), who schemes to marry three different women for their dowries, and whose plan to escape with their money is thwarted by other pretenders for the affections of the same women. These two

---

\(^5\) H.C. Robbins Landon, 1791: Mozart’s Last Year (London: James and Hudson, c1988), 268.
\(^7\) Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi, Lo spirito di contradizione, facsimile edition, ed. Howard Mayer Brown and Eric Weimer (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1983). The title page of the libretto identifies the work as a dramma giocoso per musica; the frontispiece of the copyist’s score presents it as opera bernesca; the cover of the bound manuscript is titled opera buffa.
operas, effectively the same story with these two different names, appear to be the earliest works in a chain of creations that proliferated in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. There is nothing extraordinary about this; it is yet another example of a series of interrelated works from the same period that make manifest the borrowing, re-working and appropriation that was common practice in the theatres and opera houses of Europe.

In my research, I have encountered a number of other libretti and operatic scores entitled either Lo spirito di contradizione or Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, some with unidentified authors, whose textual, musical or conceptual inter-relationships have never been explored. This thesis therefore involves an exploration of both Guglielmi’s Lo spirito di contradizione as well as the web of inter-related works either bearing the same title or its cognate, Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna. These comic works set to music are generically termed as commedia per musica, dramma giocoso per musica, opera bernesca or opera buffa. The generic description of opera buffa rarely appears in the libretti but does appear in the 1766 score.\(^8\) For some of these versions studied, the term pasticcio could also be used to take into account the contribution of more than one composer to an opera. Given that the term opera buffa has been used in relation to comic opera since the late eighteenth century, it will be used in this thesis in relation to the libretti and the scores that I have accessed.

**The Question of Posterity**

While research into the historical context of the comic theatre of northern Italy is helpful in this study, and gives a sense of the diverse activity that was taking place in different Italian centres, it is the libretti that can help to provide a more detailed picture of how operas spread and were re-worked according to the needs of each new centre where they were presented. Many libretti exist without their corresponding scores. If a performance was intended as a revival of a popular work, the plots and characters were often amended to suit the situation at

---

the time, the forces available, and the tastes of the audience or whoever was commissioning the performance. It could be argued that the librettist of the revival had much to do with fashioning the opera’s outcome. In many of these cases, the original librettist is not named. The libretto of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* from 1767 is one such example: its original author Palomba is not acknowledged. Perhaps it was because amendments were made to accommodate the addition of two characters. Moreover, the score of this version does not appear to have survived.

The libretti were printed so that the audience could read and follow the story as it was being performed, but one gets the impression that the libretti were also intended as a keepsake and record of both the story and the personnel involved: singers, choreographer, stage director and so forth. In most cases, this information survives. The musical materials for the impending performance were often produced with the necessary modifications to instrumentation, voices and text, but only as working copies for the musicians and singers, not with the expectation that they would be re-used, or kept for posterity. This process was repeated for subsequent revivals. The score of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* illustrates this type of working score with nothing more than the title of the opera at the top of the first page and Anfossi’s name appearing in a manner that seems almost incidental. Guglielmi’s name appears nowhere in acknowledgement of his contributions. Guglielmi’s score of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* and the work of its copyist give the impression that it was intended to be a permanent record of this version. The score does not include the information that was customary for a libretto, as briefly outlined earlier, but appears with a title page in the copyist’s hand, notes the genre of the work, time and place of the performance and the name of the composer. What still needs to be established in this case is whether this opera was commissioned by a Venetian impresario, whether the score was made in order to be sold or if Guglielmi intended it as a personal archival copy. When considering the time-frame of this opera, its production and performance in relation to Guglielmi’s other works in in this period of his career, there are indications that *Lo spirito di contraddizione* was needed in a hurry. After studying and comparing the libretti of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* with *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, it can be surmised that Martinelli, while adapting the text to standard Italian and the setting to

---

9 This score could also have been intended as a presentation copy, but no ode or dedication exists on the libretto. To my knowledge, no record or order of sale has been found.
Venetian, sought to re-configure the play’s structure to deliver the machinations of the characters efficiently, lending the climax and conclusion a somewhat tighter finish than that in Palomba’s play.

Towards a Modern Edition

This thesis provides an edition of the first act of Guglielmi’s *Lo spirito di contraddizione* as well as an exploration of the operas of Anfossi and Guglielmi and the web of inter-related works. My approach to this edition and this thesis is based on Jerome McGann’s theory as adapted by musicologists such as James Grier, who claims ‘the work of art as a social phenomenon’.¹⁰ This view is in accordance with Jennifer Williams Brown, who points out in her description of the postmodern textual critical view that: ‘…the concept of the author has been expanded to admit a range of people involved…’.¹¹ My aim is to understand the historical descent of this work and its filiations with the other libretti, establish its significance in the context of Guglielmi’s compositions, and to situate it in its historical context within the operatic canon.¹² The manuscript of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* is clear and complete. To use the term offered by James Grier, the edition of the first act produced here and the inclusion of the opera’s historical inter-relationships comprise an ‘historical enterprise’.¹³

The task of editing early operas is far from easy. Much has been written about ‘composers’ intentions’, authenticity and the early music editor.¹⁴ Various studies on editing music encourage the editor to respect the sources from which they work and the intentions of composers and copyists, as much as they can be determined. In the case of seventeenth and eighteenth-century operas, establishing the composers’ intentions is often an impossible task. Transformation was part of the reality of opera: works were frequently transformed from one season to another or from one location to another. Given these circumstances, modern editions

---

¹³ ‘… the question of whether editing is a psychological or a historical enterprise…whether one privileges the ‘author’s intention’ or the actual historical evolution of the text’. See Grier, *Critical Editing*, 17, 19.
¹⁴ The age of early music revivals, which flourished particularly in the last two decades of the 20th century, has inspired musicologists such as Howard Mayer Brown, Richard Taruskin and Nicholas Kenyon to address issues of authenticity and editing. See collection of essays edited by Nicholas Kenyon: *Authenticity and Early Music* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1996).
can only hope to re-construct an opera as it was for the given performance for which the surviving scores and parts were prepared.

One of the primary questions is the authenticity of the score and the authorship of Lo spirito di contraddizione. The surviving manuscript copy of the work, and what is available now in facsimile, is a score that was produced by Iseppo Baldan’s copying house.\(^{15}\) My edition of Lo spirito di contraddizione is therefore based on the version of a scribe, as Guglielmi’s own hand does not feature here. Based on the summation given by Ellen Rosand in 2002, in ‘charting’ the progress of research in her field of Venetian opera studies, more editions are needed to accompany the musicological research being undertaken.\(^{16}\) In this thesis I propose that the historical filiation of the score and the inter-relationships of the libretti accompany the edition as well as the critical and editorial methods, historical notes, sources and synopses. As Rosand points out, ‘Only then will it be possible for these works, crucial to the establishment of the genre, to become part of the larger discourse of opera’.\(^{17}\)

In keeping with Grier’s methods, Table 1 below shows the group of intertwined works that are named Lo spirito di contraddizione, or works that are descendents of the original story Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna (1763), showing the year and place where they were premièred and the authors of both their libretti and music.\(^{18}\) Palomba was sometimes not acknowledged on the title page of the libretti, but was acknowledged in the catalogues that I have examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Librettist</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>L’esprit de contradiction</td>
<td>Charles Dufresny</td>
<td>(play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Lo spirito di contraddizione</td>
<td>Carlo Goldoni</td>
<td>(play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>The Spirit of Contradiction</td>
<td>John Rich</td>
<td>(play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi/Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Lo spirito di contraddizione</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</td>
<td>Palomba’s plot</td>
<td>Anfossi/ Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Ghelen</td>
<td>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</td>
<td>Palomba’s plot</td>
<td>Anfossi/Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) I am grateful to Dr Jan Stockigt for pointing this out. Further evidence of this will be given in Chapter Three.


\(^{17}\) Rosand, ‘Una carta del navegar’,11.

\(^{18}\) Grier, Critical Editing,16.
This project is concerned with the works that lie between *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* of 1763, and Gnecco’s version of the same play of 1793. The first three works at the head of the table are linked in name only. Their content makes it clear that they do not belong to the group of works set as operas, and these three works were apparently never transformed into operas. In addition to these works, there is a second group sharing the same titles, but unrelated musically to the earlier group. Chronologically they overlap with the first group, but can be regarded as quite separate. These are shown in Table 2.

### Table 1. Works entitled *Lo spirito di contraddizione* or *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, 1700-1793

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Librettist</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td><em>Lo spirito di contraddizione</em></td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>de Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Aquila</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi/Guglielmi/Giordano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi/Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Palomba's plot</td>
<td>Gnecco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Additional, unrelated operas of the same name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Librettist</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Livigni</td>
<td>Cherubini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td><em>Lo spirito di contraddizione</em></td>
<td>Mazzolà</td>
<td>Schuster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Livigni</td>
<td>Brunetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Livigni</td>
<td>Brunetti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Operas based on the contradictory nature of a central character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Librettist</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td><em>L’esprit de contraddition</em></td>
<td>Dufresny</td>
<td>(play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td><em>Lo spirito di contraddizione</em></td>
<td>Goldoni</td>
<td>(play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td><em>The Spirit of Contradiction</em></td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>(play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em></td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td><em>Lo spirito di contraddizione</em></td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td><em>Lo spirito di contraddizione</em></td>
<td>Mazzolà</td>
<td>Schuster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subsequent revivals of Palomba’s plot could be included in Table 3, but the theme of contradiction is no more emphasized than in 1763.

**Thesis Outline**

This first chapter presents a review of the literature pertinent to this study and that helps to place Guglielmi in the historical context of the Neapolitan Conservatories, and more broadly, in his life and times. In addition to the more mundane aspects of this work that pertain mainly to the editorial process, this chapter also explores the plot of Palomba’s libretto, how it continued to be appropriated and how the thread of Guglielmi’s material continued throughout the subsequent works. This thesis also argues for the re-incorporation of the prominent composer Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi and at least some of his extant operas back into the repertory of modern performance.

Chapter Two provides a detailed description of the libretto *Lo spirito di contraddizione* with a relevant discussion of *Lo sposo di tre, marito di nessuna*, together with a comparative study outlining the differences and similarities between the libretti that I have examined. Examples of text are given with some discussion of themes. This chapter also offers a more detailed account of the plot through a discussion of the succession of libretti and later operas that directly appropriated material from Guglielmi’s work or that were more loosely based on the original opera, despite being developed from the same plot.

Chapter Three is devoted to the music of Guglielmi’s *Lo spirito di contraddizione* with some comparisons made with the original score of the 1763 Neapolitan dialect version of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, and the score of the pasticcio version produced in Vienna in 1768 at the Teatri Priviligiati under the direction of Florian Gasmann.

Chapter Four provides an introduction to my critical scholarly edition of the first act of *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, as well as discussions of problems encountered in the process of editing the work and of the amendments that have been made. The portion of the work edited is limited by the scope of the requirements of the degree and should be regarded as a representative sample of the musical styles and compositional technique used by Guglielmi in his operas: the orchestral sinfonia, opening vocal ensemble, arias for male and female
9

characters, a *cavatina*, *recitativo secco* and a first-act finale. The edition aims to make this opera more accessible to singers, particularly the text and its elisions, which have been placed in line with the notes to enable the study and performance of Guglielmi’s mid eighteenth-century *opera buffa* and its *recitativo secco*.

**Literature Review**

Interest in Italian opera of the second half of the eighteenth century has been growing slowly among researchers, but the amount of surviving material yet to be investigated is enormous. To date, Guglielmi has attracted less attention than have his contemporaries such as Giovanni Paisiello and Domenico Cimarosa (1749–1801), both of whom were highly prolific and are now gaining more prominence in musical scholarship. The librettists they engaged were many, and included Palomba and Martinelli, who are central to the present study. 19 Other projects aim to broaden the current outlook on earlier composers such as Cavalli, Legrenzi, Provenzale, and many others who came to prominence in the seventeenth century. The composers from the Neapolitan conservatories, who by their teaching methods and curriculum laid the groundwork for Guglielmi and his contemporaries, are numerous and are yet to be brought into the larger discourse of opera. The history of the conservatories spans several centuries, although research to date has focused on the seventeenth and eighteenth. Lucio Tufano provides a comprehensive view of the life, education and curriculum of the children residing in the conservatories. 20 In his work on *Provenzale* alone, Dinko Fabris has revealed the importance of Provenzale’s teaching at the Santa Maria di Loreto, which laid the foundations for eighteenth-century developments. 21 Francesco Cotticelli and Paologiovanni Maione provide a comprehensive description of theatrical activity and the construction of key theaters in Naples in the first half of the eighteenth century through their extensive research of official correspondence, documents from notaries and financial records. 22 Ellen Rosand’s critical

19 Paisiello composed the music to Palomba’s libretto *Il Ciarlone*. A further example of the eighteenth-century custom of ‘appropriation’ is Paisiello’s revisions of Guglielmi’s *La donna di tutti i caratteri* (Palomba’s text) and to *Madama l’umorista. Le nozze distorbate* is also a libretto by Palomba. Cimarosa also revised *La donna di tutti i caratteri*.


examination of the literary and musical Venetian documentation from the seventeenth-century operatic scene in Venice provides a solid background for eighteenth-century studies.\(^{23}\)

Reinhard Strohm further fleshes out the Venetian background with his work on the arrival of the Neapolitan opera in Venice and the subsequent careers of the Neapolitan composers beyond Italy.\(^{24}\)

In my own work, the search for primary sources has involved libraries beyond the Neapolitan region. Various on-line catalogues have facilitated the research: in particular, the OPAC SBN unified catalogue of Italian libraries,\(^{25}\) the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden (S.L.U.B.), the Library of Congress and the Gaspari online service hosted by the Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della musica di Bologna. The 1763 Neapolitan libretto of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* is held in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele III in Rome. The corresponding Anfossi manuscript, co-written by Guglielmi, is held at the Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna. The manuscript of Guglielmi’s *Lo spirito di contraddizione* of 1766—the manuscript re-printed in facsimile and central to my study—is held in the Österreichische Nazionalbibliothek, Vienna. The manuscript of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, revived in 1768 in Ghelen, is held in the same library; however, the librettist is noted in their catalogue as Filippo Livigni.

As far as background to the Neapolitan Conservatories and their composers are concerned, my first point of reference was the work of nineteenth-century musicologist Francesco Florimo. His extraordinary survey of opera and sacred music extends to the opera conservatories and institutions of Bologna, Milan, Venice and Rome, to name but a few, which were in operation either concurrently with those of Naples in the eighteenth century or established later.\(^{26}\)

Starting in the fifteenth century, with his research spanning well into the nineteenth, Florimo’s four volumes include invaluable biographical information on composers who are yet to be revived for study and performance. The shortcomings of this survey, however, derive from the fact that, as the author himself concedes, the amount of information available at the time of his
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\(^{25}\) The OPAC SBN refers to the catalogue available on the Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico: Catalogo del Servizio Bibliotecario Nazionale. See [http://www.sbn.it/opacsbn/opac/iccu/base.jsp](http://www.sbn.it/opacsbn/opac/iccu/base.jsp)

research was also limited. The biographical material he provided concerning Guglielmi offers some interesting, anecdotal information on the composer and lists *Lo spirito di contraddizione* as having premièred in 1765. To my knowledge, this opera has not appeared in any catalogues that include that particular year. Anfossi is also well represented in Florimo’s biographical section; however, his information is not always reliable, such as his reference to *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, which he claims was premièred in 1781 and co-written by Guglielmi and Giuseppe Giordano. The librettists are only acknowledged in the information offered in Florimo’s tables listing the works, and Anfossi’s librettist is listed as ‘Anonymous’.

Researching the libretti and their origins requires investigation of literature quite distinct from that pertaining to the composers of operatic music. Michael Robinson’s ground-breaking work in the 1970s continues to be an invaluable starting point for the study of Naples, the conservatories and Neapolitan Opera. Today, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera* plays a notable role in providing a comprehensive overview of the *opere buffe* and *serie* in the Neapolitan environment, an insight into the conservatories and the favorable cultural climate of King Charles VII of Naples (1734-59). Robinson provides a detailed account of all the Neapolitan conservatories, their patronage and how their learning programs and outcomes fed the whole of Europe, including England, with composers and musicians for decades.

Two doctoral dissertations written in the 1990s on the work of Guglielmi provided the focus from which to launch this project. Kay Lipton’s thesis, “The *Opere Buffe* of Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi in Vienna and Esterháza: Contributions to the Development of *Opera Buffa* between 1768 and 1793” marks a turning point in *opera buffa* research outside the Italian environment. Lipton provides a thorough review of the surviving biographical information concerning Guglielmi. Her thesis offers interpretation and analysis of Guglielmi’s collected
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28 Florimo, *La scuola musicale di Napoli*, Vol 4, 346. In Anfossi’s biographical section, only Guglielmi is mentioned as co-writer. See Vol. 2, 373. Giuseppe Giordano is also confirmed by the Library of Congress catalogue, but the opera is not noted as the première.
opera buffe, and those which were transformed into pasticci and intermezzi in response to audience tastes. In her study, Lipton includes Anfossi’s *Lo sposo di tre, marito di nessuna*, the pasticcio version of 1768. Guglielmi’s work is also contextualized through comparison with operas written by his contemporaries and performed at Esterhaza under the direction of Haydn. Lipton offers a clear description of specific compositional methods and the composer’s approach to form. Guglielmi often adopted harmonic associations in which a specific harmonic area, or occasionally a tonal area, was associated with a particular character type or dramatic theme.\(^3\) Lipton includes some wonderful historical anecdotes on Guglielmi’s behavior and character towards singers and others among his contemporaries.

Anthony DelDonna’s thesis, “The Operas of Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi (1728–1804): The Relationship of his Dialect Operas to his Opere Serie”, provides great insight into the political and cultural climate throughout the period in which Neapolitan opera flourished.\(^3\) He presents a thorough case for considering Neapolitan opera as a distinct operatic genre by drawing upon the relevant issues beyond and surrounding Guglielmi’s time, including significant historical events. The reign of King Charles VII until 1759 and the control exerted over the theatrical scene by his court were hugely influential on the development of opera in Naples.\(^3\) DelDonna acknowledges the lasting influence of Charles Burney who wrote that the style of Vinci was the true Neapolitan style and that Naples was among ‘the most eminent cities for vocal music’, proposing the creative output of composers trained in Naples as a ‘Neapolitan School’ and the Neapolitan Opera as a genre in its own right.\(^3\) DelDonna also acknowledges the work of Robinson and continues with his own analyses of three poignant operatic genres by Guglielmi: the opera seria, *La Semiramide riconosciuta*; the commedia per musica, *Il raggriratore di poche fortuna* and the farsa, *Le sventure sfortunate*. His study focuses on selected examples of recitatives, arias and ensemble pieces with attention given to stylistic elements as the basis for his generalized characterization of Guglielmi’s music. DelDonna’s analysis examines the libretti, noting the dramatic structure resulting from the division of acts and scenes, as well as the placement of musical items and their distribution and the dramatic significance of each of
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\(^3\) Lipton, “The Opere Buffe”, 33.
\(^3\) The Bourbon ruler of Naples was also Charles III of Spain, Charles V of Sicily, and the duke of Parma and Piacenza. For further details, see Robinson, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera*, 7.
\(^3\) DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 2. See also Kerry S. Grant et al., *Dr Burney as Critic and Historian of Music* (UMI Research Press: Ann Arbor, 1988), 236-237.
the characters. His discussion includes voice types and orchestration, noting Guglielmi’s practice regarding the type and number of instruments and their role as accompaniment. Maintaining his argument for Neapolitan Opera, his thesis also focuses on the use of the Neapolitan language in Guglielmi’s opere serie and requires him to lend equal weight to the discussion of the libretto and its text as well as the music.35 DelDonna’s biographical section is a thorough account and clarification of Guglielmi’s family background and ancestry. Using many archival records kept at Massa, he traces the Guglielmi name back to the first half of the sixteenth century.36 His more recent writings on the opera, theatrical culture and society of Naples journeys beyond the realms of serious opera to include the broader context of the Enlightenment.37

In 2008, the twelfth volume of Studi musicali toscani, containing no less than twenty-three articles, was dedicated to Guglielmi’s work.38 Mariateresa Dellaborra’s article on Martinelli as Guglielmi’s librettist offers an intense study of his first libretto with Guglielmi, I rivali placati.39 Several articles relate to Guglielmi’s manuscripts of later works that are represented in Benedictine archives in the Campania region.40

Two sources on Martinelli are provided in Marita McClymonds’s book on Jommelli and de Brito’s comprehensive study on opera in eighteenth-century Portugal.41 The former provides a fascinating picture of the last years of Jommelli’s life at the Portuguese court where Martinelli was a highly-regarded and valued colleague. Given the few resources on Martinelli’s

35 As the language of the former Kingdom of Naples, Neapolitan is regarded by some as a language, while other scholars consider it to be a dialect of Italian. There is no general consensus on this question.
36 Some discrepancies in earlier biographies have been revealed by DelDonna as far as Pietro’s father is concerned: Marc’Antonio has at times been reterred to as Jacopo Antonio.
37 See Anthony DelDonna, Opera, Theatrical Culture and Society in Late Eighteenth-Century Naples (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012).
contribution as an Italian librettist, McClymonds’s work provides a vital link to him, his libretti and his correspondence with Jommelli before arriving in Portugal. Brito gives a comprehensive report on the history of opera in the Portuguese Court and all who were involved, outlining the extent of Martinelli’s duties as court poet. Of particular interest is Jeronimo Francisco de Lima, the composer who reset Martinelli’s *Lo spirito di contraddizione* in 1772.

