



assumed that all three of the new pieces belong to that version. No mention is made of a setting of the Act 3 aria 'Vedrai s'a tuo dispetto' uniquely preserved in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Mus.ms. 30341, fols 29r-29v). Explicitly attributed in an early hand to 'R. C.' (Rinaldo Cesare), it cannot derive from the 1704 Hamburg version, in which Keiser planned to use Fedeli's setting. This setting must therefore have been composed either for Weissenfels or for Hamburg in 1706. Fortunately, it can be read online through the website of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.

The Ortus edition is well produced in a handsome and sturdy binding. A thorough Preface with abbreviated English translation is limited only by its failure to take much notice of the relevant literature in English. There is a full critical report and numerous facsimiles from *Componimenti musicali*, including a long and very interesting poem by Feind in praise of Keiser. Especially considering the slimness of this volume, it is regrettable that it does not provide a facsimile of Keiser's 1704 Hamburg libretto, at least the revealing Preface. The sole copy of the libretto can, however, be viewed on the website of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, which holds the only copy, under the shelfmark Mus. T 3, 30 (search for VD18 90123972).

The music text appears to be reliable. I would only raise a question regarding the editors' interpretation of Osmano's aria 'Zürne was hin' (14–15). In this aria, labelled 'Violette e tutti li Violini Unisoni' in *Componimenti musicali*, the two violin parts are notated in the alto clef as well as the viola. The clefs and the unusually low range for the violins (g–d<sup>2</sup>) led the editors to conclude that one or more of the violinists would probably have switched to the viola for this aria. A more likely explanation, I think, would be that the alto clef was chosen for the violin parts simply to avoid an unnecessary proliferation of ledger lines.

As a composer – rather than a name in the annals of music history – Keiser is less well known than most of his leading German contemporaries. There are various possible reasons for this neglect: his focus on opera with the inevitable heavy loss of sources and high cost of modern revivals; the mix of languages in the operas, making him neither fish nor fowl to some national tastes; and a misplaced expectation that he will sound like Handel or J. S. Bach and consequent disappointment when he does not. None the less, Keiser was one of the most brilliant and original dramatic composers of his time. He also commands special interest for the enormous influence he exerted on Handel, who over the course of his career borrowed countless melodic ideas from Keiser, no doubt more than we will ever know. Handel's *Almira* clearly betrays his familiarity with Keiser's unfinished first version, as Hellmuth Christian Wolff demonstrated in *Die Barockoper in Hamburg, 1678–1738* (Wolfenbüttel: Mösel, 1957), volume 1, 246–248 and volume 2, 72–83. Hugo Leichtentritt, on page 37 of his dissertation *Reinhard Keiser in seinen Opern* (Berlin, 1901), judged Keiser's setting far superior to Handel's. Whether or not we agree with this assessment, it is very good at last to have a fine modern edition of this important opera.

JOHN H. ROBERTS

[jhroberts@berkeley.edu](mailto:jhroberts@berkeley.edu)



*Eighteenth-Century Music* © Cambridge University Press, 2020

doi:10.1017/S1478570619000393

ANTONIO SALIERI (1750–1825), ED. JANE SCHATKIN HETRICK

*REQUIEM WITH TWO RELATED MOTETS*

Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, 2017

pp. xxv + 248, ISBN 978 0 895 79859 6

With this meticulously prepared edition of the Requiem of 1804, Jane Schatkin Hettrick has completed her publication of all of Antonio Salieri's large-scale sacred compositions, which span the years 1767 to 1809 and include four concerted Masses as well as the early *Missa stylo a cappella*. These volumes, the result of over two



decades of scholarly effort, afford a closer view of the changing conditions for the practice of Catholic liturgical music in central Europe around the turn of the nineteenth century, especially in its relationship to opera. Salieri, a dominant figure in the operatic sphere during this period, pursued a different stylistic orientation in his mass settings, favouring the choral over the solo vocal element, perhaps as a more or less conscious response to controversies over the perceived secularization of church music. Yet for the most part he also eschewed the contrapuntal techniques which had long symbolized the genre of *musica da chiesa* (except in the youthful and accomplished *a cappella* mass of 1767). This choice possibly reflects the diminishing status of polyphony as a norm even in religious music, and perhaps also that the historicizing tendencies of romantic aesthetics had cast polyphony as an ‘antique’ musical feature.

These traits also characterize the Requiem, which actually stands outside the liturgical context of the Viennese Hofmusikkapelle where Salieri served as director from 1788 to 1824. Hettrick explains this in her comprehensively detailed Introduction, where she describes the work as the most personal of all of Salieri’s compositions. Unlike those contemporaries who contributed the period’s best-known examples of the genre (including Jommelli, Michael Haydn, Mozart, Eybler and Cherubini), Salieri composed his Requiem for himself, anticipating his own death by more than twenty years and eventually bequeathing the autograph manuscript not to the imperial court but to his close friend and patron, Count Heinrich Wilhelm von Haugwitz. Most notably, he made a telling alteration of the standard liturgical text of the *Missa pro defunctis*, consistently changing ‘eis’ to ‘ei’ (as in ‘dona ei requiem’) throughout the entire work, in a clear act of self-reference.

