



and finally supply clues as to the composition of the ballets, for example on the groupings among the female and male dancers and their required numbers. This introductory essay is again illustrated by three others: a revised version of Antonia Banducci's earlier essay from this journal, 'Staging and Its Dramatic Effect in French Baroque Opera: Evidence from Prompt Notes' (*Eighteenth-Century Music* 1/1 (2004), 5–28), is followed by Nathalie Rizzoni's 'Le geste éloquent: la pantomime en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle' (The Eloquent Gesture: Pantomime in France during the Eighteenth Century) and Waeber's own contribution "'Le Devin de la Foire"? The Role of Pantomime in Rousseau's *Devin du village*'.

Part 3 is more loosely organized and clusters the remaining five contributions under the generic topic 'Du ballet en action à la synthèse des genres'. This section broadens the ideas discussed in the two previous ones. Sarah McCleave constructs an interesting portrait of 'Marie Sallé and the development of the ballet en action', reviewing the famous dancer's career which 'offers several contexts for discussing gesture' (175). Emilio Sala, Patrick Taïeb and Mark Darlow all show how 'learned' and 'popular' repertoires – those of the Paris Opéra and of the *Foire* – influenced one another, and how they were intermingled for expressive and dramatic purposes. Sala takes Jean-François Mussot's *L'Homme au masque de fer* (1790) as a case study of musical dramatization in the 'pantomime-dialogue', while Patrick Taïeb explores the *ouverture pantomime* of Nicolas Dalayrac's *Azémia* (1786/1787), 'un hommage à "notre grand Rameau"'; Mark Darlow is concerned with 'L'esthétique du tableau dans les ballets de *Tarare*, version de 1819' (The Aesthetic of the *tableau* in the Ballets of the 1819 Version of *Tarare*). As for Bruce Alan Brown's 'Le ballet-pantomime réformé et son nouveau public: Paris, Vienne' (The Reformed Ballet-Pantomime and Its New Public: Paris, Vienna), he tackles the circulation and internationalization of this wordless art of mute acting within and between the cities of Paris, London and Vienna. The book ends with two librettos by Charles-François Pannard edited by N. Rizzoni.

All in all, the book brilliantly investigates and discusses the role of gesture and mime in the theatrical reforms of the century. One may regret, however, that the subgenre of the *théâtre de société* – intended for amateur performers and private circles, and particularly illustrated by Beaumarchais's numerous *parades* – is not given more attention. This is a missed opportunity to study how gesture and music (mainly vaudevilles, and at times original monodies) were brought together in such recreational entertainments, though to be fair to the contributors, such a study would in any case be hampered by the lack of surviving sources. Notwithstanding this, the book remains a welcome and valuable addition to our knowledge of an era in which the French dramatic arts were frequently subject to significant reform.

JEAN-PAUL C. MONTAGNIER



*Eighteenth-Century Music* © Cambridge University Press, 2012  
doi:10.1017/S1478570611000431

IAN WOODFIELD

*THE VIENNA DON GIOVANNI*

Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010

pp. xviii + 214, ISBN 978 1 84383 586 8

Following *Mozart's Così fan tutte: A Compositional History* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), Ian Woodfield has made an equally penetrating study of Mozart's previous opera. Readers may be forgiven for wondering at a reference (xiii) to 'three' Mozart operas 'so far investigated': *Così*, the Prague *Don Giovanni* and the Vienna *Don Giovanni*. Previous discussions (my own included) have indeed identified distinct Prague and Vienna versions of *Don Giovanni*, but they can hardly be said to be two different operas. Indeed, much of Woodfield's absorbing and meticulous study of extant sources tends towards merging, if not quite blending, these versions into a kind of *Don Giovanni* soup in which the choice of ingredients is left to the local chef or impresario.