In his article “Opera in Arcadia” Burt provides a discussion of the importance of text and libretto in the operatic realm. Of special interest is the example given by Burt tracing the history of the libretto by Domenico David, *La forza del virtù*. Commencing with its original setting by Carlo Pollaroli in 1693, he traces a journey that encompasses five more musical settings and changes in title and adjustments to the plot that culminate in Metastasio’s *Siface* and its musical setting by Porpora in 1757. Subsequently, Metastasio’s play was to continue further along its own path. The discussion of this pathway parallels that of this thesis in regard to Palomba’s libretto.

Michael Talbot and Mickey White offer a fresh insight into the career of Vivaldi’s nephew Pietro Mauro and take us into the professional world of the music copyist. The study of copyists is relevant to this topic because of the central role they played in the preparation of operatic materials, the rapid scoring of alterations deemed necessary for new performances, and a range of other matters connected with the dissemination of the music. Ultimately, these factors also need to be taken into account in the preparation of modern editions.

On the editing and presentation of the musical text, I have consulted such references as James Grier’s book *The Critical Editing of Music*, John Caldwell’s book *Editing Early Music* and Samantha Owens’s edition of Kusser’s *Adonis*. The Bärenreiter editions of the Mozart scores have also been an invaluable guide for developing my own edition of a mid-eighteenth century opera. Given the availability of facsimile publications of early manuscripts, one of the issues facing the modern scholar is whether it suffices to perform directly from the surviving
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eighteenth-century manuscripts or whether it is preferable to produce a new modern edition, even when the photographically-reproduced original is perfectly legible. In discussing this question, Grier points out that ‘the photographic facsimile is well-established as an important form of publication in musicology’. One of the realities of our time is the growth in historically-informed performance, and a generation or more of scholars and performers who are trained in reading such works in their original notation. At the same time, it is still generally true that for many practicing musicians today, reading such a score from original notation is beyond the realms of practicality, not only because of the idiosyncrasies of early handwritings, but also in light of the range of performance practice conventions that are not indicated in the score itself. Even though Lo spirito di contraddizione presents very well and is a reliable copy of a score, aided by Howard Mayer-Brown’s thorough and comprehensive notes, it still includes a range of notational and scribal conventions that are precluded in a modern edition. This reinforces Grier’s remarks concerning the limitations of working from photographs. In addition to the notational and performance practice conventions that are not shown in the original scores, many modern facsimiles are not able to reproduce all the details of the original document when such aspects as variables of lighting, film speed and contrast are taken into account. These aspects could be re-assessed in the future in line with technological advances that are continually being made.

**Historical Background**

In the northern and central towns of Italy, central European courts, the Iberian Peninsula and London, opera was established as the regular and foremost entertainment by the 1700s, even if the court establishments that operated extravagant arts programs were at times interrupted by political turmoil and changing royal interests and agendas in their artistic patronage. Portugal, for instance, suffered a devastating and deadly earthquake in 1755. As a result of such events and circumstances that evoked insecurity in the arts, independence among artists began to emerge. While dramas continued to be written, published and performed, opera had driven spoken drama from the theatres. Plays were still popular as amateur productions in convents and schools, and theatrical performances were common in royal courts and private houses;
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46 Grier, *Critical Editing*, 146.
47 Grier, *Critical Editing*, 146.
however, professional theatre was sung. Venice succumbed first, with opera gradually spreading to Mantua and Modena.\textsuperscript{49} The \textit{commedia per musica napoletana} was introduced later, originating in the late seventeenth century and reserved for private settings. Its first public appearance was not given until the Teatro dei Fiorentini changed hands in 1709.\textsuperscript{50}

Due to the nature of the operatic industry, Neapolitan opera composers were forced to make Venice the centre of their activities. Strohm maintains that a career in a foreign court was dependant on a successful season in Venice.\textsuperscript{51} By 1710, the success of Neapolitan composers who had moved from the city and gained commissions to write operas outside the Neapolitan state began to be noticeable.\textsuperscript{52} To some extent this was helped by the support that lyric theatre received at home in Naples. During the reign of King Charles Bourbon I (1734–1759), there was enormous operatic productivity, including the construction of the San Carlo theatre, which attracted attention throughout Europe.\textsuperscript{53} By mid-century, four operas by Neapolitans had been performed in Venice and serious opera had been introduced to the Neapolitan courts.\textsuperscript{54} By the 1760s, however, the political situation had altered. King Charles had left Naples in 1759 to assume the Spanish throne, leaving Minister Bernardo Tanucci as regent until Charles’s third son, the eight-year-old Prince Ferdinand, reached maturity. This new leadership and lack of interest in the arts on the part of the new regent was a significant shift from the indulgences of King Charles, and impacted on the artistic function of San Carlo and the surrounding theatres. The impresario Gaetano Grossasteta was forced to engage in cost-cutting measures. It was not only theatres that felt the impact, but also conservatories.

Naples had been musically important since the Renaissance. By the early eighteenth century the city had organized methods and complex systems in place with the establishment of four conservatories that benefitted from patronage by reigning and other wealthy bodies. Founded throughout the sixteenth century at various times, the conservatories of Santa Maria di Loreto,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{49} Burt, “Opera in Arcadia”, 153.
  \item \textsuperscript{50} DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 13. For a history of the Teatro dei Fiorentini see also Cotticelli and Maione, \textit{Onesto divertimento}, 95-136.
  \item \textsuperscript{52} Robinson, \textit{Naples and Neapolitan Opera}, 26.
  \item \textsuperscript{53} Robinson, \textit{Naples and Neapolitan Opera}, 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{54} DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”,12.
\end{itemize}
Santa Maria della Pietà dei Turchini, I poveri di Gesù Cristo and San Onofrio a Capuana were established for the purposes of feeding, housing and educating the poor and orphaned. Three of them, including Santa Maria di Loreto, came to be run by laymen boards of governors that were responsible to the viceroy. By the mid-seventeenth century, the policies of employing the best educators and encouraging talented music students as paying boarders, whether they were orphans or not, were well established.

In 1663, Francesco Provenzale’s appointment marked a turning point in the establishment of the conservatories. His direction, together with subsequent engagements of high-quality staff, modified the educational program and fashioned it towards a more secular curriculum. During Provenzale’s era Naples was like an island, one that was removed from the main Italian or European cultural centres. His direction lasted forty years and his educational influence on succeeding generations of composers continued. According to Robinson, financial reasons lay behind the enormous growth in the conservatories throughout the seventeenth century. By the early eighteenth century, students were enrolled from beyond the Neapolitan region from places as far away as Spain and Germany. The Neapolitans eventually dominated the music scene beyond Naples.

The Neapolitan conservatories offered an intense program and curriculum that heavily fostered the writing of sacred works. This aspect of composition played a vital role in the teaching curriculum. By the seventeenth century, students were constantly hired out to perform, providing a source of income for the schools. The development of Santa Maria di Loreto into a recognized conservatorium happened over the years of 1705–07 with the omission of non-musical subjects such as the humanities, rhetoric and grammar. The rigorous musically-dominated timetable was a commitment to excellence in counterpoint,
figured bass, melody-writing and text-setting. This must have been an attraction, together with the opportunities for self-improvement and for gaining some kind of social advantage through the connections that could be made. Guglielmi became a product of this system and greatly profited from the rigorous training and education.

**Guglielmi’s Life and Career**

Although there has been a significant increase in research on Guglielmi in recent years and some recordings of ensemble works made, only a small amount of his musical output has been revived and many aspects of his career remain largely unknown. One of six children (and one of two surviving males), Guglielmi was born into a family of musicians in Massa-Carrara, 1729, on the Ligurian coastline in Tuscany. His father, Marc’ Antonio (1682–1742), composed and played the bassoon and viola. As noted by two historians, while still a boy, Pietro Alessandro was sometimes engaged to play in the orchestra of the ducal theatre. By this stage of Guglielmi’s youth, the Duchess Ricciarda Gonzaga had noted his talents, particularly after Guglielmi had composed a *farsa*. With the help of the duchess, instruction was arranged in Lucca under Giacomo Puccini senior (1712–1781). This may have been with the intention of preparing Guglielmi for the conservatories of Naples.

Marc’ Antonio’s first son (1713–1790) had been trained in organ and music theory by his father. When Pietro was eight years old, his older brother Domenico entered the priesthood. Guglielmi was encouraged further by Ricciarda Gonzaga (1729-1790), the wife of Alderano I Cybo-Malaspina, duke of Massa-Carrara, and was possibly funded by her to enter the S. Maria di Loreto conservatory in Naples in 1746.
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64 The Quartetto Guglielmi performing his Sonata N. 1 in Do M, Allegro Moderato can be viewed on [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=StoY60_Asms&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=StoY60_Asms&feature=related) (accessed 5 May 2012) and his Credidi per soli, coro e orchestra recorded by the Orchestra da camera “P.A.Guglielmi” can be viewed on [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cA5N7fBXaas](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cA5N7fBXaas) (accessed 5 May 2012).

65 DelDonna quotes and references Piovano and Giampaoli. See DelDonna, “The operas of Guglielmi”, 66.

66 By this time the duchess was widowed to Cybo-Malaspina.

67 DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 66. The *farsa* gained popularity as a genre towards the 1790s.
Guglielmi was among those from beyond Naples who attended the Neapolitan conservatories. He studied at the conservatory of Santa Maria de Loreto, where his work made an impression from the outset. Guglielmi studied under Francesco Durante, and by 1750 he was serving as *primo maestrino*. By the eighteenth century it was a conservatory policy to allow students to compose either the whole or sections of an opera themselves. It is not fully known what his compositional projects were throughout the final stages of his studies there, but it can be assumed that Guglielmi was influenced by the conservatory’s sacred music culture and practice, leading him to produce an enormous output of liturgical works until his final church posts in Rome. The policy of making senior composition pupils take a hand in the creation of operas effectively gave them the opportunity to be apprenticed to a practicing composer and meant that they left the conservatories ready to embark on their careers.\(^{68}\)

1754 is recorded as the year of Guglielmi’s departure from the conservatories. His first opera was for the Teatro Fiorentini in 1757, *Lo solachianello ‘mbroglione*, to a libretto supplied by D. Pignataro, and with a title that suggests that it was in the Neapolitan language. He continued to produce operas regularly, sometimes three in one year. Four of his operas were collaborations with Palomba: *La ricca iocanderia* (1759), *I due soldati* (1760) and *La donna di tutti i caratteri* (1762). *Lo sposo di tre e marito di nessuna* (1763), co-written with Anfossi, marked his last libretto with Palomba. In this same year Guglielmi turned to *opera seria*, setting Metastasio’s *L’Olimpiade* and *Siroe re di Persia*. He remained in Naples until 1763, writing several comic operas each year. In 1764, he produced his first *opera buffa* with librettist Martinelli, *Li rivali placati*, followed by *Il ratto della sposa* (1765) and *Lo spirito di contraddizione* (1766) as the final collaboration.\(^{69}\)

After Naples, and possibly due to the success of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, Guglielmi went to Venice, where he is thought to have spent the next four years. There he wrote the music and staged *Lo spirito di contraddizione* for which Martinelli used the same plot as Palomba’s, replacing the dialect with Italian. The Venetian operas were written in quick succession and were very successful.\(^{70}\) As is the case with Guglielmi’s earlier collaboration

\(^{68}\) Robinson, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera*, 17.

\(^{69}\) We know that Martinelli went to the court of Ludwigsberg, Stuttgart in 1766. How this collaboration happened is uncertain at this stage.

\(^{70}\) Lipton, “Opere Buffe”, 120.
with Anfossi, no accounts have been discovered that can provide any insight into the nature of his collaboration with Martinelli, and what their creative process entailed. To my knowledge, it is not known how Guglielmi came to collaborate in Anfossi’s opera.

In 1768 Guglielmi, taking advantage of the enormous popularity of Italian opera in England, took up the position of composer and director of music at the King’s Theatre in the Haymarket. According to DelDonna’s findings, Guglielmi returned to Naples with his wife in 1776. Not much is known of the singer Lelia Acchiappati, who sang in the première of her husband’s Ricimero on May 30, 1777, as well as in operas by other composers. Acchiappati’s entry in the biographical dictionary of Lombardian women states that she was born in Brescia, with some sources stating Venice as her place of birth, and moreover that “she had the misfortune of marrying a musician, rich in talent but a true adventurer, gambler and duelist, Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi”. Deldonna’s research into two early musicological reviews revealed unfavourable press reports of her performances. Upon Guglielmi’s return to Naples, he found that Cimarosa and Paisiello were quite popular. Naturally enough, this caused a considerable amount of tension, to the point that Guglielmi came to consider them as his rivals for quite some time. This rivalry was the cause of criticism that would spark much debate and speculation on his character. Statements describing Guglielmi as ‘lazy, stingy and without self-respect’ by one of Paisiello’s students may have been true. Guglielmi had a reputation as something of a womanizer, and indeed his marriage came to a bitter end, with his children being distributed amongst friends to be raised after Lelia’s death. Such derogatory statements about Guglielmi, however, could well have had personal agendas attached. His
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71 DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 75.
72 DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 76.
73 Rachele Farina, Dizionario biografico delle donne lombarde: 568 – 1968 (Milano: Baldini & Castolid, 1995), 18. Farina’s entry into the dictionary: “Ebbe la fortuna-sventura di sposare un musicista ricco di talento ma vero avventuriero, giocatore e duellista”. Some discrepancies, however, lie in this entry regarding Lelia’s venture to London: it implies that she went to London from Venice, without mention of her career appointments in Naples.
75 Giacomo Gotifredo Ferrariis is quoted here from his Amedotti piacevole e interessanti, a cura di S. Di Giacomo (Milano: Remo Sandron, 1830), 168. See DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 75.
76 His marriage was dissolved in 1784. The details of separation and child arrangements are documented in the records of Massa. DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 77-78.
return to Naples, according to DelDonna, also sparked his most fervent and creative period, establishing him as a valued composer of Neapolitan opera in the comic and seria idioms.\textsuperscript{77}

Guglielmi’s penultimate appointment at Saint Peter’s in Rome was probably made as a result of his success with the oratorio Debora e Sisara. He continued to stage operas throughout the terms of both the Roman appointments. While Guglielmi’s opere serie and oratorios have created some interest recently, it still remains to be seen what could be made of Guglielmi’s repertoire from the Vatican. He was appointed as maestro di cappella in March, 1793, probably as a result of Antonio Baroni’s death.\textsuperscript{78} In 1797 Guglielmi moved to direct music at San Lorenzo in Lucina. Lelia came back to live with him in Rome, and the family, apart from those children who had married, was re-united.\textsuperscript{79}

Guglielmi’s works were performed very widely: his operas alone were performed in major cities in Europe, and particularly in Germany, but also in more distant cities such as London, Moscow and Boston.\textsuperscript{80} Li rivali placati and Il ratto della sposa were revived in various theaters in the north, and a version of the latter was also produced and performed in London in 1768, with the text of the third act re-written by another librettist.\textsuperscript{81} Scores and libretti are held in major music collections throughout Europe, with a large body of works held in Dresden. Most of the materials related to Lo spirito di contraddizione are in Naples and Venice, but additional material can be found in locations such as Lisbon, Dresden and Vienna.\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{77} DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 76.
\textsuperscript{78} Baroni held his post from 1778–1792. His last opera was given in Rome, 1778. Baroni was a teacher and relative of Muzio Clementi.
\textsuperscript{79} DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 79.
\textsuperscript{80} Many of the works that exist are also popular works extracted from the operas. Apart from the catalogues to be acknowledged in Chapter Two, many of Guglielmi’s works exist in the King’s Theatre Collection.
\textsuperscript{81} Pietro Guglielmi, Il ratto della sposa. A comic opera: As perform’d at the King’s Theatre in the Hay-Market. The Music entirely new by Signor Pietro Guglielmi, a Neapolitan Composer. The Poetry of the Two first Acts by Signor Gaetano Martinelli and the Third by Giovan Gualberto Bottarelli (London, 1768). It could be assumed here that adjustments were made to the music, given the added note ‘the music entirely new’ on the cover of the libretto.
\textsuperscript{82} A substantial collection of Guglilemi’s work can also be found at the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden (S.L.U.B.). Several of his opere buffe are also in the collection maintained by Maria Antonia Walpurgis after the death of Augustus III, King of Poland. These include his first two, Il ratto della sposa and I rivali placati.
The Case for Neapolitan Opera

It is a well-documented fact that commercial opera began in Venice in 1637, and that it quickly spread to other cities. Rosand’s account describes the birth of opera in Florence, its further development in Rome, and its eventual consolidation and commercialization in Venice. Its permanent establishment there was enabled by three factors existing in this city: regular demand, dependable financial backing and a broad and predictable audience.\(^{83}\) Parma, Bologna and Padua had already seen some performances by wandering groups. The *commedie dell’arte* received a considerable injection of southern, particularly Neapolitan, traits during its rise in popularity. Itinerant troupes of singers, generally from Rome, or trained in the Roman style of singing,\(^{84}\) the travelling lyric troupes throughout the north of Italy in the seventeenth century, as well as the itinerant troupes of the *comici dell’arte* played various roles in the dissemination and the commercialization of opera.

It is difficult to pinpoint exactly the influences that were crucial in the development of *opera buffa*, and although some generic devices such as recitatives and exiting arias were taken from *opera seria*, *opera buffa* is not completely tied to it. Pirrotta maintains that the *comici* were inspired to afford music a greater role than was already present due to intense competition faced by itinerant lyric troupes. In recent times, Kirkendale’s research on the Roman Emilio Cavalieri claims that the ‘earliest documentation for the humorous effect’ characteristic of the *opera buffa* was provided by Cavalieri’s *pastorals* of 1590 and 1595.\(^{85}\) It was not until the early eighteenth century that the operatic form known as the *commedia per musica napoletana* gained significance.\(^{86}\)

According to Michael Robinson, dialect operas were commonplace in Naples throughout the eighteenth century, but once an opera of this type moved north, it became necessary for the

\(^{83}\) See Rosand’s introduction; Rosand, *Opera in 17th Century Venice*, 1.

\(^{84}\) Pirrotta, “Commedia dell’Arte and Opera”, 316.


\(^{86}\) First rising to prominence at the Teatro Fiorentini. See DelDonna “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 15. See also Cotticelli and Maione, *Un onesto divertimento*. 
dialect to be removed and replaced with standard Italian. Conversely, non-Neapolitan material rarely reached Naples, and libretti by non-Neapolitans were used there only infrequently. For Anfossi’s *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, Palomba set the text in the Neapolitan dialect for what we assume to have been the inauguration of this plot. This raises the question of the degree to which Guglielmi’s opera may be considered a Neapolitan opera. *Lo spirito di contradizione* is an opera, not composed by a Neapolitan for performance in Naples, but by a non-Neapolitan for a Venetian audience. It displays, however, the characteristics associated with the Neapolitan comedic genre, its original libretto created by a Neapolitan and delivered in the Neapolitan language. Its composer was a pupil of Santa Maria de Loreto, taught by one of its leading teachers, Francesco Durante. The highly-Neapolitan character of the work produced by Anfossi and Palomba, characterized by the characters and their local settings, permeates Martinelli’s and Guglielmi’s northern versions. DelDonna’s recent writings acknowledge Goldoni’s impact on the *commedia per musica* and the influence exerted on Neapolitan librettists. The two operas at the centre of this discussion display many Goldonian characteristics, some of which go back to the *commedia delle arte*. The conventional *opera buffa* plot contained the shenanigans of charlatans, incorporating elements of disguise and mistaken identity, as was brilliantly emulated in Da Ponte’s *Così fan tutte* in its Neapolitan setting. The various love intrigues are eventually resolved and all ends well.

The plots discussed here are also shaped according to Lipton’s formula based on the Goldonian comic methods:

- a series of intrigues in which lower and middle-class characters aspire to the status of their upper-class employers
- an erratic baroness
- an ineffective governor
- a quack doctor

---

87 Robinson, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera*, 188. Some Italian is present in the text of *Lo sposo di tre*, in such parts as the Baronesse, Odoardo and Lismene. In some cases, the composers’ own provincial dialect and accent infiltrates the text: Guglielmi, from Massa-Carrara and Anfossi from Taggia, both in the Ligurian region.

88 I have not been able to ascertain the origins of this story, or how it came to be a libretto for the 1763 premiere. These two works are not mentioned in the *Opera Plot Index*. See E. William Studwell & David A. Hamilton, *The Opera Plot Index: A Guide to Locating Plots and Descriptions of Operas, Operettas and other works of the Musical Theater and Associated Material* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1990).

