

ABSTRACT

- 1 -

CARLO GOLDONI AND THE 18TH-CENTURY LONDON STAGE

Thesis submitted for an M. A. degree

This is a translation into Goldoni's working relationship as a librettist with the King's Theatre in London and it covers the period between 1740 and 1793. The King's Theatre was known as the Italian Opera House and Goldoni was invited to write libretti for its productions. This he did successfully - so successfully that he can be said to have become an integral part of the cultural life of an exalted section of London society.

The cultural climate in London in the 18th century favoured entertainments such as pantomime, farce and burlesque, that had derived from or imitated Commedia dell'Arte. This liking for traditional theatrical forms was a European phenomenon and had its roots in the Theatre of Shakespeare in England as well as in the popular and the classical theatre in France. In Italy the Commedia dell'Arte never really died, although in the 18th century Goldoni tried to free himself from it in an attempt to modernise the Italian theatre. But even so, Commedia dell'Arte survived in libretti of the type Goldoni was writing and which proved successful for Comic Opera. This was the result of an evolution from simpler musical forms such as intermezzi and cantata a lingua and soon rivalled Opera Seria in popularity. In the second half of the century and under the influence of proto-Romanticism comic-opera libretti became increasingly sentimental, a trend which was reflected in Goldoni's own libretti for this type of theatrical entertainment. Comic Opera was evolving in the direction of the type of "melodrama" which was to dominate the theatre of the 19th century. In this context Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola - one of the great successes of the King's Theatre - demonstrates that while preserving links with a traditional past Goldoni seemed to be looking forward to a future development in Comic-Opera libretti, which, dying as he did in 1793, he was not to live to see.

Gabriella King

University of London, Bedford College

ProQuest Number: 10097348

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10097348

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

This is an investigation into Goldoni's working relationship as a librettist with the King's Theatre in London and it covers the period between 1749 and 1793. The King's Theatre was known as the Italian Opera House and Goldoni was invited to write libretti for its productions. This he did successfully - so successfully that he can be said to have become an integral part of the cultural life of an exalted section of London society.

The cultural climate in London in the 18th century favoured entertainments such as pantomime, farce and burlesque, that had derived from or imitated Commedia dell'Arte. This liking for traditional theatrical forms was a European phenomenon and had its roots in the theatre of Shakespeare in England as well as in the popular and the classical theatre in France. In Italy the Commedia dell'Arte never really died, although in the 18th century Goldoni tried to free himself from it in an attempt to modernise the Italian theatre. But even so, Commedia dell'Arte survived in libretti of the type Goldoni was writing and which proved suitable for Comic Opera. This was the result of an evolution from simpler musical forms such as intermezzi and cantata a llengua and soon rivalled Opera Seria in popularity. In the second half of the century and under the influence of proto-Romanticism comic-opera libretti became increasingly sentimental, a trend which was reflected in Goldoni's own libretti for this type of theatrical entertainment. Comic Opera was evolving in the direction of the type of "melodrama" which was to dominate the theatre of the 19th century. In this context Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola - one of the great successes of the King's Theatre - demonstrates that while preserving links with a traditional past Goldoni seemed to be looking forward to a future development in Comic-Opera libretti, which, dying as he did in 1793, he was not to live to see.

entertainments and pantomime. The subsequent revival of Commedia dell'Arte and use of Goldoni's libretti.

	<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>
Abstract	Reference in Goldoni's <u>Mémoires</u> to his collaboration with "the London Opera House". This identified as King's Theatre in Haymarket. Research uncovers widely scattered material for comprehensive study. Chosen time boundaries 1749 and 1793. Review of History of London Stage necessary in evaluating Goldoni's contribution to it. Italian <u>Opera Seria</u> an integral part of London's cultural life. Followed by revival of <u>Commedia dell'Arte</u> through pantomime. Followed by public enthusiasm for Comic Opera. Goldoni's early comic opera- <u>libretti</u> widely used on account of their <u>Commedia dell'Arte</u> ingredients. His collaboration with Piccinni under proto-Romantic influences leading to a new, "sentimental" type of Comic Opera. In Goldoni's <u>libretti Commedia dell'Arte</u> the link with the past, sentimentality the link with the future.
Introduction	
Chapter one	Cultural, economic, social conditions in 18th-century London. Italian Opera an integral part of the London Stage. The King's Theatre known as "the Italian Opera House". Links between musical entertainments and pantomime. Subsequent revival of <u>Commedia dell'Arte</u> and use of Goldoni's <u>libretti</u> .
Chapter two	Development of English farce from French comedy. Its links with <u>Commedia dell'Arte</u> . <u>Harlequin</u> comes
Chapter three	
Chapter four	
Chapter five	
Chapter six	