Undoubtedly, this flexible model of what we understand by ‘Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*’ represents a more realistic view of late eighteenth-century compositional and theatrical practice than does any attempt to fix the opera in a definitive form from which all variants are a departure. It has long been understood that what was performed may have varied considerably during the Vienna run (May–December 1788, after which it disappeared from the Burgtheater repertory in Mozart’s lifetime), but the reasons for such changes (notably the omission of the *scena ultima*) remain unclear. If Woodfield is right, and there were versions that may have been considered but not actually staged, he has added a biographical layer to what was already a difficult, albeit productive period for Mozart. Woodfield also reviews sources that may have been beyond the reach of Mozart and Da Ponte, if not of their co-creators, the singers, designers and managements of the Prague and Vienna theatres. The relations between sources demonstrate two-way transmission between Vienna and Prague as well as export of scores from Vienna copying houses to other theatres, some intended for singspiel performance (in German, with dialogue replacing simple recitatives). Vienna numbers are found in material used for performance in Prague in 1791, when Mozart returned there; and although no source gives ‘any clue as to the musical text performed’, it remains possible that Mozart was ‘an active participant’ in the post-1788 evolution of *Don Giovanni* (129–130).

This leaves areas of uncertainty, and areas ripe for hypothesis: Woodfield admits that what he produces are precise questions, rather than answers. Nevertheless the existence of grey areas offers considerable insight into how the operatic culture of the time viewed a ‘text’ that perhaps became fixed only in the nineteenth century. What would seem aberrations to pure-minded adherents of *Werktreue* turn out to be normal practice, and conceivably had the composer’s consent, if not his positive endorsement. The relatively common practice of placing Elvira’s Vienna aria (‘*Mi tradi*’) in Act 1, as a response to Leporello’s catalogue, makes some sense except that Mozart would not normally have had two arias for the same character in the same act and the same key (but see Woodfield’s discussion of the D major version of ‘*Mi tradi*’, 71–73). In the 1826 New York libretto (possibly sanctioned by Da Ponte), the aria (without recitative) precedes the quartet.

Woodfield acknowledges prior work from other scholars, notably Hans Ernst Weidinger and Dexter Edge, and future researchers will find his concise introduction to their work helpful. He pushes the story on by full presentation of source evidence, often in tabular form, including thirty-one pages (158–188) of ‘page-break analysis’ by which the derivation of copies is deduced (Appendix 2; Appendix 1 details another useful method, ‘error transmission’). It would require much time and a substantial research grant to check these data, and one simply has to trust the author (which I gladly do).

The battery of evidence is formidable, but it still leaves space not only for a ‘theory of transmission’ but also for a strong hint of an ideological position about operatic texts. Woodfield offers a credible picture of ‘organized chaos’, as composer and librettist struggled to complete an opera while copyists were already at work. The creative team includes the singers; we should not consider the Vienna additions as offerings merely to placate them, or view them as a departure from, or indeed a move towards, ‘some kind of abstract, aesthetically ideal version’ (2). Edge has already noted that Ottavio’s Prague aria (‘*Il mio tesoro*’), written for Baglioni, was copied into the performance material for Vienna, which has singers’ names inserted (53); while this does not mean that the Vienna tenor Morella actually sang both arias, as most tenors do today, the possibility cannot be excluded, at least in rehearsal. The aria composed for Morella, ‘*Dalla sua pace*’, was sometimes transferred to Act 2 in (roughly) the place normally occupied by ‘*Il mio tesoro*’.

How many versions, therefore, can be distinguished? Woodfield both clarifies the position and then (for he is a realist) blurs it again. He presents the familiar differences in parallel columns (xvi–xvii), headed simply ‘Prague’ and ‘Vienna’, but eventually identifies ‘four distinct stages in the Viennese conception’ (31). Of these, Vienna 1 is Prague plus the new numbers (unwieldy). The second (source missing) is ‘a hypothetical revision’ of the ordering in Act 2 (31). Vienna 2a and 2b are versions likely to have been considered satisfactory for performance in the particular circumstances of Vienna in 1788: these are covered by the table of extant sources (5–6). But then, as mentioned above, the Vienna additions were sent to Prague, presumably with Mozart’s consent (and Da Ponte’s? His point of view we seldom consider; perhaps he had



none). And the Vienna copying house was preparing scores for other centres, which adapted them to their own circumstances, for that particular season.