89 For further explanation on the qualities of the Neapolitan comedic genres see Anthony DelDonna, *Opera, Theatrical Culture and Society*, 6.


91 Lipton, “Opere Buffe”, 121.

92 Lipton, “Opere Buffe”, 120.
• an idealistic lover
• a charlatan or smooth-talking swindler.

Each of the three female characters in Guglielmi’s and Anfossi’s plots conspires to arrange three marriages to the same man. The discussion of Neapolitan Opera, including its developments in the eighteenth century, and Guglielmi’s place within and contribution to the buffa genre, necessitates a study of the libretti: the characters, the settings and the plots.\(^9\)

\(^9\) For further explanation on the discussion of the Neapolitan style, see DelDonna, *Opera, Theatrical Culture and Society*, 11.
Chapter Two

The Labyrinth of Texts

Guglielmi was a composer of his time. He used compositional conventions to good effect, such as exit arias and orchestration devices for key characters. These, together with the close collaboration he developed with his librettists and performers skilled in mimicry, expressiveness, adaptability and recitation, enabled him to achieve successful performance seasons. This chapter discusses the storyline of Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna of 1763 (with a focus on the libretto of Lo spirito di contraddizione of 1766) to provide insights on how the former provided a point of reference to other works, and how it was disseminated and transmitted. Some comparisons will also be made regarding the versions in Italian and in the Neapolitan dialect.

When works are labelled as being written in the Neapolitan dialect, this is not necessarily true of the whole play. At times, Italian was used for certain characters depending on the class or demeanor the author wished to portray. Robinson maintains that in comic opera, the use of Neapolitan dialect and standard Italian (Tuscan) served to delineate one group of characters from another: the comic (parti buffe) and the serious (parti serie). This view rings true. Robinson’s point on the delineation of characters is particularly relevant to Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna in the libretti of 1763 and 1767. It is worth bearing in mind eighteenth-century usage of stylistic differentiations with regard to delivery of the text; for example, the use of a fast parlando for the comic character and ‘roulades and vocalisations’ for the serious one. It could be argued that the commedia’s intricate sub-plots and embroilments with the upper and lower classes added to the ‘depth and intimacy’ in performance, creating a verismo in its own right, an idiom that became synonymous with opera buffa.

---

1 I am grateful to Michael Robinson for pointing this out to me. See also Robinson, Naples and Neapolitan Opera, 195 (Chepstow, 16 April, 2013)

The post-modern method of editing that takes into account the forces involved in the creation of the score necessitates that the libretto be brought into discourse. The libretto not only supplies the play but also, when printed, documents such information as the author/s, the time and place of the performance, stage directions, the dedication or royal ode, and the names of the directors (musical, stage and choreographer), and cast members. This proves to be the case in the libretto of 1763, where we learn on page 68 that the music was all composed by Anfossi except for the ‘...opening, the three finali and the Baroness’s Aria in Act III that were composed by Pietro Guglielmi’. As established by Kay Lipton, the ‘opening’ (apertura) is stated as being the beginning (vocal) ensemble that follows the Sinfonia. The same note was placed on the first page of the 1768 libretto with the word apertura replaced by the word introduzione. What the libretti do not reveal is how the collaboration between the composer and librettist occurred and evolved. It appears that it was not uncommon for the two to be based in different places, often quite far away. Metastasio for instance, was able to maintain his status as a popular figure amongst the high-class Neapolitan public, and continued to dominate the operatic scene in Italy despite being posted in Vienna. Rosand offers a description of how works were usually conceived and points out that the relationship between the librettist and composer was often conducted over a long distance. This meant that the composers did not always know their casts in advance and were unable to fashion the music accordingly.

Turning now to the works that concern us here, it is necessary to consider the various libretti, referred to either as Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna or Lo spirito di contradizione, and to consider the ways in which they are related, and how they evolved from their initial points of departure. These works are listed chronologically in Table 1. It should be noted that the omission of an author’s name from a printed libretto was often a sign that the libretto had been altered in some way. The works are referred to by the abbreviated names Lo Spirito and Lo Sposo. The authors of the libretti are provided (whether they are named in the libretto or not), and the composers of the music for each work are also given. The place of composition,

---

3 Si avvertisce, che la musica, come si è detto è del Signor D. Pascale Anfossi, a riserba perè dell’apertura, i tre finali, e l’aria della Baronessa all’Atto III, che sono stati posti in musica dal Sig. D. Pietro Guglielmi.
4 Robinson, Naples and Neapolitan Opera, 37–38.
5 Rosand, “Una carta del navegar”, 198.
further comments, and references to the current availability of each of these sources is explained. This material is analysed in more detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lo Spirito</th>
<th>Lo Sposo</th>
<th>Libretto</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dufresney</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L'esprit de Contradiction</td>
<td>Paris; one-act play. In French. Translated into Italian (Gualzetti, Melani) and into English (Morlock).</td>
<td>French libretto online, English translation through Project Gutenberg. Italian translation in numerous libraries including Naples, Biblioteca nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Goldoni</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Venice; five-act play; premièred at Carneval. In Italian – Martellian verse.</td>
<td>Editions and reprints readily available; the plays are collected in volumes. Also held in Venice, Biblioteca d’arte del Museo civico Correr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>Guglielmi</td>
<td>Venice; three-acts; Teatro San Moisè; Carnevale. In Italian.</td>
<td>Manuscript at Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna; libretto in Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi/ Other authors not named / Gasmann</td>
<td>Naples; three acts; Teatro Nuovo sopra Toledo; Autumn. In Neapolitan dialect.</td>
<td>Published by Gennaro Migliaccio, Naples. Libretto in Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi / Guglielmi / Gasmann</td>
<td>Vienna; three acts; Teatri Privilegiati, Ghelen; Spring. In Italian.</td>
<td>Manuscript at Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna. Libretto at University of Wisconsin library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>de Lima</td>
<td>Lisbon; three acts; Teatro Salvaterra; Carnevale. In Italian.</td>
<td>Libretto in Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica; Venezia, Biblioteche della Fondazione Giorgio Cini.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi/ Guglielmi/</td>
<td>Naples; three acts; Real Teatro del Fondo di Separazione. In Italian?</td>
<td>Libretto in Naples, Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica S. Pietro a Majella.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Lo Spirito</td>
<td>Lo Sposo</td>
<td>Libretto</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Palomba</td>
<td>Anfossi / Guglielmi / Giordano</td>
<td>Aquila; three acts; Teatro della città dell’Aquila. No composer mentioned but attributed to the three by Florimo and Schatz. In Neapolitan dialect</td>
<td>Published by Amato Cons, Naples; libretto in Washington, Library of Congress and Biblioteca della Società Napoletana di Storia Patria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Livigni)</td>
<td>Brunetti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna; two acts; Teatro Zagnoni. In Italian.</td>
<td>Published under Sassi. Venice, Biblioteca della Fondazione Giorgio Cini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Palomba)</td>
<td>Gnecco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milan; two acts, Teatro La Scala; Lent. In Italian.</td>
<td>Libretto held in numerous libraries, including Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Livigni</td>
<td>Brunetti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ascoli; two acts. Teatro di Ventidio Basso; Carnevale. In Italian.</td>
<td>Libretto held in Ascoli Piceno, Biblioteca Comunale Giulio Gabrielli.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Versions of *Lo Spirito* and *Lo Sposo*, 1700-1795

In subsequent libretti of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* (1763) in which the librettist is not acknowledged, the story has been amended and characters either added or omitted. The 1768 version produced in Ghelen is a prime example of this. The name of the original composer appears, as does the name of whoever has added an aria for whatever reason. This is usually the Kapellmeister, and in the case of Ghelen, it was Florian Gasmann, who was directing the revival at the time. By the later eighteenth century, works in two acts became customary, and we find one plot of the original libretto condensed to accommodate this.
Timeline of Works Explained

In the following discussion, the works have been separated into two groups. The section entitled “Related Works” provides details of operas and plays that are clearly related to one another. This is followed by a discussion of “Unrelated Works” with similar titles that appear to have no direct connection and for which the similarity of their titles may be no more than a coincidence.  

1. Related Works

Naples, 1763

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* premiered in the autumn of 1763 at the Teatro Nuovo sopra Toledo, Naples. A copy of the libretto exists in Rome at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele III. The libretto was written mostly in the Neapolitan dialect by Antonio Palomba, and the music was composed by Pasquale Anfossi with contributions by Guglielmi: the opening (*apertura*), the three finali and the Baroness’s aria in the third act. The Teatro Nuovo was one of several theaters in Naples purpose-built for the presentation of *commedie per musica napoletana*.  

Antonio Palomba, the uncle of Giuseppe Palomba (also a librettist), and possibly a notary, wrote more than fifty comic libretti in the Neapolitan dialect and works in standard Italian. His works were frequently staged outside Naples, although they were usually set by composers who were associated with Naples.  

DelDonna points out that Palomba may have been part of the *tribunalisti*—educated members of the Neapolitan middle class who were serving in the Spanish bureaucratic establishment.

---

6 The value of including the discussion of libretti related only by their titles is to aid future investigations. In the past, the operas set to Livigni’s libretto have been mistaken for Palomba’s storyline.

7 Antonio Vaccaro’s Teatro Nuovo, with a capacity to seat an audience of one thousand spectators, had been constructed in 1724 at the top of Via Toledo on the site of the Giardinello di Montecalvario, near the church of Monte Calvario. The impresario Angelo Carasale played a key role in the construction of the Teatro Nuovo, later serving as its impresario and subsequently moving to Teatro San Bartolomeo. See DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 44. For a history on the Teatro Nuovo sopra Montecalvario see also Coticelli and Maione, *Onesto divertimento ed allegria de’ popoli: Materiali per una storia dello spettacolo a Napoli nel primo Settecento* (Mila: Ricordi, 1996), 137-158.


10 These men were of social standing through the encouragement by the Austrian rulers, but, as in the case of the lawyer Goldoni in Venice, had the ability to portray the local milieu and subsequently inculcate it into their own creative projects. See DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 25.
I have not been able to locate the original source or plot of *Lo sposo di tre e marito di nessuna*, either in Neapolitan or in standard Italian. The plotline of one man attempting to marry three women in order to escape with their dowries may have arisen earlier than 1763 and been conceived beyond Palomba and his contemporaries. The origin of the plot and whether it began with Palomba’s 1763 libretto warrants further investigation in the future. The *commedie delle arte* springs to mind when a character such as Falloppio is presented, or Tartuffe when the plot involves the activities of an imposter.

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* evokes the typical Neapolitan setting, one that is by the sea, and this is emphasized by the Countess making her first entry by boat. As well as this, the Neapolitan language is used. The three acts are divided as follows:

- Act I – seventeen scenes
- Act II – sixteen scenes
- Act III – fifteen scenes

The cast of characters, following the Goldonian comic stereotypes outlined in the previous chapter, and the use of language is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Baronessa</td>
<td>Flighty Baroness, prospective fiancée</td>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunziella</td>
<td>Rich peasant, prospective fiancée</td>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giacomina</td>
<td>Prospective fiancée</td>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismene</td>
<td>Idealistic lover</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Tomasino</td>
<td>Smooth-talking swindler</td>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Belisario</td>
<td>Ineffective governor</td>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Falloppio</td>
<td>Quack doctor</td>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo</td>
<td>Idealistic lover</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. *Language distribution of Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*

The theme of ‘contradiction’ is present in the plot but with an angle that differs from the previous play. It is perpetuated by the antagonistic baroness and referred to briefly by Don Tomasino:

*Chesta è na stravagante, e fa il contrario de quanto se le dice*
(This woman is a bizarre one, and does the opposite of what she says)

and expressed by the Baroness in her aria, Act One:

*Cpara la regola, siente la scola:* Learn the rule, listen to the school
*De quanto dice chi se vo bene:* of what he says if he loves you
*Tutto il contrario s’ave da fa:* All to the contrary must be done.
Furthermore, when the Baroness lays down the law to Don Tomasino prior to what she thinks will be their marriage:

*Per questo voglio a tene. E se sposannomi*  
This is why I want you. And if we marry
*Le bizzarrie del mio contrario umore*  
My outlandish, contrary humour
*Lieto sopporterai*  
You will happily bear.

Guglielmi’s role in setting the music was for the *apertura*, the three finali and the Baroness’s aria in Act Three. Where Guglielmi’s music begins and ends in the opera is best understood with reference to the score, and is discussed in Chapter Three. Don Belisario’s first lines in the opening scene are as follows, as he tries to quell the maddening crowd wanting to be heard at the tribunal:

*Che susurro! Che sciabbacco!*  
What noise! What racket!
*Zitto lla, potta de bacco.*  
Silence there, no more noise.
*A tte il ciucio hanno arrobato?*  
Has your donkey been stolen?
*A tte t’hanno stravisato?*  
Were you beaten?
*A tte filglieta sbiata?*  
Has your daughter run off?
*V’aggio ntiso, jate a gliannola.*  
I have understood, get lost all of you
*Veniant partes coram me*  
Come the contenders before me.11

Although her noble status needs to be portrayed, the Baroness speaks predominantly in Neapolitan dialect except when she is playing her more official role as the Baroness of the tribunal. To give a sense of authority, Latin is used for some pronouncements made by her or the Governor. Lismene, who is the Governor’s sister and in love with Odoardo, speaks in Italian in order to portray a less-comic yet endearing appeal. Odoardo, in love with Giacomina, speaks in Italian when communicating with her, while she speaks in Neapolitan, lending his character the more serious tone. This point regarding ‘serious’ and ‘comic’ characters is in keeping with Robinson’s theory of the *parti serie* and the *parti buffe*. The characters of Odoardo and Lismene speak in Italian and display the qualities of earnestness, steadfastness and feelings of love, although Odoardo is at first infatuated by Giacomina.12 His idealism is emphasized in Act One, Scene Eleven with reference to Ottavia’s words in *L’incoronazione di Poppea*:

11 I thank Laura Mauriello for her guidance in these translations (email 28 Feb, 2013).
Che mi avenne!
What happened to me?
Ove Son! Che fò! che penso!....
Where am I? What am I doing? What am I thinking?
...misero gioco di Fortuna, e d’Amore...
...pitiable games of Fortune and Love

Don Tomasino is allocated the Neapolitan dialect but needs to use Italian to emphasise his title in Scene Six (Act One) when he is convincing Giacomina that he is a gentleman of noble birth:

Ci ababbo io per mia puntualità
I abide by my punctuality
Son gentiluom di nascita, e noi altri
I am a gentleman by birth, and the rest of us
Allorchè qualche debito facciamo,
whilst we may incur some debt,
O li pagamo presto (o non pagamo)
we pay quickly (or we don’t pay)

However, he cannot help slipping back into dialect on the word for ‘we pay’: pagamo rather than paghiamo. These subtleties would not have been lost on Neapolitan audiences.

To emphasize the Baroness’s rank and nobility, she does not make her first appearance until Scene Nine, when she enters by boat to the sounds of the local band, thereby creating an impact upon entrance. Her Cavatina is not preceded by recitative and she is given her exit aria in the very next scene. This allows her a longer time on stage and sets her character apart from the others. In Scene Nine, Act Two, after the tribunal with the Baroness, Don Belisario and Don Falloppio are also ‘speaking’ in Italian. Don Falloppio tries to assert himself as the medico, speaking in Italian to lend himself a higher rank and importance:

Un palpito di cor! Questo è cattivo.
A jolt to the heart! This is bad.
Eccovi qua un Galen, e un Ippocrasso
Here we have a Galen and Hippocrates
Pronto a far la gran cura.
Ready to offer the grand cure.

The opening ensemble mentioned earlier depicts the tribunal and the Governor’s efforts to co-ordinate proceedings. The tribunal reconvenes with the presence of the Baroness and only comes to fruition by the finale of the first act after the machinations of the plot have been set up. The finale to the first act calls for the Baroness to open the scene by announcing the first litigation:

Falloppio de Falloppiis
Falloppio of Falloppiis
Con supplica umilissima
With humble petition
Expone a oscia illustrissima
Is here to show his Lordship
Come appuntò i sponsali
the way he officiated at the wedding
Co Nunzia Panarella
of Nunzia Panarella
Ch’è quella, che sta qui.
The one that sits here.
Act Two depicts the process by which Don Tomasino covers his tracks with Don Belisario, Don Falloppio and Odoardo, and the ways in which he convinces them individually that he is not interested in any of their fiancées. It all proves too much for him, and the following text, in Italian, expresses his reflection on the severity of his situation:

Eccome nell’intrico
De fa tre matrimonie, e stipulare
In un istesso istante, tre Capitoli

Here I am in the bind
of making three marriages, and stipulating
In the same moment, three dowries

By the third act, Don Tomasino has been found out. Preceding the Baroness’s aria in this act is the recitative, which expresses her distress at being deceived by Don Tomasino and her wish to have him behind bars:

Si carceri l’indegno, e fra catene
Vo che si chiuda in prigionia profonda.

Place the unworthy in jail and in chains
I want him thrown into the dungeon

At this point we find an aria by Guglielmi interpolated into opera. The circumstances for this insertion of extraneous music for the Baroness’s aria of two stanzas in the sixth scene of the third act remain a matter of speculation. Moreover, the first stanza momentarily introduces another character into the plot, the languishing shepherd Aminta, protagonist of Tasso’s famous poem of 1573:

Dove son! Che cosa oscura!
E aquidotto, o sepoltura!
Già s’è l’aria serenata,
E in campagna lieta, grata
Trasformato in caperarello
Mentre Aminta pastorello
Si sta solo a lamentar.

Where am I? What a dark place
Is it water, or grave?
The air has already cleared
and into a happy, welcome country
transformed to the reverse(?)
while Aminta the shepherd
remains alone to lament.

This reference to the extraneous character Aminta certainly invites speculation that Guglielmi’s aria may not have been composed specifically for this opera, but may have been an existing aria interpolated into the opera for reasons that perhaps go beyond its broad topical suitability. It should be remembered that Metastasio’s libretto of Il re pastore based on Tasso’s Aminta (1573) had been in circulation since 1751, and although Guglielmi’s aria does not appear to be drawn from Metastasio’s text, it should be noted that Guglielmi did eventually set Metastasio’s libretto for a version of Il re pastore premièred in Venice at the Teatro San Benedetto in 1767.
Guglielmi became known for his final act finali, with the dialogue and the music structured in the form of *duetti*. Six of the characters are paired as follows:

- The Baroness – Don Bellisario
- Don Falloppio – Nunziella
- Giacomina – Don Tomasino

The opening phrase is given to the Baroness, *Quann’io faccio la sgregnosa*. The outcome of the plot is that Giacomina and Don Tomasino are left unpartnered.

As will be seen in the subsequent versions and revivals to *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, the new authors at the very least sought to shorten the opera by a minimum of three scenes. Prior to this libretto of 1763, Palomba had provided the libretti for Guglielmi’s *La ricca locanderia, I due soldati* and *La donna di tutti I caratteri*. Guglielmi’s collaboration with Anfossi therefore remains a mystery, although we know that he was established as a composer by this time.

**Venice, 1766**

*Lo spirito di contraddizione* was premièred at Carnevale in 1766 at the San Moisè Theater in Venice, and was entirely composed by Guglielmi to a libretto written by Martinelli in standard Italian. The libretto is held in Venice in the Biblioteca di Studi Teatrali Casa di Carlo Goldoni, but is now widely available as a Garland facsimile. By the mid-eighteenth century, Italian composers and their music, as well as librettists, were enjoying immense popularity outside Italy. For example Metastasio, employed in Vienna in 1730 as successor to the Venetian poet Apostolo Zeno, was considered to be the greatest poet in Europe. Martinelli was employed part-time in Germany at the court of Württemberg in Ludwigsberg. He was then appointed as court poet in 1769 by his friend and former colleague Jommelli, who was serving as Director of Music to the court of Portugal. Whether Martinelli’s communication with Guglielmi was by letter or whether he had a face-to-face collaboration with him at some stage is not known.