Hettrick’s edition provides supplementary material in the form of two related motets by Salieri, *Spiritus meus attenuabitur* and *Audite vocem magnam dicentem*, as well as the Kyrie and responsorial chants which make up a part of the liturgy of the *Libera me* (the concluding section of the Requiem, often treated as an independent piece), together with a substitute clarinet part to be used in the event that the English horn of Salieri’s original scoring is unavailable. All of these additional items are historically valid in deriving from Viennese sources of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, most of them connected with the composer himself or with events which took place shortly following his death on 7 May 1825: his funeral on 10 May in the Augustinerkirche within the imperial court complex and a memorial service on 22 June in the Minoritenkirche, the principal church of Vienna’s Italian community, at which the Requiem was performed for the first time. Yet the volume’s resulting aspect of historical compilation stands somewhat at odds with an apparent aim to present a single authoritative text transcending specificities of time, place and occasion, as illustrated by Hettrick’s reliance on the concept of *Fassung letzter Hand* several times in her commentaries. Without the burden of attempting such an idealized textuality, the edition might have chosen as its principal source the score copy and parts prepared for the memorial service, now in the collection of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, rather than the autograph score, so as to transmit an exemplar of a historically appropriate yet non-prescriptive version for the reference of modern performers. And, indeed, one of the manifest virtues of Hettrick’s edition is the thoroughness and care with which it documents the diverse contexts of its subject matter, covering a wide range of topics that include Salieri’s religious faith, his friendship with Haugwitz and the subsequent history of the Requiem at the latter’s estate in Náměšť nad Oslavou, Bohemia, and the performance practice of sacred music in contemporary Vienna.

The Critical Notes to the Requiem observe that ‘in spite of the special meaning of this work to the composer, as expressed in his instructive title [“Little Requiem, composed by me, and for me, Ant. Salieri, lowliest creature”], it appears that Salieri did not prepare the [autograph] manuscript with exceptional care’ (191). The notation in a number of passages is illegible or incorrect to the point of requiring consultation of the Viennese score copy and parts for a proper transcription, and Hettrick adds that Salieri’s other manuscripts of liturgical music are neater by comparison. These circumstances probably call for a closer exploration of the Requiem’s ‘special meaning’ and of the complex dimensions of individualism and personal significance in musical works altogether c1800, even if the state of biographical and other evidence could never wholly remove the element of speculation. Thus we may ask to what extent the expression ‘lowliest creature’ should be taken at face value, as unambiguous humility and self-abasement, or whether it demonstrates complex



rhetorical dimensions, given Salieri's willingness to compose a Requiem for himself and to alter a 'sacrosanct' liturgical text, producing a shift away from the age-old Christian emphasis on community.

The historical context and musical style of the work might also provide insights into its composer's possible ambivalence towards mortality. For example, around one half of the longest movement, the Sequence, is occupied by a fivefold, unchanging repetition of a seventeen-bar phrase, beginning at 'Recordare, Jesu pie', with intervening passages between each repetition. The phrase consists of four shorter units of four bars each whose endings are all clearly marked by caesuras, with the last unit extended by one bar for greater cadential effect; yet this elongation does little to mediate against the overall feeling of squareness. Even granting the suitability of such an orderly structure to the strophic organization of the text, it is all too easy to find the long series of restatements of identical material perfunctory and even tiresome. Or it could be possible to pursue a more sympathetic interpretation which sets the impersonality and communality of a faith based upon 'one holy catholic and apostolic Church' above the allegedly personal significance of this work and the imperatives of individualist originality. The question remains open for the time being.

JEN-YEN CHEN

[jenyenc@ntu.edu.tw](mailto:jenyenc@ntu.edu.tw)



*Eighteenth-Century Music* © Cambridge University Press, 2020  
doi:10.1017/S147857061900040X

ANTONIO VIVALDI (1678–1741), ED. BETTINA SCHWEMER  
*LA STRAVAGANZA*

Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2019

Score, two volumes: pp. xxv + 162, ISMN 979 0 006 54406 6 / pp. xxv + 131, ISMN 979 0 006 54409 7

Piano reduction, two volumes: pp. xxiv + 177, ISMN 979 0 006 54407 3 / pp. xxiv + 129, ISMN 979 0 006 54410 3

The appearance of the landmark collection *L'Estro armonico* (Amsterdam: Estienne Roger, 1711) – his Op. 3 – catapulted Vivaldi into international fame as a leading composer of instrumental concertos and helped initiate a transalpine craze for North Italian-influenced solo concertos. Anticipating demand for a follow-up collection, Vivaldi included a letter in Op. 3 in which he promised another collection to follow shortly. The varied disposition of the works in Op. 3 required a minimum of eight partbooks, so Vivaldi promised the next collection would have fewer parts and thus be more affordable for those who found the required materials to be an expensive proposition. Several years elapsed before Op. 4 appeared, even though evidence suggests the concertos found in Op. 4 were submitted to the publisher around the time Op. 3 was published. During this intervening period, Vivaldi began to establish himself as a prominent composer and impresario for Venetian operatic theatres and became increasingly involved in compositional duties at the Pio Ospedale della Pietà.

Eager to ensure that this second collection of concertos live up to the excitement generated by Op. 3, Vivaldi focused on building even more invention, drama and surprises into his harmonic, rhythmic and textural vocabulary. He gave the set the title *La stravaganza* ('Extravagance'), and several aspects of his experimentation throughout the set are among the boldest ideas to be found in his published works. While not quite reaching the same level of acclaim as his Op. 3, *La stravaganza* was very well received. The concertos were reprinted and reissued several times – as a whole and as part of small sets of 'favourite' concertos.

The present edition by Bettina Schwemer partially draws upon work begun by the late Christopher Hogwood in preparation for his own edition, which was left uncompleted at the time of his death. The twelve concertos of Op. 4 are published in score alongside several alternative versions and related works (RV291 – added to Walsh and Hare's 1728 edition of Op. 4 – along with RV383 and the first movement of RV381, the latter two related to Concerto 1 of the set). A violin-piano reduction and performance parts (the latter not reviewed here) are also