Eventually, after Mozart's death, came moves to rationalize the textual situation in the Breitkopf und Härtel full score of 1801 (136–140), apt for an age developing its belief in *Werktreue*: an object for Lydia Goehr's 'imaginary museum' rather than a resource for the theatre, and a brake on further evolution of the hybrid versions flourishing in the 1790s. Printed texts enshrine a work into versions we recognize today as 'Prague' and 'Vienna' *tout court*. The *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* score (1968) relegates the two wonderful arias and the *buffo* duet written for Vienna to the appendix, suggesting that only one version has true authenticity. Its much later *Kritische Bericht* (2003) presents a modified statement about sources – one that, of course, Woodfield modifies still further. The inescapable implication is that the concept of a complete and authentic edition is or ought to be doomed. It does not quite follow, however, that all the hard work was in vain, or that the *Gesamtausgabe* should be considered an aberration. There is a market for printed scores, and purchasers of masterpieces want a stout binding, not a pile of manuscript fascicles such as was prepared for the theatres. These Woodfield aptly compares to a pack of cards, ready to be reshuffled to suit the circumstances of a particular place in a particular season. Perhaps in future electronic scores may be produced that users can shuffle around; but for print there was no alternative to making an ordered selection.

Even Mozart's most extensive alterations, to *Idomeneo* in 1786, do not amount to a new concept: the plot is unchanged and the main effect is on nuances of characterization – also affected by different singers' approaches to identical texts. Some versions of *Don Giovanni* acted in the composer's and librettist's lifetimes were outside their control (most obviously the singspiel versions), and knowledge of these richly informs reception history. Probably undertaken with no intention to slight the original, they document what seemed theatrically presentable in an irrecoverable time and place; this does not afford them status as a template for later interpretations. The modern theatre is not the eighteenth-century theatre; layers of meaning have accumulated that require access to a text we can ascribe to definite, even if multiple, authorship. We may like to imagine 'out there, somewhere, ontologically, is the "real" *Don Giovanni* . . . enshrined mostly in Mozart's score and the printed libretto'; versions traceable to Mozart have 'privileged status, in relation to which all performances and all other kinds of interpretations are secondary or subsidiary' (Richard Will, 'In Search of Authentic Mozart', *News of the National Humanities Center*, Fall/Winter 2010, 1; <<http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/newsletter2010/nhcnewswinter2011.pdf>> (4 July 2011)). This is surely right, but following Edge, Tyson and others, Woodfield makes tellingly clear the pertinence of that 'mostly'; and he points to the irony of performances today going 'authentic' just as 'the academy' is beginning to take a more flexible view of such texts. We are indebted to him for presenting the ingredients that make up the early forms of *Don Giovanni* but we should not regard it as intrinsically wrong to adopt a version of nearly identifiable authorship rather than remixing the *Don Giovanni* soup for every modern production; we can safely leave that to the stage director.

JULIAN RUSHTON



## EDITIONS

*Eighteenth-Century Music* © Cambridge University Press, 2012  
doi:10.1017/S1478570611000443

LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN (1770–1827), ED. JON CEANDER MITCHELL

PIANO CONCERTO IN E FLAT MAJOR WoO 4

Recent Researches in the Music of the Classical Era 80

Middleton: A-R, 2010

pp. xii + 99, ISBN 978 0 89579 665 3

This edition presents a new reconstruction of Beethoven's early unnumbered Concerto in E flat major, generally referred to as WoO 4, the only source of which is a manuscript copy in an unknown hand but