---

14 Information on this part of Martinelli’s career remains somewhat scant.
15 De Brito, *Opera in Portuguese*, 40.
In 1766 the plot of Palomba’s libretto appears as *Lo spirito di contradizione*, fully attributed to Gaetano Martinelli, distributed in three acts and with music by Guglielmi. The reason for this particular title remains a mystery. It may have been that Martinelli wished to disguise the true origins of his story and borrowed the title of Goldoni’s play *Lo spirito di contradizione* that had already been in circulation for eight years. The cast of eight characters in the libretti of 1763 and 1766 mirror each other closely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</em>, 1763</th>
<th><em>Lo spirito di contradizione</em>, 1766</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>La Baronessa</strong> – Antagonistic noble, in love with Don Tomasino</td>
<td><strong>Countess Flaminia</strong> - Baronesse of the castle, in love with Don Cesarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giacomina</strong> – Civil maiden, in love with Don Tomasino</td>
<td><strong>Lisetta the well-born</strong> – Maiden of condition, in love with Don Cesarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nunziella</strong> – wealthy farmer, in love with Don Tomasino</td>
<td><strong>Cecchina</strong> – wealthy peasant, suburban dweller, in love with Don Cesarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Tomasino</strong> – vagabond, impostor</td>
<td><strong>Don Cesarino</strong> - vagabond and impostor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Belisario</strong> – Governor of locality, ignorant and boor</td>
<td><strong>Governor Asdrubale</strong> – ignorant and in love with the Countess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Falloppio</strong> – tatterdemalion, in love with Nunziella</td>
<td><strong>Orazio Capocchio</strong> – charlatan, secretariat, in love with Lisetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Odoardo</strong> – in love with Giacomina</td>
<td><strong>Agabito</strong> – notary of the locality, in love with Cecchina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lismene</strong> – Governor’s sister, in love with Odoardo</td>
<td><strong>Nannetta</strong> - the governor’s sister, in love with the Agabito, the notary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. **Characters in Palombo’s *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* (1763) and Martinelli’s *Lo spirito di contradizione* (1766)**

Agabito and Nannetta replace Odoardo and Lismene as the idealistic lovers, and Orazio replaces Don Falloppio as the quack doctor. As was common in *buffa* practices, non-singing extras were included. In this case: *contadini e contadine* (farmers and peasants) needed at the tribunal scene, syndicates of the community, two servants for the Countess, three notaries, a jailer and, to emphasize the Venetian setting, a gondolier. This performance at the San Moisè included two ballet scenes, one of which represented soldiers who had just deserted, having swapped their clothing with local shepherds in the open countryside. For an explanation of ballet scenes (*Balli*) and their subject matter in the three-act opera see McClymonds *Jommelli’s Last Years*, 47.
the third of which requires seven scenes fewer than the earlier version to bring it to a conclusion, are divided as follows:

- Act I – seventeen scenes
- Act II – sixteen scenes
- Act III – eight scenes

The opening scene of Act One mirrors the 1763 libretto. The Governor Asdrubale is holding an audience and is receiving grievances from various people. Lisetta, Cecchina and the charlatan Orazio are demanding to be heard. The love intrigues are established from the outset: Lisetta complains that Orazio wants to force her to marry him. Asdrubale threatens him with prison. Orazio responds that she did love him and had promised to marry him, to which Asdrubale writes out an order with a demand for her to marry him. The scene is punctuated by the Governor’s complaints about the pressures of his job. Agabito, the notary, is in love with Cecchina, but she will not respond to his advances. Nannetta, the governor’s sister, is in love with Agabito, and complains about men. The text of the opening ensemble from 1763 was used, translated into Italian (right column).

- Che susurro! Che sciabbacco!
- Zitto lla, potta de bacco.
- A tte il ciuccio hanno arrobato?
- A tte ’hanno stravisato?
- A tte filgletta sbiata?
- V’aggio ntiso, jate a giannola.
- Veniant partes coram me.

- Che sussurro, che fracco!
- Zitto un poco, non più chiasso:
- A te l’asino han rubato?
- Tu sei stato bastonato?
- La tu figlia sen fuggì?
- V’ho già inteso, Signor si:
- Veniant partes coram me.

Don Cesarino is the vagabond and impostor whose greatest attraction is not only his charm but also the title of nobility. He promises to marry Lisetta but tells her that she must wait, as he is temporarily short of cash. She suggests that her dowry of a thousand scudi will tide him over for the wedding expenses. Cesarino assures her:

- Non dubitar, da cavalier d’onore
- Manterò la promessa.

- Do not doubt, I am a cavalier of honour
- I will hold my promise.

She is besotted and is prepared to overlook the sum of money he requests. Similar conversations are subsequently held with Cecchina and La Contessa. Don Cesarino’s soliloquy enables him to reflect on which of the beautiful women he should wed (Lisetta, Cecchina or the Countess).
Orazio questions Cesarino whether the rumors are true: will he wed Lisetta? Cesarino emphatically denies it. Cecchina arrives, much to Cesarino’s embarrassment, and sympathizes with Orazio’s affections for Lisetta. Cecchina wants to finalize the marriage arrangements with Cesarino quickly. Again, Cesarino expresses his temporary shortage of cash and she promises him five hundred *zecchini* as initial payment upon the signing of the contract. Cesarino joins Agabito in going to greet the Countess, who is arriving back from her journey. Everyone gathers to welcome her. The Countess’s arrival in Scene Twelve is marked by her *cavatina, Da quest’onde disturbata*, as a precursor to her aria *Quei languidi sospiri* in the following scene. This enables her to remain on stage for longer, following the same strategy used by Palomba in 1763. She is arrogant and rude and dismisses them all except for Cesarino. She declares that she wishes to marry him. The Countess’s arrival prompts Orazio to announce himself as the *medico*. She refuses to allow Orazio to speak up and tears up the Governor’s memorial. The theme of contradiction is expressed by Don Cesarino:

\[
\text{Questa fra le più pazze, è la regina,} \\
\text{il suo maggior piacere è in contradire}
\]

Of the craziest women she is the queen  
Her greatest pleasure is in contradicting.

As Don Cesarino is approached and questioned by each of the prospective fiancées, they hear of his affiliation with the other woman. He explains his behaviour each time with the excuse that he is acting as marriage broker for the other. In his second soliloquy, he reflects and gloats that he will have three dowries by the following morning when he plans to flee. Orazio arrives to demand Lisetta’s hand and shows the Countess the memorial written by the Governor, in which it is clearly stated that Lisetta loves Cesarino. Due to the Countess’s contradictory nature, Cesarino’s ploy is to confess his guilt, and she promptly pronounces his innocence. He asks that Lisetta and Cecchina be allowed to present their cases, and as Cesarino predicts, she will not hear any complaints.

In Act Two Agabito pines for Cecchina, but the Governor’s sister Nannetta continues to declare that she loves him. The Governor orders the notary not to speak to his sister. Agabito assures him that he loves Cecchina, who in turn rejects him. The Governor, in love with the Countess, has been rejected by her. She arranges with Cesarino to marry him and he in turn arranges his marriage with Lisetta. Orazio, in the meantime, is led to believe that Cesarino will marry Lisetta. Agabito believes that he will marry Cecchina and the Governor believes that he will marry the Countess, all due to Cesarino’s power to convince. The Governor believes that
Cesarino will marry Lisetta. When Cesarino leaves, the three men realize that he has lied to them all. Cesarino further attempts to convince the Governor by bringing a notary with him to Lisetta’s house. The Governor listens in on their arrangements and is happy. Cesarino convinces Orazio that he intends to marry Cecchina by bringing a notary with him to her house. Orazio listens in on their arrangements, and he is content. In the chancery, three tables are set up. All parties arrive one after the other, and by sheer audacity Cesarino signs all three marriage contracts, while having convinced each party that he is acting on behalf of a friend. He then pockets the three dowries and leaves. Soon everyone discovers that Cesarino has taken their money and has gone, and they seek him out. One by one, the women take back their dowries and reproach him heavily for his crime.

Act Three opens with the Governor reporting the news that Don Cesarino has been incarcerated and that Lisetta and Cecchina…

They cried four tears or so; but afterwards (following the female style) their bewailing ended in the search of new lovers.

The Countess continues to reject the Governor’s advances. In keeping with her contradictory nature, the Countess convinces the notary Agabito that he should marry Nannetta despite the Governor’s protests. Even though they will be brothers-in-law, the Governor demands that the notary continue to address him by his title. Following this, the Governor decides to propose to Cecchina. Lisetta and Orazio get together and the governor asks Cecchina for her hand. In the final scene Cesarino is brought before the Countess, begging for mercy:

Shameful sighing
Tearful, sobbing
here, at the end is Don Cesarin who asks you for mercy.

After the charges are read out to him, the Countess banishes him. He laments his outcome of having no wife. Cecchina accepts the Governor’s proposal.

As in the 1763 opera, Guglielmi’s finale is structured as duetti. It is likely that he requested Martinelli to keep the dialogue metered in the same way, translated to Italian, so that he could
retain the music. Unlike the 1763 libretto where the Baroness initiates the dialogue, here Lisetta begins the duets, admitting her love to Orazio in her coquettish manner:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Quando io faccio la ritrosa} & \quad \text{When I play bashful} \\
\text{Che in amor dico di nò;} & \quad \text{That in love I say ‘no’;} \\
\text{Dice il core allor così} & \quad \text{Then the heart says to do so} \\
\text{Caro sposo eccomi qui.} & \quad \text{Dear husband, I am here.}
\end{align*}
\]

Following Lisetta and Orazio, Cecchina and the Governor sing of their love for one another and the finale brings the Countess and Cesarino together for a duet: she castigates him and he continues to lament his losses. They remain unpartnered.

In her study of Martinelli’s libretti that were produced in collaboration with his colleague and friend Jommelli at the Portuguese court, McClymonds found that they are ‘…lighthearted, sometimes hilarious parodies on the foibles of humankind’. While \textit{Lo spirito di contraddizione} is largely a recreation of a previous work, this opera is an example of a well-organized plot. Martinelli’s re-structuring of the plot enables the action to flow exceptionally well, and to come together as a well-polished finale.

\textbf{Naples, 1767}

\textit{Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna} was revived at the Teatro Nuovo sopra Toledo in the Autumn of 1767 in Naples. No score survives, but a copy of the 1767 libretto exists in the Museo Internazionale de Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna, published in Naples by Gennaro Migliaccio. Palomba’s name appears nowhere in the libretto. The libretto states that the music is by Pasquale Anfossi, ‘except for the finali, and the arias of Lauretta, that are from other authors’. No mention is made of Guarracino’s aria and its composer. Guglielmi is not mentioned, and in the absence of a score, the presence of his music can neither be confirmed nor denied. As the omission of Palomba’s name as the librettist suggests, changes were made to accommodate the addition of the new characters, Lauretta and Guarracino. Given the

\begin{itemize}
\item[17] McClymonds also mentions that the Jommelli and Martinelli collaborations were undeservedly criticized for being ‘heavy’ and ‘unsuccessful’. See Marita P. McClymonds, \textit{Niccolò Jommelli}, xviii.
\item[18] Antonio Palomba, \textit{Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna} (Napoli: Gennaro Migliaccio, 1767). According to Brown, Sartori’s catalogue does not mention the original \textit{Lo sposo di tre} but two subsequent revivals: one in Naples, at the Teatro Nuovo sopra Toledo in the Autumn of 1767 and the performance of 1768 in Vienna.
\item[19] \textit{La musica è del Signor D. Pascale Anfossi Maestro di Cappella Napoletano, a riserba dei finali, e delle arie di Lauretta, che sono di altri Autori}.\end{itemize}
changes to the text and the reference to other composers in the libretto, this version of 1767 could be considered as a pasticcio.

With such changes, comparisons can still be made with Martinelli’s versions of the characters. The table below shows the characters and their 1767 counterparts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, 1763</th>
<th>Lo spirito di contraddizione, 1766</th>
<th>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, 1767</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Baronessa: antagonistic woman keen on Don Tomasino</td>
<td>La Contessa Flaminia: Baroness of the castle, in love with Don Cesarino</td>
<td>La Baronessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunziella, the rich peasant keen on Don Tomasino</td>
<td>Cecchina: wealthy peasant, suburban dweller, in love with Don Cesarino</td>
<td>Nunziella: the rich peasant keen on Don Tomasino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giacomina: maiden of condition, keen on Don Tomasino</td>
<td>Lisetta: maiden of condition, in love with Don Cesarino</td>
<td>Giacomina: in love with Don Tomasino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Tomasino: the vagabond, impostor</td>
<td>Don Cesarino: vagabond, impostor</td>
<td>Don Tomasino: the vagabond, impostor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Belisario, the ignorant Governor</td>
<td>II Governatore Asdrubale: Ignorant, in love with the Countess</td>
<td>Don Belisario: the ignorant Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo: in love with Giacomina, admired by Lismene</td>
<td>Agabito: Notary admired by Nannetta</td>
<td>Odoardo: admired by Lismene,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Falloppio</td>
<td>Orazio Capocchio: Charlatan</td>
<td>Don Falloppio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismene: the Governor’s sister</td>
<td>Nannetta: the Governor’s sister, in love with Agabito</td>
<td>Lismene: the Governor’s sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character addition - Lauretta: the Baroness’s maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character addition - Guarracino: Don Tomasino’s lackey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Characters in Martinelli’s Lo spirito di contraddizione (1766) and Anfossi’s Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna (1763 and 1767)

The name of the composer of Lauretta’s and Guarracino’s arias could have been on the score. Guarracino is named on the cast list as played by a female—possibly a mezzo soprano—and is given an aria in Act One. Lauretta sings one aria in each of the first two acts. The Neapolitan language was retained for this revival, as was Italian for the characters Odoardo and Lismene. Lauretta’s character, which evokes a character of stability and endearment, is also in Italian.

The opening scene mirrors that of the previous two operas—“What a noise, what racket!...”—with the Governor trying to maintain order over the people’s complaints and demands to see
the Baroness. In the absence of the score from 1767, it can be safely assumed that Guglielmi’s finale was used. Similarly, the text and syllables chanted by the Baroness in the 1763 finale of Act One fit exactly:

- **Faloppio de [F]alloppis**
- **Con supplica umilissima**
- **Espone a uscia illustrissima,**
- **Come appuntò i sponsali**
- **Co Nunzia Panarella**
- **Ch’è quella che sta qui.**

The entire finale of Act Two also mirrors the 1763 libretto initiated by Don Tommasino, given that the characters of Lauretta and Guarracino are not needed to enter this dialogue:

- **Eccomi nell’intrico**
- **De fai tre matrimonio, e stipulare**
- **In un’istesso istante tre capitoli.**

The editorial note at the beginning of the libretto shows no mention of the Baroness’s aria in Act Three of the original version. The Baroness’s solo differs in this revival, replacing *Dove son! Che cosa oscura!* with *Che si trafﬁga il petto.*

- **Che si trafﬁga il petto,**
- **chi nacque in altra età:**
- **Non è il mio core avvezzo**
- **A tal bestialità.**

It does not seem feasible that Guglielmi composed this aria.

The text of the final scene mirrors the original in the first few lines only, changing thereafter to include the characters of Lauretta and Guarracino. The *duetti* commence halfway through the *scena ultima,* marking the start of the finale, which is retained exactly as it is in the 1763 libretto, as shown earlier. It can only be surmised that Guglielmi’s settings might have been used for the dialogue initiated by the Baroness to the Governor, and continued until the end of the scene.

**Ghelen, 1768**

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* was newly presented in the *Teatri Priviligia*ti in the spring of 1768 in Vienna. The libretto was by Palomba, and the music by Anfossi, Guglielmi and Gasmann. The libretto is to be found at the Österreichiche Nationalsbibliothek, but the
library’s catalogue attributes the text to Filippo Livigni. The libretto for this performance makes no mention of an author but acknowledges Anfossi, Guglielmi and Florian Gasmann as the composers of the music. It provides the same note as in the original libretto of 1763 with the exception of the word *introduzione* replacing the word *apertura*: “that the ‘introduction’, the three finali and the Baroness’s aria in the third act were composed by Guglielmi”.\(^{20}\) The libretto also states that the arias marked with an asterisk are those written by Gasmann, the *Maestro di Cappella di S.M. Imperatore*. No such asterisks are visible in the microfilm copy at my disposal, and may only be visible in the original.\(^{21}\) This *pasticcio* version is presented in Italian for the Viennese audience, but must have been translated directly from Palomba’s libretto of 1763 rather than from the 1767 version. This also suggests that Guglielmi’s Venetian opera was not known in Ghelen at this time, when a fully-Italian version may have been used.

Lismene’s character has been omitted from this version, and much of the script had to be altered to accommodate this change. The three acts were also retained and divided as:

- Act One – fifteen scenes
- Act Two – eleven scenes
- Act Three – ten scenes.

In some cases, apart from the adjustment of the plot to allow for the omission of Lismene, the text does not appear as a direct translation from the Neapolitan dialect of the 1763 libretto to this Italian libretto. The opening provides an example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item *Che sussurro, che fracasso!* What a noise, what racket!
  \item *Ziti un pò non tanto chiaasso.* A little quiet not so much noise.
  \item *A te l’asino han rubato?* Did they steal your donkey?
  \item *A te il grugno han’ammaccato* Did they break your nose?
  \item *A te l’uscio hanno sfondato?* Did they destroy your house?
  \item *V’hò già inteso, andate al Diavolo* I’ve just attended to you, go to to the devil,
  \item *Veniant partes coram me.* Come contenders before me.
\end{itemize}

In this opening, the reference to the ‘daughter running off’ has been substituted for ‘did they destroy your house?’ The finale to the first act, which uses Guglielmi’s music, has been

\(^{20}\) Lipton argues the case that the word *introduzione* in the Viennese libretto refers to the opening ensemble rather than the Sinfonia. See Lipton, “Opere Buffe”, 252 fn.3. This is discussed further in Chapter Three.

\(^{21}\) This is also noted in the Library of Congress entry. The libretto I have examined is a copy taken from a microfilm.
Ecco nell’intrico of having three marriages, and stipulate in the same instance, three dowries.

Eccome as earlier has changed to ecco and the word contratti is used instead of the earlier capitoli. An important feature in Act Two is the introduction of a popular aria that was circulating in the 1700s, attributed to Pergolesi. When the Baroness is on the balcony looking for Don Tomasino, she spots him coming up the street. Don Tomasino notices her standing there, and in an attempt to play ‘hard-to-get’, he begins, after a brief recitative, to sing the famous aria Son già tre di che Nina:

La Baronessa
Sta sul balcon: per far la più invogliare
Non vò badarle, e mettermi a cantare.
“Son già tre di che Nina
In letto se ne sta
Il sonno l’assassina
Svegliatela per pietà...”

The Baroness
is on the balcony, to keep her keen
I won’t acknowledge her, and will sing
“It is three days since Nina
has risen from her bed
The slumber is killing her
Wake her for pity’s sake...”

Whilst Gasmann provided a new Baroness’s aria Quel labrettin di rose to replace the original Caro frà tante, e tante in Act Two, Guglielmi’s aria for the Baroness in Act Three is retained from Palomba’s libretto: Dove son!Che cosa oscura! A comparison of the libretti for the finale of Act Three, however, renders problematic the original editor’s note that three finali were composed by Guglielmi. The lines below are the first few of the finale of the 1768 libretto:

Furfante, ingannatore
Perchè non ci avvezzi
La faccia a pezzi a pezzi
Ti voglio far sfregiar...

Villain, deceiver
Because we are not accustomed to this
Your face into bits and pieces
I want to slash...

As shown below, this is the sextet of 1763 from Scene Thirteen:

Mpostore, ngannatore,
Non è come te pienze
La facce lenze lenze
Te voglio fa strisa!

Imposter, deceiver,
It is not how you think,
Your trickster-like face
I must unravel!

---

22 This aria is also known as Tre giorni son che Nina, which has often been attributed to Pergolesi, but in more recent times it has been labelled ‘Anonymous’. It remains a popular aria for vocal study today. Lipton has given a comprehensive view on this aria and its origins. See Lipton, “Opere Buffe”, 263–266.

23 I thank Laura Mauriello for her guidance (email 3 August, 2013).
The 1768 version, therefore, ends with the sextet, which does not enable the plot to continue unfolding into the *duetti* where the characters are paired off. This libretto does not appear in the Italian catalogues. Like the version of 1767, this opera represents a typical example of eighteenth-century appropriation, the latter also demonstrating the popularity of opera from the Neapolitan-trained composers throughout Europe.

**Lisbon, 1772**

In 1772, Martinelli’s *Lo spirito di contraddizione* was set to new music by the Portuguese composer and former student of San Onofrio a Capuana, Jeronimo Francisco de Lima (1743–1822). This three-act *dramma giocoso* premièred during Carnevale at the Real Teatro di Salvaterra, the court’s winter palace. The libretto can be found at the Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna.

Summoned by his friend Jommelli, Martinelli arrived in Lisbon on 20 May 1769 to finalize his production of *Fetonte* and remained there as court librettist all his life. It was a substantial move from the court of Ludwigsberg, attracting the same wage of 300 *zecchini*. Judging by the correspondence between Martinelli and Jommelli, the friendship could have been a justifiable reason for this move. Apart from overseeing the court’s stage productions, Martinelli’s job also entailed revisions to libretti that needed to be made to accommodate royal tastes. *Lo spirito di contraddizione* was one such example. Given that Martinelli had recreated Anfossi’s libretto in 1766 for a Venetian audience, possibly according to Guglielmi’s instructions, it stands to reason that he should make amendments for a production at the Portuguese court six years later with all male performers, a practice that was still in force in the 1770s. The following table serves as a guide to some of the many revisions that were made to the solos, in order of appearance.

---

24 See McClymonds, ‘Jommelli’. Appendix Six of her book contains the correspondence between Jommelli, Pedro José da Silva Bottelho—director of the royal Portuguese theatres—and Martinelli in the lead-up to the latter’s arrival in Lisbon.
The most obvious change is the omission of the Governor’s sister Nannetta. The question that cannot be answered is whether Martinelli was forced to cut back one character for practical reasons or whether there might be some other explanation. An examination of the libretto and the way in which the changes have been configured leads me to believe that there were practical reasons for these, such as the availability of singers. Martinelli’s re-configuring of the plot starts from Scene Two. The Countess’s entry occurs earlier, in Scene Eight rather than Scene Twelve as happened in the previous libretto. In addition, Cecchina’s character is assigned the aria that belonged to Nannetta in the earlier version.

The acts, therefore, are divided as follows:

- Act I – thirteen scenes
- Act II – seventeen scenes
- Act III – seven scenes

The theme of contradiction continues in this plot as before, but not as loudly. As in the previous plots, the Countess’s character is portrayed as treating her subjects rudely. Her contradictory nature is described by Don Cesarino in Act Two, Scene Two:

- Già lo dissi; la regola non sbaglia;  
  I’ve already said; the rule is never wrong
- Bisogna contradir quel che si vuole  
  You need to contradict what you want.

### Table 6. Comparison of solos between Venice, 1766 and Lisbon, 1772

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Lo spirito di contradizione, 1766</th>
<th>Lo spirito di contradizione, 1772</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Il Governatore: Maledetti</td>
<td>Il Governatore: Maledetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nannetta: Noi sole sempliccette</td>
<td>Agabito: Che contento, che piacere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisetta: Già sento che dal giubilo</td>
<td>Lisetta: Già sento che dal giubilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orazio: Alla tiranna mia</td>
<td>Cecchina: Del mio Don Cesarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecchina: Son troppo vergognosa</td>
<td>La Contessa: Da quest’onde disturbata;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Contessa: Da quest’onde disturbata;</td>
<td>Quei languidi sospiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quei languidi sospiro</td>
<td>Don Cesarino: Lo sposo tuo qual sia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cesarino: Lo sposo tuo qual sia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Nannetta: Mai più non posso pazientar</td>
<td>Cecchina: Noi sole sempliccette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecchina: Da un’altro giovanetto</td>
<td>Il Governatore: Fermati là Saturno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il Governatore: Il mio gran merito</td>
<td>Don Cesarino: Nella stessa preparata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisetta: Tu sai che t’adoro</td>
<td>Lisetta: Sento amor, che vezzosetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cesarino: Voi le spose condurrete</td>
<td>Orazio: Alla tiranna mia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orazio: La mia amorosa</td>
<td>La Contessa: Sento aimè che cosa sia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Contessa: Sento aimè che cosa sia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Nannetta: Non n’è maggior contento</td>
<td>Il Governatore: Perchè così sdegnose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agabito: Al nostro merito</td>
<td>Lisetta: Non v’è maggior contento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cesarino: Vergognoso sospirante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, it could also be suggested that the ending is in keeping with a theme of contradiction: Don Cesarino the impostor ends up marrying the Countess after all, rather than remaining alone as in Martinelli’s version of 1766.

While Guglielmi’s music was popular in the Portuguese court, there is evidence that his music was not retained here: surely it would have been acknowledged in the libretto. None of the catalogue entries I have examined refer to him as a contributor to this version of 1772. Lima’s opera was revived at the Teatro de S. Carlos in Lisbon in 1985. According to The New Grove, the score exists in the Biblioteca de Ajuda in Portugal. An edition of the 1985 revival has not been published to my knowledge, and it has not been possible to confirm whether a new edition was prepared or whether the original score was used. Martinelli was highly regarded by the Portuguese court, particularly by his colleague Jommelli, and his employment continued through difficult economic times until his death in 1794.

Naples and L’Aquila, 1781

Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna was revived twice in 1781 in two cities, Naples and L’Aquila. The OPAC SBN catalogue entries for both libretti do not provide the time or the season of these performances. The performance in Naples was at the Real Teatro del Fondo di Separazione, and that in L’Aquila, the capital of Abruzzo, was at the Teatro della città dell’Aquila. The libretto of the Naples production is attributed to Palomba, the music to Anfossi and Guglielmi. The libretto is held at the Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica S. Pietro a Majella. It has not been possible to consult this libretto during the course of this research. The libretto I have examined belonging to the performance at L’Aquila is held at the Library of Congress.

According to the catalogue entry of the libretto of L’Aquila, the plot was written by Palomba and the music composed by Anfossi with contributions by Guglielmi and Giuseppe

---

25 I was not able to acquire the score during this research project.
26 Whilst Jomelli was under contract to write operas for the court of Lisbon, he was living in Naples at the time. Prior to this contract he had been in Stuttgart. See De Brito, Opera in Portugal, 40.
27 It is also held at the Biblioteca della Società Napoletana di storia patria. The libretto at the Library of Congress is also entered in Schatz’s catalogue and follows the same details.
Giordani. 28 This libretto, however, poses some problems: it is missing the vital information that generally precedes the page listing the characters, including notes on the performance, direction, composers and so forth. The title page noting Palomba’s name as author and the place of performance is barely decipherable—da rappresentarsi nel teatro della città dell’Aquila—and the year of performance is obscured. Pages 58–63 are also missing, from partway through Scene Nine to partway through Scene Thirteen. This is before the sextet which has been retained, but it does make it difficult to determine the entire picture of amendments made. To my knowledge, the scores for these performances do not exist, but with the acknowledgement of Guglielmi’s contribution to the music, it can be assumed that the now-customary movements were retained: the apertura, the three finali and the Baroness’s aria in the third act. The character Lismene was retained in both versions.

An examination of the performance at L’Aquila is best made by comparing it with the Neapolitan libretto of 1763. This performance was kept in the Neapolitan dialect and, out of all of the revivals examined remains most true to that of 1763, in spite of Giordano’s input. The opening ensemble is an exact match, and none of the finali differ in text to those of the original. Guglielmi’s aria for the Baroness, Dove son, che cosa oscura? has also been retained in the third act. Odoardo and Lismene have remained as the parti serie, and their parts are in Italian. The only aria that differs is in Act Two, Scene 13: Don Falloppio’s aria, Tu d’amor sei malatella replaces A zitella innamorata from 1763. It is safe to assume that this was Giordano’s contribution.

These performances, in the early 1780s, were given at a time when the two-act opera was becoming more prevalent. The Neapolitan version of 1781 acknowledges Palomba, Anfossi and Guglielmi, and therefore could not have been altered drastically to two acts, particularly with the character of Lismene retained. The L’Aquila version, acknowledging the three original authors as well as Giordani, could not accommodate large omissions of text as well as retaining Lismene.

28 The Italian OPAC SBN entry only provides Palomba’s name as author. This version is also noted in Florimo’s catalogue but states the source of the libretto as anonymous. See Florimo, La scuola musicale, Vol 4, 346.
Milan, 1793

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* premièred at the Teatro alla Scala during the Lenten season of 1793, in Milan. The libretto, significantly amended into two acts, uses the original plot of Palomba, with newly-composed music by Francesco Gnecco. The libretto is found at the Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna, but a score does not appear to have survived.\(^{29}\) Palomba’s name does not appear on the libretto but is acknowledged on the catalogues. Given that the dedication on the title page of the libretto was written by Giovanni Battista Calvi, there is every reason to believe that he was responsible for the libretto’s amendments and the production of the opera. The plot is the same as in 1763 and the characters have the same names, but many arias are omitted. In fact, the entire libretto is somewhat modified, if not culled significantly, and very little dialect is retained.

The character Lismene was excluded, as in Gasmann’s version of 1768. The opening, apart from the language translation, was slightly adjusted:

\[
\begin{align*}
    Che sussurro, che fracasso & \quad \text{What noise, what a racket} \\
    Zitto un pò non tanto chiasso & \quad \text{Some quiet, not so much noise} \\
    A te l’asino han rubato & \quad \text{Did they steal your donkey?} \\
    A te il viso han fracassato & \quad \text{Did they break your face?} \\
    A te l’uscio hanno sfondato & \quad \text{Did they destroy your house?} \\
    V’ho già inteso; andate al diavolo & \quad \text{I’ve already seen to you, go to the devil} \\
    Veniant partes coram me. & \quad \text{Come contenders before me.}
\end{align*}
\]

Don Belisario’s opening gives the impression that the opera was translated again from the 1763 version and that the character of Lismene was omitted from the original of 1763 rather than from the Vienna libretto of 1768. The fourth and fifth lines of the text above do not mirror Belisario’s lines from 1768. Fewer arias were distributed in this version. Given that the story needed to resolve in two acts, the opera ends with the discovery of Don Tomasino’s plan and with the confrontation.

This performance was dedicated to the Archduke Ferdinando, along with the Archduchess Maria Beatrice Ricciarda, Princess of Modena and Duchess of Massa and granddaughter of Ricciarda Gonzaga who had discovered Guglielmi’s talent decades before. Two ballets were included in this performance: *La fata urgella* and *Li pastori D’Arcadia*. The ballets are not

\(^{29}\) It is also found in libraries across the north of Italy and at the Library of Congress.
only included in the scores but also appear as separate entries, and are both composed by Gnecco. This opera buffa provides yet another eighteenth-century example of a work that was appropriated and re-fashioned according to current needs and trends. This is particularly evident in the move towards the two-act opera.

In summary, a review of Palomba’s plot reveals that the endings have been reconfigured to suit current tastes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</td>
<td>Giacomina and Don Tomasino end up unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Lo spirito di contraddizione</td>
<td>Martinelli changes the ending to leave Don Cesarino and the Countess unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Ghelen</td>
<td>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</td>
<td>No one is paired off; the plot ends with Don Tomasino being caught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Lo spirito di contraddizione</td>
<td>Martinelli changes the ending to Don Cesarino and the Countess marrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna</td>
<td>Don Tomasino is left free.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Plot outcomes

2. Unrelated Works

Paris, 1700

The earliest of the works in the table above is L’esprit de contradiction, conceived in Paris in 1700 by playwright Charles Rivière Dufresny (1648–1724) as one of his first plays. The time and place of the première appear not to be recorded. Unlike some other French plays, such as Beaumarchais’ work that was transformed into The Barber of Seville, the plot of Dufresny’s play does not appear to be the inspiration for Guglielmi’s Lo spirito di contraddizione. The plot bears no immediate resemblance to the earliest Italian version by Martinelli except for some very general similarities such as sharing the subject of contradiction.

The theme of contradiction in Dufresny’s play is perpetuated by Madame Oronte, a woman of social standing, and also by arguments surrounding marriage prospects and the signing of a marriage contract. The characters are as follows:

- Monsieur Oronte
- Madame Oronte
- Lucas – gardener
- Angelique – daughter
- Valère – *in love with Angelique*
- Monsieur Thibaudois – suitor for Angelique
- Notary
- Lackey

Moreover, there are only two male contenders for marriage—M. Thibaudois and Valère—pursuing one female, Angelique. The similarity to Italian plots studied here lies in the central female figure in Dufresny’s play, Madame Oronte. She evokes the aspect of contradiction, and therefore has the central role, and is portrayed as demanding, arrogant and obnoxious, not unlike the countesses or baronesses of the *opera buffa* idiom. Her contradiction is more a condition perpetuated by her own perception that those around her are working against her. Monsieur Oronte has grown to accommodate his wife’s personality by engaging in the battle of wills with the assistance of the family gardener, Lucas. Angelique is a quiet and compliant, yet clever, daughter who has learnt to operate and usurp her parents’ manipulative practices, and quietly operates to have the name of her preferred husband firmly on the marriage contract. It is not until the end of the play that her preferred husband is revealed.

While there are some elementary similarities between this play and the later operas, this appears to be more a coincidence than a conscious borrowing of ideas. Dufresny’s plot lacks some of the central ingredients of comic opera plots, particularly the Goldonian traits mentioned earlier: the buffoonery, the quack doctor and the ineffective governor. This one-act play appears in Italian catalogues as shown above, but not until the very end of the period, by which time the operas of the same name were coming to the end of their vogue. Whether or not this play was based on an existing story warrants further investigation. Dufresny’s play was translated into Italian in 1792, and again in 1922. It was also later appropriated as an English play in two acts suggesting a significant degree of popularity.31

---

31 Dufresny’s play was translated twice: Giacomo Antonio Gualzetti, 1792 and Raffaello Melani in 1922.
Venice, 1758

Carlo Goldoni’s five-act play in verse was premièred in Venice during Carnevale of 1758.\(^{32}\) Goldoni was prolific as an opera librettist, having produced libretti for intermezzi, opera seria and opera buffa, some of which were set to music by Paisiello and Galuppi. He also left a large corpus of plays that were successful in his lifetime. Goldoni and Dufresny treated a similar argument, but their methods differed. Goldoni’s affair is centered on the character Lady Dorotea who, like Madame Oronte, maintains an obsession with wanting to contradict those around her, including the servants, because of her own perceptions of them. The characters are as follows (note the tradition of naming the servants using diminuitive forms such as Volpino, Gasperina, Foligno):

- Ferrante – *old citizen*
- Camilla – *daughter of Ferrante*
- Rinaldo – *son of Ferrante*
- Dorotea – *wife of Ferrante*
- Fabrizio – *old citizen*
- Roberto – *son of Fabrizio, suitor for Camilla*
- Conte Alessandro – *mutual friend*
- Gaudenzio – *citizen, mutual friend*
- Gasperina – *Ferrante’s housemaid*
- Volpino – *Ferrante’s butler*
- Foligno – *Ferrante’s servant*

Dorotea’s sister-in-law Camilla is to marry Roberto, but her dowry should be funded by the capital that was brought in by Dorotea’s marriage to Camilla’s brother Rinaldo. In the end, Dorotea can only be cured of her “malady and unbearable obstinacy through the calming and noble influence of the Count Alexander, the perfect ‘man of the world’”:\(^{33}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
(S’ella di me si fida, abbasserà l’orgolio.)
\end{align*}
\]

(If she trusts in me, she will lower her pride.)

The person preventing the marriage, Dorotea, finally succumbs. This plot also ends with the signing of a marriage contract.

---


Unlike Dufresny, Goldoni developed his plot in five acts and set the text to Martellian verse, the fourteen-syllable verse developed by the early eighteenth-century librettist and theorist Pier Jacopo Martello.\(^\text{34}\) Goldoni’s play enjoyed great success: it was favorably received by the critics and continued to be performed throughout the nineteenth century. It would be difficult to argue that Goldoni may have been inspired by Dufresny’s version, especially given that Goldoni’s appointment to the Commedia italienne in Paris was not offered to him until 1762. In his memoirs, Goldoni maintains, moreover, that he was still living in Italy, that his library did not contain a collection of French literature at the time of writing, and that he had no prior knowledge of L’esprit de contradiction.\(^\text{35}\) It was not until he saw Dufresny’s play in Paris that he read it with both plays ‘side by side’.\(^\text{36}\) Goldoni’s preamble to the play expresses his admiration for Dufresny’s work and concedes that his own Lo spirito di contradizione did not enjoy the same success in Venice as Dufresny’s in Paris. It was still popular and played for sixty years after its premiere: “Sono sessanta anni che si rappresenta, e piace sempre è diletta, è come se fosse nuova, applaudita, e la mia all’incontro è stata pochissimo fortunata in Venezia.”\(^\text{37}\)

**London, 1760**

*The Spirit of Contradiction: A new comedy of two acts as it is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Govent Garden. By a gentleman of Cambridge*, premièred in 1760 and was written by theatre manager and dancer John Rich (1692–1761).\(^\text{38}\) A copy of the second edition libretto is held in Washington at the Library of Congress.\(^\text{39}\) This plot, set in the country garden of the Partlet family, mirrors that of Dufresny’s L’esprit de Contradiction. It was written in two acts,
allowing more time for the unfolding of the denouement and for the emphasis on the theme of contradiction. As with Madame Oronte in Dufresny’s play, the theme of contradiction is perpetuated by Mrs Partlet. The table below compares the characters of the two versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Spirit of Contradiction, 1760</th>
<th>L’esprit de contradiction, 1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Partlet – a country gentleman</td>
<td>Monsieur Oronte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Partlet – wife to Partlet</td>
<td>Madame Oronte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randal – Partlet’s gardiner</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Harriet – daughter</td>
<td>Angelique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovewell – an officer in the army, in love with Harriet</td>
<td>Valere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer – a gentleman grazier, in love with Harriet</td>
<td>Monsieur Thibaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty – their servant</td>
<td>Lackey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruin - lawyer</td>
<td>Notary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison of characters between Dufresny’s play of 1700 and John Rich’s play of 1760

The time has come for the Partlets to see that their daughter Harriet is married and settled. Two contenders for marriage are on hand: Steer and the more refined Mr Lovewell. Mrs Partlet is the character who evokes the theme of contradiction throughout the play. In this production of 1760, contradiction is emphasised more strongly than in Dufresny’s play, as expressed by Randal the gardener:

You are right there Master: for if Madam takes it in her head, that you are planting your Daughter into the bed of Matrimony, she will be stocking her up and letting her die in Virginity.

Suffering from a condition perpetuated by her own perception of others working against her, Mrs Partlet proceeds to arrange her daughter’s marriage to the man of whom her husband disapproves. Mr Partlet, like Monsieur Oronte, has grown to accommodate his wife’s defiant will by engaging, with the assistance of the family gardener, in the same battle of wills. Harriet, like Angelique, is a compliant daughter who has learnt to operate and usurp her parents’ manipulative practices. What differs here, apart from the extended plotline, is that Harriet has an ally in the family maid, Betty. Dufresny’s play of 1700 fostered a theme that remained popular throughout the eighteenth century. His play was not only appropriated sixty years later into another production in London by John Rich, but was also translated into Italian towards the end of the century.
Venice, 1783

In 1783, *Lo sposo di tre e marito di nessuna* premièred in the Nobile Teatro di San Samuele in the Autumn of 1783 in Venice. A new libretto, bearing the same title as on many prior occasions, was written by Filippo Livigni with a musical setting by Luigi Cherubini. The libretto is held at the Biblioteca Musicale Governativa del Conservatorio di Musica S. Cecilia, Rome and other libraries throughout the north of Italy. The characters’ names differ—Donna Lisetta, Don Martino, Don Pistacchio, Donna Rosa, Don Simone, Bettina and Folletto—and the libretto bears no relationship to Palomba’s plot. This version is therefore the starting point of a new stem in the labyrinth of libretti with the same name. This work of Cherubini’s was revived on 24 July 2005 for the Festival della Valle d’Itria, Martina Franca, Puglia, directed by Davide Livermore, and with the Orchestra Internazionale d’Italia directed by Dimitri Jurowski. According to the revivalists, the story is based on Carlo Goldoni’s *Il caffè della campagna.* In the Goldoni style, much is kept of the *Commedie delle arte* tradition—with more shenanigans around mistaken identity than the plot in Palomba’s libretto. The characters are as follows:

- **Donna Lisetta** - Baroness, sister of Don Martino
- **Don Martino** - Captain
- **Don Pistacchio** - Baron of Lago Secco
- **Donna Rosa** - Baroness, betrothed of Don Pistacchio
- **Don Simone** - Uncle of Don Pistacchio
- **Bettina** - Street singer
- **Folletto** - Dicer, suitor of Bettina

In addition to these characters—the usual number for opera buffa—there are also servants, village people and musicians. Don Simone chooses the Baroness Donna Rosa as a suitable match for his nephew, Don Pistacchio, the Baron of the castle. In Scene Three of the first act, he plays a similar scene to that of the Governor in the opening of *Lo spirito di contradizione* shown earlier, proving less helpful:

*Orsù villani*

*Da me cosa volete?*

Come on peasants,

What do you want from me?

---

40 Presso Giovanni Battista Casali. This opera, according to the modern edition, runs for 150 minutes.
42 Cherubini–Bock/Geyer, “Synopsis”. I have not been able to trace the première of *Il caffè della campagna*, nor have I investigated whether Livigni himself intended his libretto to be based on Goldoni’s play.
... T’hanno ammazzato l’asino
Non importa, tutti abbiam da morire
Un contadino cavò gli occhi al tuo buo?
Che gli faccia gl’occhiali a spese sue
Tu non hai da mangiar?
Digiuna, e zitto
Tu hai debiti? Paga
Cosa dici? Tua moglie sen fuggì?
Fuggì tu ancora
Piano, adagio
Voi fate riscaldar la mia testa.

They killed your ass?
No matter, we all must die.
A farmer blinded your ox?
He shall pay for glasses for it.
You have nothing to eat
Then fast, and shut up.
You have debts, pay them.
What’s that? Your wife ran away?
Do the same.
Quiet... Take it easy....
You are making my head spin.

Donna Rosa sends him a portrait via Don Martino, who is himself keen on her. He exchanges the portrait with that of his sister, also searching for a suitor. The swap is successful and Don Pistacchio is convinced that Donna Lisetta was the intended bride. However, some misunderstandings occur that lead Don Martino to threaten Don Pistacchio to a duel to fight for the Donna’s honour. More confusion follows, lawyers are sent from Naples (turning out to be Don Martino and Donna Lisetta in disguise), the oracle is consulted (a further disguise) and the outcome is three unexpected weddings, with one groom left empty-handed.

As a result of this revival and access to Cherubini’s manuscripts now held at the Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Cracow, a critical edition by Helen Geyer and Elisabeth Bock has been published by Simrock, as well as a translation into English. In 1977 Lorenzo Tozzi revised the Sinfonia and it was published by Suvini Zerboni in Milan.

**Dresden, 1785**

*Lo spirito di contradizione* premièred in the Teatro di S. A. E. di Sassonia in 1785, Dresden. This libretto in two acts was written by Caterino Mazzolà and the music by Joseph Schuster. The libretto and score are held at the SLUB. 43 Contrary to those discussed earlier, this libretto provides very little information. No names of cast members, designers or choreographers are given, and the plot has no bearing on what has previously been seen. The cast numbers six, along with three choruses:

---

43 An entry for the music manuscript also exists on the Italian catalogue held in Padua at the Biblioteca del Conservatorio Statale di Musica Cesare Pollini. Whether this is a conductor’s score for this particular performance or a revival warrants further investigation.
Il Dottore Oppositi, *medico, husband of Dorimene*
Dorimene
Lucilla, *niece of the Doctor, suitor of Lindoro*
Don Pandolfo, *supposedly ill, living in the house of the Doctor*
Nespola *servant*
Chorus of families
Chorus of gardeners
Chorus of masks

The contradictory figure in this story is the Doctor—the head of the household—who is the guardian of his niece Lucilla. The young Lindoro is in love with Lucilla but the uncle has other plans (much to the disbelief of all around) to marry her off to the hyperchondriacal Don Pandolfo, the invalid resident in the house. The theme of contradiction here is evoked in a similar way as in Dufresny’s play. Lucilla, like Angelique, is the character who needs to play her cards right, and who pretends to comply with the uncle to achieve his approval to marry her love Lindoro. This happens with the assistance of the clever maid Nespola, who knows how to manipulate the doctor’s contradictory nature by telling him that his wife had planned for Lucilla to marry the invalid Don Pandolfo the whole time. The desired outcome is achieved: the doctor signs the contract with Lindoro’s name.

Similarities with Dufresny’s play, including the servants’ involvement and the two extant contenders for marriage, suggests a direct influence. Dufresny’s play was in circulation for decades and would have been familiar to Mazzolà, who also provided the libretto for Mozart’s *La clemenza di Tito.* I have not seen records of any revivals of Schuster’s *Lo spirito di contradizione.* An Italian catalogue entry for a copy of the music manuscript exists, and is held in Padua at the Biblioteca del Conservatorio Statale di Musica “Cesare Pollini”. Furthermore, the catalogue describes the pressmark as indicating the Teatro Verdi, but no date for the publication appears.

**Bologna, 1786**

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* premièred at the Teatro Zagnoni in the Autumn of 1786 in Bologna. The music was newly composed by Antonio Brunetti to the existing libretto by Filippo Livigni. This libretto, published by Sassi, is held in the Biblioteche della Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice. This plot was also set in two acts. The libretto I have examined does not
note the librettist; however, the Italian OPAC SBN entry does. Considering that the libretto has only been slightly amended, this is not in keeping with the usual lack of author acknowledgement. Brunetti’s name appears under the actors’ names and la musica è tutta nuova del Sig. Antonio Brunetti Maestro di Cappella Pisano. One distinguishing feature of the libretto is the protesta, a disclaimer, probably due to the paganistic references (possibly referring to the consultation of the oracle):

\[Tutto\ ce\ò,\ che\ non\ è\ conforme\ ai\ veri\ sentimenti\ della\ Santa\ Romana\ Chiesa\ Cattolica,\ è\ solo\ pure\ scherzi\ di\ Poesia,\ e\ non\ sentimento\ dell’Autore,\ che\ si\ dichiara\ vero\ Cattolico.\]

The Italian OPAC SBN entry of the version published in Bologna matches the names of the cast in the libretto I have studied. A second entry by Brunetti exists for this opera, without dates, which suggests that this one is the revival, rather than the former. Orcesi Niccolò in Piacenza is noted as the publisher. The names of the characters differ from the first version of this plot in 1783, except that in both versions, Don Simone, the uncle of Don Pistacchio, becomes Don Peperone. The OPAC SBN entries confirm Filippo Livigni as librettist. Although this could be coincidental, the entry of this version in Piacenza notes Maria Antonia Brunetti as Donna Lisetta, suggesting a relative of the composer.

**Ascoli, 1796**

In 1796, Lo sposo di tre e marito di nessuno: dramma per musica a sette voci da rappresentarsi nel pubblico was revived at the Teatro di Ventidio Basso in the city of Ascoli for Carnavale. The libretto contains an inscription that indicates that La musica è tutta nuova del celebre sig. Maestro Antonio Brunetti, Pisano. The libretto is that of Livigni and is held at the Biblioteca Comunale Giulio Gabrielli, but a score does not appear to have survived for this revival. The first number “Guardate quanti giuochi che fa quel ciarlatano..” immediately evokes the *buffa* setting as in Livigni’s original setting of 1783. The work is dedicated to Monsignor Settimo De’ Mar. The versions by Cherubini and Brunetti described here have at times been mistaken as settings of Palomba’s libretto rather than of the different storyline composed by Livigni.

---

44 Act Two, Scene Two is shorter and has no aria. The aria has been omitted in Scene Eleven, but the opera contains the same number of scenes.

45 “Everything that does not conform to the sentiments of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, is solely pure jests of poetry, and does not reflect the sentiments of the author who declares himself a true Catholic”.

46 “The music is all new from the renowned Maestro Antonio Brunetti, Pisano.”
There is no set formula governing the process by which a story or play becomes transformed into an opera. It can range from the strictest adaptation, including literal quotation of original text, through to the loosest appropriation of the ideas on which the original story was based. In the eighteenth century there appear to have been few if any conventions governing operatic transformations and the appropriation of extant story lines, and certainly none of the concerns that exist today about intellectual property. So we find that operas have the same story, but the libretto may be completely re-written, partially re-written or lightly transformed. From the comparisons made above, it can be concluded that the initial plot created by Palomba in 1763 was subsequently re-worked each time. Scores were modified and arias substituted by the current director, either to suit audience taste or to accommodate available singers and/or their demands.
Chapter Three
Musical Inter-relationships

By the time he came to study at the Naples conservatory, Guglielmi was showing an aptitude for composition and had attracted the attention of the Duchess of Massa, Ricciarda Gonzaga.\(^1\) Inevitably, he was to become a product of his Neapolitan education as well as the musical practices that surrounded him throughout his career. Guglielmi produced an enormous output of works including some eighty-five operas as well as oratorios and instrumental works.\(^2\) It is normal to see such abundant productivity from composers of this era, particularly in works for the theater that were often conceived for a single season, rather than for the purpose of longevity.\(^3\) Sanguinetti points out that every professionally-trained composer was able to produce an opera in a matter of weeks.\(^4\) Guglielmi was a composer of his time, one who followed the trends and practices that catered to public demand. Some collaborations with other composers occurred, such as Guglielmi’s contribution of the opening ensemble, the three finali and the Baroness’s aria in Anfossi’s opera of 1763. Others were simply amendments and additions made to suit the audience or the culture of the place of production, and the composer may or may not have been aware of these.

In this chapter, the musical aspects of *Lo spirito di contradizione* will be discussed, as will its connections with Anfossi’s *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*. Comparisons will be made between *Lo spirito di contradizione* from 1766 and the other scores I have accessed: the original Neapolitan version of 1763 and that from Ghelen in 1768. Examples are taken from

---

1 Guglielmi’s biography was also documented by fellow citizen of Massa Carrara, Stefano Giampaoli (1920–1985) who wrote several publications on aspects of his and Guglielmi’s home town. See Stefano Giampaoli, *Musica e teatro alla corte di Massa. I Guglielmi* (Massa: Modena, 1978).
3 As discussed in previous chapters, the economic and political climate was also a consideration in relation to the longevity of a particular work or of music-making in general. As well as the Naples conservatories, many of these issues regarding economic and political climate affecting the arts are outlined in detail by Lucio Tufano. See Lucio Tufano, “Il mestiere del musicista”, 759–64. I am grateful to Anthony DelDonna for his guidance (Georgetown University, 7 April, 2013).
each of the manuscripts and compared to illustrate how Guglielmi’s music was retained from 1763 in these subsequent operas. The examples provided in this chapter are re-produced in the Appendix to facilitate comparison. Anfossi’s original work and Gassman’s role in the Ghelen manuscript will be addressed, as will the extent to which Guglielmi’s music was preserved in these works.\textsuperscript{5}

The four conservatories in Naples developed an organized curriculum of music education, particularly at Santa Maria de Loreto where Guglielmi was a pupil. Fabris suggests that this ‘mechanism’ maintained a constant control over future generations, until at least the arrival of the Bourbons in 1734.\textsuperscript{6} Preserved collections of music manuscripts with exercises and examples used in training the boys at the conservatorii have survived.\textsuperscript{7} According to Gjerdingen, the teaching curriculum utilized two main ‘images’ of music-making. The first was the partimenti, the unfigured or lightly-figured basses, and the second the solfeggi, comprising two-part compositions for the partimento bass and melody.\textsuperscript{8} The teaching of these elements, crucial to the galant style that prevailed in the mid-eighteenth century, relied heavily on improvisation and oral transmission. What could also have been derived through the direct transmission of skills from teacher to pupil was the imparting of larger forms such as the oratorio and opera composition. To date, no written documents have been discovered about the teaching of large-scale works, although didactic works composed specifically for the students at the conservatory such as Mancini’s (1672–1737) Il zelo animato have survived.\textsuperscript{9} Guglielmi’s teacher Francesco Durante (1684–1755), who was highly productive in the sacred genres, served as one of the founding members of the Conservatories, starting at the

\textsuperscript{5} I accessed Schuster’s score from SLUB. Although I discussed the libretto in Chapter Two, a discussion of the score would best be served in another study.
\textsuperscript{6} Fabris, Music in Seventeenth Century Naples, 79.
\textsuperscript{8} Gjerdingen, “Images of Galant Music”, 132.
Conservatorio dei poveri di Gesù Cristo and later progressing to Santa Maria de Loreto.  

Although his own legacy of works did not include a significant number of operas, the foundations of partimenti taught and established by Durante paved the way for mid-eighteenth century opera in Italy and throughout most of Europe. While not a descendant of the Neapolitan school, Rossini poses a fine example thereof: – ‘Io non conosco che solo la scuola di Durante’.  

Music for comedy  

The mid-eighteenth century comic opera was typically in three acts and always proceeded by a sinfonia or overture, followed by an opening vocal ensemble or chorus. The usual practice was to start the arias and lyrical items once all the actors were assembled on stage, engaged in dialogue and chorus, and facilitating an introduction to the characters. The format included at least two arias for each of the six or seven characters over the entire opera, tracts of dialogue set to simple or secco recitative and three ensemble finali.

According to contemporary practices, and as it was throughout the mid-eighteenth century, the recitativi secchi in the scores studied here are presented without a key signature and in common time; some bars require six beats in the bar to accommodate the text. In addition to its narrative role, the musical function of the recitative is to modulate and create a transition between the arias or between ensemble and aria. Where longer conversations are needed, the modulations within the recitative serve to advance the conversation and introduce the next character who is to participate in the dialogue. The voice part of the recitative has to follow the inflections of natural speech. The text underlay of recitatives in the score reflects this even when the syllables are not precisely placed under the notes, as is the case in many surviving manuscripts. Composers and copyists were evidently aware that singers knew exactly where to

---

13 The text is set to quavers over a bass line consisting mainly of semibreves and minims. The recitative facilitates the dialogue and continues to serve the dramatic function of exposing, narrating and advancing the action, and it is generally divided into short phrases, each punctuated by a cadence. DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 92.
14 Downes, “Recitative”, 52
place the elisions. This custom was retained as the most effective way to set conversational text.

As Robinson describes, eighteenth-century ensembles were a ‘point of momentary interaction between characters during which nothing was resolved’.¹⁵ The opening of Lo spirito di contradizione is a fine example of this. To allow for interaction in the finali and to accommodate whatever the text presented, the composers opted for a freer form, one that could be considered a chain finale.¹⁶ This resulted in a lengthy finale, freely-shaped to suit the action. Platoff also maintained that the finali did not often show evidence of a detailed and structured plan in regard to the tonal or thematic relationships among the sections.¹⁷ The pairing of characters was common in the final-act finale, one that enabled slanging matches, the characters to interrupt each other and the voices to come together for intermittent, short, homophonic phrases.¹⁸

**Naples, 1763**

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* by Pasquale Anfossi premièred in Naples in the Autumn of 1763 at the Teatro Nuovo sopra Toledo. Guglielmi wrote the music for the opening ensemble, the three finali and the Baroness’s aria in Act Three. The libretto, written mostly in the Neapolitan language, was supplied by Antonio Palomba. A copy of the score is held in the Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna.¹⁹

Also a graduate of Santa Maria de Loreto, Anfossi’s list of operas numbers around seventy.²⁰ He entered the conservatory in 1744 as a violinist and studied partimento and solfeggio under

---

¹⁵ Robinson, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera*, 228.
¹⁶ Robinson uses Abert’s terminology. See *Naples and Neapolitan Opera*, 235.
¹⁸ Robinson’s descriptions of other mid-eighteenth century finali such as those of Vinci, Leo, Pergolesi comprise a methodology that fits the operas studied here. Robinson, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera*, 235.
¹⁹ The score is now accessible online. See *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica, Gaspari online.
Sacchini and Piccinni. Upon leaving the Conservatory, Anfossi continued to be mentored by Piccinni. He tried to establish a career in Rome but did not have great success, so decided to try his luck in Paris under the guise of *Maestro del Conservatorio di Venezia*. After several successful commissions, he left for London to direct at the Italian theatre in 1783. Anfossi’s music was sought after in Germany and in Prague. Following further successes, he returned to Rome in 1787 and eventually sought a position as *Maestro di Cappella* at St John Lateran in 1791. He died in 1797. His first opera was *La serva spiritosa* in 1763. Guglielmi’s arrival at the Conservatory was four years after Anfossi’s, and they would have crossed paths as students, though whether they remained in contact after completing their training and after their collaboration on the opera has not been established.

The fact that only a title and composer’s name appears at the head of the 1763 score of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* (see below) suggests that it is a working score. It has been argued that the *apertura* noted at the beginning of the libretto and attributed to Guglielmi (as described in Chapter Two) is in fact the introductory quintet, rather than the Sinfonia (or the overture) as was previously thought. The Sinfonia is structured as one piece in two sections, both in G major. The second section, marked with a pause, moves to compound meter. Note in the example below the modest scoring of instruments, typical of most comic operas:

---

his *Grove* article, Robinson maintains Anfossi’s year for entering Santa Maria as 1744. By Florimo’s account places him at the age of eight. Florimo, *La scuola musicale*, Vol. 2, 370.

---

22 Lipton, “Opere Buffè”, 252, fn.2.
23 I am grateful to Anthony DelDonna for pointing this out. Most *partiture* were orchestrated with between eight and twelve parts (email 15 August, 2013). An example of the more richly orchestrated comic opera lies in Gasmann’s version of this opera of 1768.
In Example 2 below, the vocal clefs of the opening ensemble are somewhat difficult to discern, and the copyist did not repeat the clefs on subsequent pages. The characters’ names do not precede the appropriate staves and some of the parts are not complete, implying that Anfossi worked from his own score. The conducting of this opera could very well have been shared between Anfossi and Gugielmi.24 The direction at the top of the page indicates, ‘Don

24 I thank Anthony DelDonna for his guidance (email 7 June, 2013).
Belisario, Odoardo with various people who want justice; Giacomina, Nunziella on the thresholds of their houses and Don Falloppio’. (Note the difference in handwriting).

The opera outline is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Number of Scenes</th>
<th>Character, number of arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Opening ensemble/Scene One : Guglielmi</td>
<td>Don Belisario, Odoardo Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio and various people. <em>Che susurro! Che sciabaccio!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | Scenes Two to Fifteen | Don Belisario: *Tra il contrasto*  
Lismene: *Se da tue leggiadre stelle*  
Nunziella: *Segnò cojetate*  
Giacomina: *Speranza de chest’arma*  
Don Falloppio: *Se chi è nnamorato mo ride*  
Baroness: *Un concerto simpatico* (cavatina)  
*Ompara la regola, sienti la scuola*  
Odoardo: *Con pallida sembianza*  
Don Tomasino: *Già saie, chi t’è marito* |
|     | Finale : Guglielmi | Don Belisario, Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio, Don Tomasino: *Falloppio de Falloppiis* |
| II  | Sixteen Scenes | Nunziella and Falloppio: *Quanto sosti sventurato* (Cavatina duet)  
Odoardo: *Vedo che sono ingrato*  
Don Tomasino: *Quanno sta sposa, bella e ciaciosa*  
Nunziella: *Na vorta io nzemprecella*  
Don Belisario: *Il marito è un quid pro quo*  
Giacomina: *Siente a me*  
Don Falloppio: *A zitella innamorata*  
Lismene: *Non speri quell’alma*  
Baroness: *Caro fra tante* |
|     | Finale : Guglielmi | Baroness, Don Belisario, Nunziella, Don Tomasino, Odoardo, Don Falloppio, Giacomina.  
*Su spicciate, fate presto* |
| III | Fifteen Scenes | Lismene: *Quanto m’accese tuo bel sembiante*  
Nunziella: *A’na seura sventurata*  
Giacomina: *È n’a pazzia sfacciata*  
Baronessa: *Dove son, che cosa oscura:* Guglielmi  
Baronessa, Don Belisario, Odoardo, Nunziella, Don Tomasino,  
Giacomina: *Mpostore, ngannatore* (Sextet)  
Odoardo: *Tornando a te più fido* |
|     | Finale: Guglielmi | Duets: Baroness and Don Belisario: *Quann’io faccio la sgregnosa*  
Nunziella and Don Falloppio: *Nee sta mpizzanno*  
Giacomina and Don Tomasino: *Per fuggire un’alma ingrata* |

Table 1. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*

As was customary, eight arias were composed for the first act to serve as an introduction to each character. The Baroness is not introduced until Scene Eight with the opening *cavatina, Un concerto simpatico*, scored for strings. She remains on stage for the next two scenes until the end of her aria, *Ompara la regola, sienti la scuola*. She exits leaving Don Tomasino to his
soliloquy, providing the opportunity for him to complain about the Baroness’s unsavoury character.

Common to mid eighteenth-century opera was the long length of the first act: two ensembles, eight arias and one cavatina. The sixteenth and final scene in the first act calls for six of the characters (excluding Lismene and Odoardo) to be present at the tribunal with their grievances, where again, nothing is achieved. The example below shows the first four bars of the first act finale in G major and the strings’ entry in unison. The arpeggiated bass line is typical of Guglielmi’s style.25

Example 3. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* p. 95: Opening of the finale, Act One, *Faloppio de faloppis*

---

25 I thank Anthony DelDonna for his guidance (email 7 June 2013).
Consistent with Robinson’s theory that the musical structure of the finale was freely shaped to suit the needs of the action, the second section is longer than the first (121 bars instead of 67) and the tempo changes to compound time and to the key of C major.

Example 4. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, p. 105. Act One, second section to the Finale: *Per subscriptu*

Because of such free structures in the buffo finali, an analytical approach—in keeping with Platoff’s claims—cannot always be deemed productive.\(^{26}\) A description of the first act finale to *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* of 1763 and the subsequent versions discussed in this chapter can be expressed as below:

\(^{26}\) Platoff, “The Opera Buffa Finale”, 193.
The second act is also lengthy, as evidenced by the distribution of solos outlined in Table One. Anfossi kept the distribution of arias quite even apart from the cavatina duet allocated to Nunziella and Don Falloppio at the opening of the act. The finale, in D major, numbers 237 bars, slightly longer than the first finale. It is continuous without any delineation of sections, and the meter remains in common time, with the opening phrase allocated to the Baroness:

The third act is considerably shorter but the distribution of arias remains even. As discussed in Chapter Two, the insertion of *Dove son, che cosa oscura?* in Scene Six as the Baroness’s aria clearly presents as one that was not composed specifically for this opera. There is no way of establishing whether this aria was newly composed or if it were a previously-composed piece by Guglielmi, inserted by Anfossi for some practical reason, or possibly at the behest of a singer cast for the role (in this case, Maria Michele de Notariis), an entrepreneur or a patron. Example 6 below shows the aria in the key of Eb major and its full—albeit incomplete—orchestration.


One feature of the third act is worth noting: the sextet, *‘Mpostore, ‘ngannatore* in Scene Thirteen that precedes the fourteenth and final scenes. The fifteenth and final scene call for *tutti* on stage but Odoardo and Lismene feature fleetingly, are married early in the scene and exit.
Dialogue occurs between the remaining six characters in the recitatives preceding the three duets, the first of which is led by the Baroness and the governor Don Belisario, as shown below. Note the descending quaver patterns of the opening bars and the semiquaver patterns in the strings preceding the Baroness’s line.

![Image of sheet music]

**Example 7. Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, p. 77. Finale, Act Three, Quanno io faccio la grignosa**

Therefore the duets follow as:

- The Baroness/Don Belisario
- Nunziella/Don Falloppio
- Giacomina/Don Tomasino.

The final duet between Giacomina and Don Tomasino shows that they are resigned to remaining unpartnered: *Senza sposo, senza sposa.*

Several revivals occurred of the Anfossi/Guglielmi collaboration, *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, but were often re-worked to cater for the needs of the current director, and possibly according to the availability of performers. The score to the 1767 version (Naples) and both versions of 1781 (Naples and L’Aquila), discussed in Chapter Two, appear not to have survived.
Venice, 1766

Lo spirito di contradizione, with music entirely composed by Pietro Alessandro Guglielmi, premièred at the San Moisè Theater during the Carnevale of 1766 in Venice. The libretto was written in standard Italian by Gaetano Martinelli Romano. The manuscript is held in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna and is available in a facsimile print.27

The particular circumstance that led to the production of Lo spirito di contradizione cannot be verified at this stage, apart from the fact that it was composed specifically to be premières at San Moisè. We cannot exclude the possibility that the libretto was commissioned by Guglielmi himself, perhaps with the intention of retaining some of his previous ideas. In mid-eighteenth century Italy, operas were habitually copied by hand, as the rapid turnover of compositions, particularly in vocal music, made printing totally impractical. Moreover, the underlaying of text posed difficulties for typesetters. Copying music by hand was an art and skill that provided employment for many, and as Burney commented ‘it is cruel to wish to rob them of it’.28 There is much reason to believe that this manuscript was originally from the copisteria of Iseppo Baldan in Venice.29 It cannot be certain that this particular version represents what the composer released to the orchestra or singers for the 1766 première. The time and place of the performance is stipulated on the frontispiece, but in a different hand to that of the title. The Venetian copyists remained largely anonymous, and although Baldan sometimes acknowledged himself, there is no identifiable attribution in the manuscript.30 Through Talbot’s work we know that Vivaldi’s nephew Carlo Stefano (the son of his brother Francesco) served as a copyist there. Born in 1731, he would not have been too old or too young to be working with Baldan around 1766. Talbot quotes the patrician Pietro Gradenigo, who wrote in 1700: “One of the most accurate copyists of vocal instrumental music is the priest Giuseppe Baldan whose shop is in the San Giovanni Grisostamo”31

---

29 I am grateful to Jan Stockigt for her guidance and expertise on the copisteria of Baldan.
30 See White and Talbot, ‘Pietro Mauro’, 58.
31 Quote from I. Vmc, Ms Gradenigo 67, Notatori Gradenigo, 7-57. See White and Talbot, ‘Pietro Mauro’, 54
The score of *Lo spirito di contradizione* is beautifully written and clearly legible. The exact same handwriting and calligraphic decorations appear on the frontispiece of *Lo spirito di contradizione* as others whose authenticity has long been established. The title page below (reproduced from the facsimile) below depicts two handwriting styles.

Example 8. *Lo spirito di contradizione*, frontispiece, original manuscript held at the Österreische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, MS 17.787
The repeated title of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* appears in a different, more florid and flamboyant hand. This document came from Baldan’s copying house. A further example of this same script is shown below: the title of Vivaldi’s *Nisi Dominus* that was originally attributed to Galuppi.

Example 9. *Nisi Dominus a quattro concertate*. Baldassar Galuppi, D-Dla Mus. 2973-D38
Below is the first page of Galuppi’s score to his *Miserere*, also in the same hand as *Lo spirito di contraddizione*.32

Example 10. *Miserere*. Baldassar Galuppi, D-Dl Mus. 2973-D-28,1

Guglielmi was a composer who practiced his trade and provided a service, a fine example of the composer as a master tradesman. In their *Grove* article, Hunter and Jackman point out that Guglielmi’s operas ‘kept abreast of changing fashions’.33 Guglielmi’s third-act finale configured as duet ensembles highlight this point. Although largely based on Anfossi’s original, this work, together with Martinelli’s libretto, *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, poses a fine example of opera buffa that is deserving of performance today.

---


33 See Hunter and Jackman, “Guglielmi”. Comprehensive details are given on the structure of Guglielmi’s arias and how he treated the *Da Capo* form.
Lo spirito di contraddizione commences with a Sinfonia in three unrelated movements, none of which have been reproduced from 1763. The choral ensemble follows, introducing the first scene of Act One. Each member of the cast of eight characters is scored in the relevant clef. Lisetta, Cecchina and Nannetta are sopranos, thus requiring their music to be written in the C1 clef. The Countess’s range needs to span soprano and alto ranges, and therefore changes for recitatives from C1 to C3. Agabito the notary, Asdrubale the ignorant governor, Orazio the charlatan and Don Cesarino the impostor are all tenors, and require the C4 clef. The table below shows the distribution of arias to the characters in Guglielmi’s opera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Number of Scenes</th>
<th>Character, Number of Arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Opening Ensemble: New Material</td>
<td>Lisetta, Cecchina, Orazio, Agabito, Il Governatore (Asdrubale): Che sussurro, che fracasso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | Scenes One to Seventeen          | Il Governatore: Maledetti  
Nannetta: Noi sole semplicette  
Lisetta : Già sento che dal giubilo  
Orazio : Alla tiranna mia  
Cecchina: Son troppo vergognosa  
La Contessa: Da quest’onde disturbata (cavatina)  
Quei languidi sospiri  
Don Cesarino : Tu già lo sai Lisetta |
|     | Finale: Retained from 1763       | La Contessa, Lisetta, Cecchina, Orazio, Agabito, Il Governatore (Asdrubale)  
Orazio de Capocchis |
| II  | Scenes One to Sixteen            | Nannetta: Mai più non posso pazientar  
Cecchina: Da un’altro giovanetto  
Governor : Il mio gran merito  
Lisetta : Tu sai che t’adoro  
Don Cesarino : Voi le spose condurrete  
Orazio : La mia amorosa  
Contessa: Sento amò che cosa sia |
|     | Finale: New material             | Contessa, Cecchina, Lisetta, Orazio, Don Cesarino, Il Governatore  
Palpitante timoso |
| III | Scenes One to Seven              | Nannetta: Non n’è maggior contento  
Agabito : Al nostro merito  
Don Cesarino : Vergognoso sospirante (cavatina) |
|     | Finale: Opening retained from 1763 | Duets: Lisetta/Orazio;  
Cecchina/Governatore  
La Contessa/Don Cesarino  
Tutti (all six) |

Table 3. Lo spirito di contraddizione, 1766
As DelDonna established in his study of Guglielmi’s *opere serie*, the number of appearances on stage by each character corresponds roughly to the musical distribution of scenes.\(^{34}\) This is also the case here. The distribution of solos is fairly even, unlike Guglielmi’s *Semiramide* in which the heroine, Semiramide, is given five arias.

For the opening ensemble of this score, *Che susurro, che fracasso!* Guglielmi chose to compose new material, the text of which was retained by Martinelli:

![Example 11. *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, p.16. Act One, Coro, *Che susurro, che fracasso!*](image)

The semiquaver pattern above repeats intermittently with the Governor’s phrases as he tries to control the townspeople. This ensemble precedes Scene One containing the first aria *Maledetti* delivered by him, after which he exits so that the townspeople can complain about his ignorance. When in dialogue, the last character to speak will be the one to sing the aria.

---

\(^{34}\) DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 90.
Nannetta and Don Cesarino are the only characters to be given soliloquy scenes. It is not until Scene Twelve that the Countess makes her appearance and is allocated a cavatina, *Da quest’onde disturbata*, to open the scene rather than the customary recitative. Her aria, *Quel languido sospiro*, is sung in the thirteenth scene that follows, preceded by recitative dialogue.

As the musical distribution in Table 3 demonstrates, Guglielmi decided to keep the same material for the finale of Act One. The text—discussed in Chapter Two—can serve as a guide when following the numbers of syllables from the libretto of 1763, *Fallopio de Falloppis* and those from the libretto of 1766, *Orazio de Capocchis*. The music to the opening of the later finale below confirms this. Note the arpeggiated passage also evident in Example 3.

Guglielmi also kept the material of the second part of the first-act finale, shown below. The music mirrors that of Example 4.


The finale to Act Two changes completely from the 1763 score in order to accommodate Martinelli’s re-working of the plot. Don Cesarino enters after five introductory bars with running semiquavers in *Palpitante Timoroso*, describing his sheer panic at harbouring the three bags of money in his clothes and planning his escape. This first section is 185 bars in length, after which the tempo changes to *allegro assai: Sei già scoperto indegno*. Don Cesarino’s plot has been exposed. After twenty-seven bars, the meter changes to three and the speed to *andante: Povero innamorato* initiated by the Governor who by this stage, has taken pity on him. This change of mood continues for fifty bars, followed by a meter change back to four and a tempo marking of *allegro assai: Amici v’ingannate*. This final section ends after 111 bars.

In Act Three, Nannetta is singled out for a soliloquy and aria in Scene Three, *Non v'è maggior contento*, and Agabito is given the aria in Scene Five, *Al vostro merito*. As they comprise the ‘serious’ characters, they do not sing in the final duets. The only other solo in the third act is the *cavatina* for Don Cesarino, *Vergognoso sospirante*, in the final scene. This scene also does not open with a recitative but does have impact, as he is answering for his crimes in front of the tribunal while begging for mercy.
The third act finale is marked as *Duetti*, following the *Scena Ultima*, and is scored for strings, in keeping with the score from 1763. Guglielmi chose to repeat the same material, the first five bars of which (below), can be compared with Example 7, *Quanno io faccio la grignosa*, opened by the Baroness in the Neapolitan version. Note the descending quaver pattern in the opening bars.


The marked difference from the score of 1763, where the opening was given to the Baroness in partnership with the Governor, is that the opening is given to Lisetta, even though her text is equivalent.
The excerpt below continues on from Example 15 above. Note the descending semiquaver patterns (also seen in Example 7) two bars preceding Lisetta’s opening phrase.

*Quando io faccio la ritrosa*, initiated by Lisetta.

Therefore the duets are as follows:

Lisetta/Orazio
Cecchina/Il Governatore
The Countess/Don Cesarino.

This enables the two principals to have the final duet. The countess ends up alone and, true to the original plot, Don Cesarino is betrothed to three and husband to none.

**Ghelen, 1768**

*Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, dramma giocoso per musica* was presented in the Teatri Privilegiati in Vienna in the spring of 1768. The libretto by Antonio Palomba (not acknowledged) was adapted to standard Italian and published in the Ghelen printing house. As stated on the libretto, “The music was composed by Pasquale Anfossi with the exception of the introduction and the three finali that are composed by Guglielmi and the arias marked with an asterisk that are composed by Floriano Gasman...”. Anfossi’s name appears on the title
page of the score of this version, which is held at the Österreichiche Nazionalbibliothek in Vienna. The catalogue entry attributes the libretto to Filippo Livigni.

Very little information exists on Gasmann’s early life. What is known, however, is that he was an important figure in Viennese operatic life in the 1760s and early 1770s. Born in 1729 in Brux, Bohemia (now known as Most), he may have been educated by the Jesuits. He went to study in Italy while still a youth. Here he would have studied partimenti under Father Martini. Following his education, his first six operas were composed for Venice. In 1763 he was summoned to Vienna to succeed Gluck as a ballet composer. By the time he came to direct Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna in 1768, he was well established as a composer of opera buffa. A year later, Gasmann’s successful L’opera seria, an operatic spoof set to Calzabigi’s libretto, premièred in Vienna and later travelled to Florence and Turin.

This manuscript, produced under his direction, was considerably restructured to allow for the omission of the character Lismene. Although it is unacknowledged in the libretto, Guglielmi’s aria for the Baroness, Dove son, che cosa oscura?, was retained in Act Three, but placed in Scene Three rather than in Scene Six. Along with these changes, a striking addition was made with the popular aria Son già tre di che Nina, originally attributed to Pergolesi. This version gives the impression that the aim was to reduce the length of the work and invoke popular appeal with the addition of Nina. The arias remain mostly the same, but are placed in different positions throughout the plot. The orthography and notation present very clearly on the manuscript, giving the impression that it was copied for the sake of posterity. Gasmann’s additions are noted while Guglielmi’s are not. There are considerable structural changes and some musical additions. In keeping with Gasmann’s style, the orchestration of Anfossi’s existing music is altered considerably, adding a fuller texture than before.

---

38 Also known as Nina and Tre giorni son che Nina. Lipton has given the inclusion of this aria and its authorship thorough investigation. See Lipton, “Opere Buffe”, 263.
The table below surveys the 1768 score of *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*. Note the changes of language from Italian to dialect, and the order of pieces compared with those in Table One, the score of 1763.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Number of Scenes</th>
<th>Character, number of arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Opening Ensemble (Guglielmi)</td>
<td>Don Belisario, Odoardo Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio and various people. <em>Che susurro!, che fracasso!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I   | Fourteen Scenes | Belisario: *Fra il contrasto in me*  
Odoardo: *Tenero cuore amante*  
Nunziabella: *Signor fermatevi*  
Giacomina: *Speranza di quest’alma*  
Falloppio: *Se chi è innamorato or ride*  
Baronessa: *Zeffiretti orgogliosetti* (cavatina by Gasmann)  
*Audia la regola, senti la scuola*  
Don Tomasino: *Già sai chi t’è marito* |
| I   | Finale: Guglielmi | Don Belisario, Odoardo, Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio, Don Tomasino  
*Falloppio de Falloppis* |
| II  | Eleven Scenes | Don Tomasino:  
*Son già tre di che Nina*: Cavatina  
*Un labrettin di rose* (Gasmann)  
Nunziatella: *Un tempo io semplicetta*  
Don Belisario: *Il marito è un quid pro quo*  
Giacomina: *Cosa sia per me non so*  
Falloppio: *Vo far che suonino le trombe*  
Baronessa: *Baroncino inzuccherato* |
| II  | Finale (Guglielmi) | Baronessa, Don Belisario, Nunziella, Don Tomasino, Odoardo, Don Falloppio, Giacomina  
*Su finisce, faccia presto* |
| III | Ten Scenes | Baroness, Nunziella, Giacomina, Odoardo, Falloppio, Belisario  
*Badi a me, sentite o bella*: Gasmann  
Nunziatella: *A una trista sventurata*  
Baronessa: *Dove son, che cosa oscura?*: Guglielmi |
| III | Finale (Guglielmi) | *Furfante incannatore*: Sextet retained from 1763 |

Table 4. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, 1768: the distribution of arias*
The Sinfonia (below) for this opera, in three sections, was newly composed, possibly the work of Gasmann. Unlike his other compositions in this score, his name does not appear at the head of the page, leaving the authorship in doubt.

The opening ensemble below, *Che susurro, che fracasso!*, was retained from 1763. A comparison can be made of the three opening bars below with Example 2. While Gasmann opted for richer orchestrations throughout the arias, the brass arrangement has been omitted from the ensemble.

Replacing Anfossi’s *cavatina* for the Baroness, *Un concerto si patetico*, is Gasmann’s *Zeffiretti orgogliosetti* in Act One, Scene Nine. He chose a rich orchestration for the Baroness’s first entry, using horns, oboes, flutes and bassoon. Although the first act was re-worked to accommodate the omission of Lismene and the addition of his own *cavatina*, Gasmann retained the first act finale from 1763: sixty-seven bars of the first section and 121 bars of the second.

![Example 18](image-url)
The examples below, the first of which shows Guglielmi’s arpeggiated bass, can be compared with Examples 3 and 4.

Example 20. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* (Ghelen) p. 153, Act One Finale,

*Per subscriptium*
The most striking addition (below) to this opera is the well-known aria, *Son già tre di che Nina*, arranged as a *cavatina*, and given to Don Tomasino following his opening recitative in Act Two, Scene Two. Lipton points out that the appearance of *Nina* in this score was in keeping with a practice that had been associated with this aria and its insertion into previous operas.


The scene following features a composition by Gasmann in 3/8 time for Don Tomasino, *Un labrettin di rose* in A major, a more subtle and gentle text replacing the less-refined *Quanno*

---

39 For a full explanation on the origins of this aria—originally attributed to Pergolesi and subsequently to Ciampi—and analysis of its form see Lipton, “The Opere Buffe”, 263-72.
40 Lipton, “The Opere Buffe”, 267.
sta sposa, bella e cianciosa from 1763. Tomasino is in a happy mood and although juggling three women, seems to find himself in love.

As noted in the libretto, Guglilemi’s Act Two finale was also retained. It is in the key of D major, is 224 bars in length and continues without any delineation. It was kept in common time and the opening given to the Baroness. The example below can be compared with Example 5.

Gasmann composed a new opening ensemble to Act Three, replacing Lismene’s aria in the original score. The example is below. Note Gasmann’s name at the top of the score.

Example 23. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, p.2, Act Three, Opening Ensemble,

*Badi a me, sentite o bella*
Guglielmi is acknowledged as the composer of the Baroness’s Aria in Act Three in the libretto of 1763 but not mentioned with regard to *Dove son, Che cosa oscura?* In this version of 1768 the aria was retained in the libretto and in the score but re-positioned to Scene Three rather than Six. While he is known for his fuller orchestrations and more inclusion of wind instruments, Gasmann chose to use a string quartet format for Guglielmi’s aria, as shown in the example below:

![Example 24](image)

**Example 24. Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna (Ghelen) p. 36, Act Three, Scene Three, Dove son, che cosa oscura?**

Until the finale, the motion of the third act is driven heavily by recitative dialogue from Scene Four onwards. Gasmann chose to retain only two arias in the entire act. What constitutes the finale here, attributed to Guglielmi and assumed to be retained from 1763, is the sextet preceding the finale from the original score, even though the libretto clearly attributes all finali to Guglielmi.
According to the note on authorship at the beginning of the libretto of 1768, the finale was written by Guglielmi. What constitutes the finale is really the sextet of Scene Thirteen from 1763. The first six bars of the sextet from Act Three, Scene Thirteen from 1763 are shown below. What still remain to be performed in the version of 1763 are: the remaining dialogue from Scene Thirteen, two further scenes and the duetti of the finale.

Below is the sextet used as the finale in 1768 with the language changed to Italian.


The opera ends with this sextet; therefore the finale from this score could possibly be Anfossi’s. As the duets do not feature, Gugleimí’s authorship of the finale in this opera comes into question. Furthermore, the plot remains unresolved. The story ends at the very point where Don Tomasino’s plan is exposed and the characters hurl insults at him.
The table below provides a summary pointing out some of the more striking features, similarities and differences between the three operas discussed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna 1763</th>
<th>Lo spirito di contraddizione 1766</th>
<th>Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna 1768</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasquale Anfossi</td>
<td>P. A. Guglielmi</td>
<td>Pasquale Anfossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions: Guglielmi;</td>
<td>Libretto: Martinelli</td>
<td>Contributions: Guglielmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libretto: Palomba (<em>not marked on the score</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening scene, three finali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening preceding scene one, three finali and the Baroness’s aria Act III.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution: Gasmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libretto: unnamed, but plot and storyline of Palomba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Neapolitan dialect, unless the Baroness is speaking or being addressed; Odoardo and Lismene, to evoke their ‘serious’ characters</td>
<td>Italian language</td>
<td>Italian language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Characters</td>
<td>Eight Characters</td>
<td>Seven Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonia to Act One is in G major:</td>
<td>Guglielmi’s <em>Sinfonia</em> and opening ensemble is all new and scored for full orchestra.</td>
<td>The Sinfonia is all new. Opening ensemble from 1763 retained but re-scored for strings only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guglielmi’s hand. Opening ensemble handwriting differs from the Sinfonia, casting doubt on Guglielmi’s authorship.</td>
<td>First Act finale retained</td>
<td>Act III begins with a new ensemble by Gasmann to allow for the omission of the character Lismene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Act Finale all new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Act Finale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. *The structural similarities and differences between the operas*

Lismene, removed from the 1768 version, returns in that of 1781, where Giuseppe Giordani appears as co-composer with Guglielmi.41 In *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, the number of appearances on stage by each character corresponds roughly to the musical distribution of scenes.42 As the table describes, the music to the opening of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* is all new, while the text and sequencing of dialogue and content remain the same. It can be assumed that Guglielmi and Martinelli sought to deliver the opening more efficiently by shortening the section containing the people’s complaints and by working the ensemble into a fuller chorus. The necessity of changing the language to standard Italian also provided the opportunity for this. Referring to the points made regarding distribution and to the matters of language discussed in Chapter Two, as was customary, the finali of the third act omit the

---

41 This version of 1781 is the only one that appears in all of Florimo’s survey of the Neapolitan schools.
42 DelDonna, ‘The Operas of Guglielmi’, 90.
‘serious’ characters: Lismene and Odoardo (1763), Nannetta and Agabito (1766) and Odoardo (1768).\textsuperscript{43}

The distribution of scenes among the acts shown in the tables above demonstrates that audiences may have been ready for two acts, as third acts were becoming shorter. Robinson presents several examples of the waning third act in the mid-eighteenth century, and maintains that by the 1760s-1770s in Naples, the idea of two-act operas may have been fomenting.\textsuperscript{44} Yet the three-act format remained for some time. While \textit{Lo spirito di contraddizione} did not see another revival, the music of Guglielmi’s opening ensemble, his finales, and in some cases the Baroness’s aria, lived on through appropriated works. Chapter Two showed that the libretti offered the most valuable information. Understandably, however, certain details are bound to be lost in their travels. This is particularly true of the Ghelen libretto and its final act, and the 1781 libretto of L’Aquila.

\textsuperscript{43} See Robinson, \textit{Naples and Neapolitan Opera}, 198.
\textsuperscript{44} Robinson, \textit{Naples and Neapolitan Opera}, 199.
CHAPTER FOUR
Towards the Modern Edition

This thesis includes a critical scholarly edition of Act One of *Lo spirito di contraddizione*. The focus of this chapter, therefore, is on the issues encountered during the editing process, the ways in which they have been resolved, and the differences between the original score and the modern edition. Although it is beyond the scope of the present project, my aim in the future is to complete a full edition of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* based on the 1766 manuscript presented here. *Lo spirito di contraddizione* contains seventeen scenes in Act One, sixteen scenes in Act Two and eight scenes in Act Three. One of the relevant questions to address, therefore, is how it could be sustained as a performance for modern audiences outside Italy who are unaccustomed to the length that is characteristic of the mid-eighteenth century *opera buffa* idiom. In southern Italy, for example, Cherubini’s *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, in two acts, was successfully revived and recorded in recent times.

The post-modern aims of this edition conform with Grier’s invocation ‘to transmit the text that best represents the historical evidence’ of the source at hand.¹ This edition, however, does not aim to restrict its use to scholars. The 1766 manuscript copy of this opera is an excellent copy. The underlying problem—and therefore the most significant editorial challenge—revolves round the setting of the text, particularly the recitatives. The copyist would have taken for granted that the singers would be capable of delivering the recitative without the provision of elisions and without the notational precision expected today. A modern edition calls for the exact placement of each syllable and elision under the appropriate notes.

¹ Grier, *Critical Editing*, 156.
Editorial Methods

To facilitate navigating the edition, and to make it easy to identify each of the scenes, the scene numbers are included in the headers on the even-numbered pages, and the item (recitative or the character’s aria) is given in square brackets on the odd-numbered pages, in addition to page numbers. Given that some scenes and arias start on even-numbered pages in the original manuscript, the same practice has been adopted in the modern one. The stage directions appear in the edition, placed in square brackets under the scene title, and above the names of the characters involved. The genre designation of each piece in the opera appears flush left above the music, in square brackets. In the ensembles, arias and sinfonia movements, the tempo terms appear above the stave, in accordance with modern usage.

The order of the instrumentation has been changed to conform to modern usage, with woodwinds on the upper staves, followed by the brass. The Italian names used for the instruments are retained, and are used in full on the first page and abbreviated on subsequent pages. This also applies to the character names. Original classical notation has been retained for the period horns, and written in the treble clef in C major. As well as indicating key signatures, the label indicates to the player which crook to insert. The crook labels on the original score are abbreviated, and remain so in this edition.

Below is an explanation of the full labels, appearing in brackets. The solmization for the horns used in the ensembles and arias for Act One and the relevant page numbers are as follows:

- Coro: Corni in G[esolreut] – in G; p.17
- Aria Il Governatore: Corni in Delasolre – in D; p.38
- Aria Lisetta: Corni Gesolreut – in G; p.80
- Cavatina: Corni in Delasolre – in D; p.134
- Aria La Contessa: Corni in Fafaut – in F; p.150

---


3 My thanks go to Gabriele Rocchetti for the explanation of the classical notation in this score (email 26 June, 2013).
Aria Don Cesarino; Corni in Cesol[reut] – in C; p.178
Finale: Corni [in Gesolreut] – in G; p.211

The viola part is not always separately notated. A viola part has been constructed to comply with the instruction *viola col basso*, and doubles the bass at the octave above. All of the dynamic markings, articulation markings and *fermate* have been replicated. The exceptions are explained in the notes. Given that this facsimile edition of the manuscript source comes with no added commentary on performance, the basso line is labelled as *Basso* in the edition. The recitative stave in the score is rarely supplied with figures. These remain in the edition. The names of the characters on the music are labelled in full throughout recitatives and ensembles.

Clefs have been modernized to accord with contemporary conventions. The C1 clefs used in the manuscript for Lisetta, Cecchina and Nannetta and the C3 clefs for La Contessa have been replaced by treble clefs (G2). The C4 clefs used for Don Cesarino, Agabito, Il Governatore and Orazio have been changed to a transposing treble clef. Text repetitions are spelt out in full, replacing the swirl-like figures used in the original. This is only relevant in the arias and ensembles. In some of the recitative dialogues, three characters occasionally speak at once. For instance, in Scene One bar 34, where Orazio, Cecchina and Lisetta speak, the treble clef represents all three.

It was common practice, in the same character’s line, not to acknowledge the accidental across the barline for each recitative. The use of accidentals has been modernized so that they appear across the barline in tied notes. The accidentals in the continuo line of the recitative, however, are not repeated when they are tied across the bar.⁴ The original meters have been retained. The recitatives are all marked as Common time; the bars that contain six beats remain unchanged. Original note values have been retained but the notation of rests has been modernized.

All tempo and articulation markings, dynamics and trills are retained. Dynamic markings have been added to parts that are doubled and not realised. In the source, these ‘unrealised’ passages are represented by two dashes in the first of the bars. The dynamic markings I have

---

⁴ This particular point regarding accidentals over the tie is relevant to the Finale music-writing program used in the project.
added to follow repeated patterns appear in parentheses. Articulation markings such as staccato and wedges that have been added to follow repeated patterns either appear in parentheses or are acknowledged with the word *simile* in parentheses. The articulation markings for the finale, however, appear as normal but are explained in the critical notes below. Grace notes, crossed and uncrossed have been retained unless otherwise stated where inconsistencies occur across parts and parallel passages.

Some methods of beaming in the manuscript could be seen as requiring modernization, such as those instances where groups of eight quavers in 4/4 bars are beamed in pairs. I do not regard them as ‘haphazard’ groupings, nor will they be too disturbing to the reader.\(^5\) The original beaming is retained, and alterations to the source are noted. I have kept the original intstrumental slurs and have added some editorial slurs in keeping with some patterns. Staccato markings have been kept to the original or placed in editorial parentheses.

The text distribution is not always clear and has been adjusted. Where two syllables are placed under one note in the source, the edition now carries the second syllable to elide on the next note with the first syllable of the following word. In the edition, they are connected with a slur (upside-down). Further to these points of language and modifications to the text, it was customary to use capitals on nouns and the pronoun *Lei*, the polite form of ‘you’. In line with contemporary practice, these have been adjusted to lower case, particularly for terms such as *la donzella*. It was also customary to place a diacritical mark on pronouns such as *mè*. I have also omitted diacritical marks on words where they are no longer used. These include: *qui, qua, fra* and *ma*. Where words or phrases are repeated in the text, I have punctuated these with either commas or full stops. Spellings have been modernized. *Adagio* has one *d* in the edition.

Verb conjugations have also been modernized and obsolete diacritical marks omitted. In verbs such as *essere* in the past absolute tense for instance, the diacritical mark on *fu* (third person singular) is no longer used. It was customary to place aside comments in parentheses; these have been retained in the text underlay.

Critical Notes
The notes below document the corrections and alterations made in the process of editing the manuscript source.

Sinfonia I
Bar 42, Oboe, note one is A.
Bar 59, Violins, beat three, note two is C.
Bar 60, Violins, beat one: notes one to three are F, A, D.
Bar 60, Violins, beat three: notes one and two are G, B.

Sinfonia II
Bar 14, Violin I, beat one, C is beamed to C in beat two.
Bars 31 and 33, Violin I, F is beamed to F in beat two.
Bars 17 and 18, 34 and 35, 38 and 39, beat one, the sextuplets are not beamed in the source. This is retained in the edition.

Sinfonia III
Bar 5, Oboes, beat one: grace notes are not crossed.
Bar 34, Violin I, beat two: lower note is G.
Bars 49, 58, 59 and 63 the grace notes appear crossed.

Coro
Bar 24, Violin I, score shows an ambiguous slur from B–C–D (to bar 25).
Bar 47, Orazio and Agabito: flemma appears with one m.
Bar 64, Continuo: f assai.

Scene One: Recitative
Bar 21, Lisetta, beat three: me spetta (retained), a contraction from mi aspetta.
Bar 32, Orazio, beat one: adagio; Lisetta, beats two-three: ascolti... dots added.

Aria Il Governatore
Bar 11, Violin I, beat four: lowest note in chord is D.
Bar 27, Violin I: grace note on E is not crossed.
Bar 38, Il Governatore, o che somaro: brackets not in the source, but appear in the libretto.

Scene Two: Recitative
Bar 15, Bass, beat one: F# and tied to previous bar.
Scene Five: Aria Nannetta
Bar 5, Violins: notes beamed as sextuplets; parallel passage in Bar 8 beats two and three are unbeamed in the source.
Bar 17, Violin II, beat three: B and G, are not dotted, beat two and three are beamed.
Bar 87, Violin I, beat one: grace note on D is not crossed.

Scene Six: Aria Lisetta
Bar 78, Violins: the forte falls on the last quaver, rather than under the first note of bar seventy-nine.

Scene Nine: Aria Cecchina
Bar 64, Violin II, beat one: no grace note on G appears on the score.

Scene Twelve: Cavatina La Contessa
Bar 3, Violin I, beat two: the articulation on B appears as a wedge in the source.
Bars 3 and 4, Violin II, beat one: ambiguous rest markings in the source.
Bar 6, Violin I, beat four: the slur is from E to G;
Violin II, beat two: E and D sharp are semiquavers.

Scene Thirteen: Aria La Contessa
Bar 8, Flute I: grace note on C is not crossed.
Bar 32, Violin I, beat one: the second quaver (G) is obscured.
Bar 35, La Contessa: B is natural.
Bars 42-43, Violin II: the note C is slurred across the bar to B natural.
Bar 67, Flute I, beat two: grace note on C is crossed.
Bars 117 and 119, Violins: beats one and two: first semiquavers are unbeamed.

Scene Fourteen: Recitative
Bar 15, beat one: one crotchet over two syllables.

Scene Fifteen: Recitative
Bar 18, Basso: F sharp is not tied to note from previous bar.

Scene Sixteen: Aria Don Cessarino
Bar 2, Violin II, beat two has no grace note.
Bar 3, Violins, beat one: grace notes appear as crotchets.
Bar 6, Violin II, beat four: grace note is not crossed.
Bars 11 – 12, Violin I, beats four and one: C and D are slurred, no staccato marking on D.
Bar 17, Violin II, beat four: grace note is not crossed.
Bars 27 - 30 semiquaver patterns realized.
Bar 69, Violins, beat four is C.
Bars 72 and 74; semiquaver groups are beamed across two beats (in eights).

*Scene Seventeen:*
Bar 4, Continuo: semibreve is C.
Bar 19, Orazio: C is not sharpened in the source.

*Finale*
Lisetta’s clef on the source is C3, rather than C1.
Bars 3 – 6, Strings, beats two-four: the source omits the staccato markings on crotchets.
Bar 4, La Contessa: syllables *vos* is placed on the last note.
Bar 11, Lisetta: part adjusted to accommodate the clef error in the source.
Bar 13, Violin II, beats two and three are tied crotchets.
Bars 31–37, Strings, beats two-four: the source omits the staccato markings on crotchets.
Bar 74, Il Governatore: beats one and three are crotchets.
Bars 138–141, Lisetta and Cecchina: text phrases in the reverse in libretto,
   Lisetta: *Senta lustrissima*\(^6\) vorrei parlarvi;
   Cecchina: *Serva umillissima venni a trovarvi.*
It has no bearing, as the two characters unite to finish their dialogue:
   *un grand’arcano gli ho da svelar.*
Bars 150–152, Violin II: the crotchets are not marked staccato following, the pattern in Bar 149.
Bar 155, Don Cesarino: the word *presto* is not contracted to *prest’obbedite.*\(^7\)
Bars 164–165, La Contessa: the text is adjusted to: *dico malissimo, faccio malissimo* in keeping with the libretto as opposed to *dico malissimo* sung twice.

\(^6\) This word is contracted in the libretto.
\(^7\) *Obbedite* is the modern spelling as opposed to one *b.*
Epilogue

Lipton and DelDonna have done much to draw together the scattered and sparse information that exists about Guglielmi. I aim to bring their summaries to the forefront to revive the interest that had been shown in this highly-prolific composer, and to fill the gaps in knowledge surrounding Guglielmi and his involvement in the operas discussed in this thesis. The scores of Brunetti and Gnecchò remain dormant and warrant further investigation. Joseph Schuster’s score of *Lo spirito di contraddizione* also merits study. Caterino Mazzolà’s libretto about the doctor with the contradictory nature and the niece who cleverly outsmarts him to win her preferred husband also needs to be investigated. The score exists intact with its corresponding libretto produced in Dresden.

There has been some scholarly discussion regarding the Neapolitan opera as a genre in its own right. In the 1970s, Robinson asserted that the ‘peculiarity of the Neapolitan brand’, with its emphasis on the dialect, was the main reason why the best examples of Neapolitan opera ‘never gained the international reputation acquired by certain other comic operas by Neapolitan composers that used Tuscan only’. 8 *Lo spirito di contradizione*, however, begs the question as to why, in its Italian form, it never gained a revival, when Anfossi’s original work needed to be re-configured so vigorously to use translations to standard Italian outside the Neapolitan region.

The fact that little is known about Guglielmi may not be due only to the jarring comments of his contemporaries quoted earlier, but may also be attributed to the professional rivalries that existed between Guglielmi, Paisiello and Cimarosa after Guglielmi returned to Naples in 1776. The apparent lack of success with his personal life (even deemed as disastrous by some, as well-documented in the records at Massa) may well have hindered the promotion of his music after his death. DelDonna rightly pointed out that such issues, the basis of much debate ‘….spawned a great deal of dubious journalism and questionable scholarship’. 9 However, Guglielmi’s enormous output could not be ignored by musicologists, and a consistent yet small amount of scholarship has followed. It is important to note that apart from the legacy of

---

9 DelDonna, “The Operas of Guglielmi”, 74.
his many works, Guglielmi’s contemporary stature is apparent in his appointments to the Accademia di Santa Cecilia, the Institute National des Sciences et Arts. These acknowledgements alone should justify continued study of Guglielmi and editing of his works. Hopefully these edited fragments may inspire a full modern edition and future performances.
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Appendix

This Appendix has been included to facilitate the comparison of the examples given in Chapter Three.

Examples 3 and 12 compare the opening of the Finale, Act One: *Falloppio de Falloppis* (1763) and *Orazio de Capocchis* (1766).
Example 12. *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, p. 95, Act One, Finale, Orazio de Capocchis
Examples 4 and 13 below compare the second part of the first act Finale from 1763 and 1766, *Per subscriptionis*.

Example 4. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, p. 105, Act One, second section to the Finale: *Per subscriptu*
Example 13. *Lo spirito di contraddizione*, p.104, Finale, Act One (part two), *Per subscriptionis*
Examples 7 and 15, 16 compare the opening of the finale, Act Three: *Quanno io faccio la grignosa* (1763) and *Quando io faccio la ritrosa* (1766).

Tables 1 and 4 below compare the language from dialect to Italian (respectively) and the order of arias between the scores *Lo sposo di tre e marito di nessuna* from 1763 and 1768.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Number of Scenes</th>
<th>Character, number of arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Opening ensemble/Scene One: Guglielmi</td>
<td>Don Belisario, Odoardo Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio and various people. <em>Che susurro! Che sciabacco!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | Scenes Two to Fifteen | Don Belisario: *Tra il contrasto*  
Lismene: *Se da tue leggiadre stelle*  
Nunziella: *Segnò cojetate*  
Giacomina: *Speranza de chest’arma*  
Don Falloppio: *Se chi è nnamorato mo ride*  
Baroness: *Un concerto simpatico* (cavatina)  
*Ompara la regola, sienti la scuola*  
Odoardo: *Con pallida sembianza*  
Don Tomasino: *Già saie, chi i’è marito*  |
|     | Finale: Guglielmi | Don Belisario, Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio, Don Tomasino: *Falloppio de Falloppis* |
| II  | Sixteen Scenes | Nunziella and Falloppio: *Quanto sosti sventurato* (Cavatina duet)  
Odoardo: *Vedo che sono ingrato*  
Don Tomasino: *Quanno sta sposa, bella e cianciosa*  
Nunziella: *Na vota io nzemprecella*  
Don Belisario: *Il marito è un quid pro quo*  
Giacomina: *Siente a me*  
Don Falloppio: *A zitella innamorata*  
Lismene: *Non speri quell’alma*  
Baroness: *Caro fra tante*  |
|     | Finale: Guglielmi | Baronessa, Don Belisario, Nunziella, Don Tomasino, Odoardo, Don Falloppio, Giacomina.  
*Su spicciate, fate presto*  |
| III | Fifteen Scenes | Lismene: *Quanto m’accese tuo bel sembiante*  
Nunziella: *A’ na seura sventurata*  
Giacomina: *È n’a pazzia sfacciata*  
Baronessa: *Dove son, che cosa oscura*; Guglielmi  
Baronessa, Don Belisario, Odoardo, Nunziella, Don Tomasino,  
Giacomina: *Mpostore, ngannatore* (Sextet)  
Odoardo: *Tornando a te più fido*  |
|     | Finale: Guglielmi | Duets: Baroness and Don Belisario: *Quann’io faccio la sgregnosa*  
Nunziella and Don Falloppio: *Nce sta mpizzanno*  
Giacomina and Don Tomasino: *Per fuggire un’alma ingrata*  |

Table 1. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, 1763
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Number of Scenes</th>
<th>Character, number ofarias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I   | Opening Ensemble (Guglielmi) | Don Belisario, Odoardo Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio and various people.  
*Che susurro!, che fracasso!* |
|     | Fourteen Scenes | Belisario: *Fra il contrasto in me*  
Odoardo: *Tenero cuore amante*  
Nunziella: *Signor fermatevi*  
Giacomina: *Speranza di quest’alma*  
Falloppio: *Se chi è innamorato or ride*  
Baroness: *Zeffiretti orgogliosi* (cavatina by Gasmann)  
*Audia la regola, senti la scuola*  
Don Tomasino: *Già sai chi t’è marito* |
|     | Finale: Guglielmi | Don Belisario, Odoardo, Giacomina, Nunziella, Don Falloppio, Don Tomasino  
*Falloppio de Falloppis* |
| II  | Eleven Scenes | Don Tomasino:  
*Son già tre di che Nina*: Cavatina  
*Un labrettin di rose* (Gasmann)  
Nunziatella:*Un tempo io semplicetta*  
Don Belisario: *Il marito è un quid pro quo*  
Giacomina: *Cosa sia per me non so*  
Falloppio: *Vo far che suonino le trombe*  
Baroness: *Baroncino inzuccherato* |
|     | Finale (Guglielmi) | Baronessa, Don Belisario, Nunziella, Don Tomasino, Odoardo, Don Falloppio, Giacomina  
*Su finisca, faccia presto* |
| III | Ten Scenes | Baroness, Nunziella, Giacomina, Odoardo, Falloppio, Belisario  
*Badi a me, sentite o bella*: Gasmann  
Nunziatella: *A una trista sventurata*  
Baronessa: *Dove son, che cosa oscura?*: Guglielmi |
|     | Finale (Guglielmi) | *Furfante incannatore*: Sextet retained from 1763 |

**Table 4. Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna, 1768**
Examples 2 and 18 compare the opening bars of *Che sussurro, che fracasso* from the scores of 1763 and 1768. The richer orchestration can be seen in the latter.

Example 2. Anfossi, *Lo sposo di tre e marito di nessuna*, p.6, Scene One, *Che sussurro, che fracasso!*
Example 18. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* (Ghelen) p. 21, Act One Ensemble,
*Che sussurro, che fracasso!*
Examples 3, 4, 19 and 20 compare the first and second sections of the finale of Act One, *Falloppio de Fallopiis* and *Per subscriptionis* from 1763 and 1768. By comparing the arpeggiated bass line of the first section, Guglielmi’s authorship can be confirmed.

Example 3. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna* p. 95, Opening of the Finale, Act One, *Falloppio de falloppis*
Example 4. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, p. 105, Act One, second section to the Finale: *Per subscriptu*

*Falloppio de Falloppi.*
Examples 5 and 22 compare the Act Two finale.

Example 5. *Lo sposo di tre, e marito di nessuna*, p. 87, Finale, Act Two: *Su spiciate, fate presto*
Examples 6 and 24 compare the orchestration of the Baroness’s aria *Dove son, che cosa oscura* from 1763 and 1768.


*Dove son, che cosa oscura?*
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