- Chapter two Commedia dell'Arte in England before 1700. Development of English farce from French comedy. Its links with Commedia dell'Arte. Harlequin comes back to England through France: a modern form of Commedia dell'Arte called pantomime. Burlesque, another 18th century favourite form of entertainment. Opera House.
- Chapter three J. Rich a Comic Opera impresario. Scene painting becomes a profession. Survival of neoclassical style in Opera and pantomime.
- Chapter eight J. Rich's Theatre. Another gap in the production of comic operas at the
- Chapter four The place of Goldoni's Il Negligente and of Italian "burlettas" in the history of Comic Opera in England. Venetian Comic Opera as opposed to Neapolitan Opera Buffa. Venice and theatres outside Italy the links between Goldoni and contemporary comic-opera composers.
- Chapter nine "Sentimentality", sensibility and taste
- Chapter five In Venice Goldoni's partnership with Galuppi begins. Goldoni already known in London. The contribution of singers to the rise or fall of operas. Theresa Cornelys intrigues in London. Her links with Venice.
- Chapter ten A slow decline in Goldoni's popularity.
- Chapter six Goldoni's Il Negligente and the Commedia dell'Arte. Il Negligente and the reform of the Theatre Goldoni Advocated in Il Teatro Comico. Figaro.

- Chapter seven A long gap (1750-1760) in the use of Goldoni's libretti at the King's Theatre. Italian libretti and Goldoni's libretti at Rich's Covent Garden. More Goldoni at the King's Theatre from 1760. Il Filosofo di Campagna: Goldoni's libretto, English humanitarianism and the social involvement of the Italian Opera House.
- Chapter eight The years from 1753 to 1763 favourable to Comic Opera. More libretti by Goldoni at the King's Theatre. Another gap in the production of comic operas at the King's Theatre after 1763. Comic Opera evolves and becomes sentimental: Goldoni's partnership with Piccinni. La Buona Figliuola.
- Chapter nine La Buona Figliuola at the King's Theatre. A new stage in the history of Comic Opera. "Sentimentality", sensibility and hints of Romanticism. Richardson's influence on European literature and on Goldoni's Pamela and La buona Figliuola.
- Chapter ten More of Goldoni's libretti used in London between 1769 and the end of the century. A slow decline in Goldoni's popularity. The rise of new composers, librettists and operas. Success of Th. Holcroft's The Follies of a day, based on Beaumarchais' Le Mariage de Figaro.

Chapter eleven

Goldoni's Mémoires a subjective and interpretation of his personal history. Evidence and counter-evidence in establishing dates of Goldoni's direct collaboration with the King's Theatre. Favart's testimony. Goldoni's letters. Women managers at the King's Theatre. Their identity established. Involvement of English actor-managers and English playwrights in affairs of the King's Theatre. The personal and business relationship between Mrs. Yates and Mrs. Brooke. The King's Theatre destroyed by fire (1789). A new trend following the evolution of Comic Opera: melodrama.

Chapter twelve

Goldoni's success in London due to his writing of Comic Opera libretti. His attitude to money. Carlo Gozzi's low opinion of him. Goldoni's use of the 18th-century social system and of patronage to his own advantage. His relationship with the public. His name known to a selected English public.

Appendix one

His friends and patrons in France. His contribution to the English Stage.

Appendix two

J.J.Rousseau and the birth of melodrama.

End of Goldoni's life coinciding with end of century and of an era. The new Comic Opera and G.Rossini.

Appendix three

Some 18th-century English adaptations, imitations and translations of Goldoni's libretti and plays.

Bibliography

Conclusions New professional openings for Goldoni in London. His position in France becoming precarious. Success in London due to particular conditions of the English Stage and to tradition of theatrical entertainments involving Italian singer and musicians and Commedia dell'Arte players. Social conditions help the establishment of Italian Serious Opera in London in the 18th century and later of Comic Opera. Goldoni's libretti contain Commedia dell'Arte elements suited to Comic Opera. Actors and other theatre people instrumental in securing Goldoni's collaboration for the King's Theatre. The King's Theatre saved from bankruptcy. Adaptations and imitations of Goldoni's libretti. Goldoni unaware of his position in the context of English culture. Borrows from Richardson. Introduces "sentimentality" in comic-opera libretti. Prepares way for melodrama. Commedia dell'Arte the link between early melodrama and pantomime.

Appendix one List of main London theatres operating in the 18th century.

Appendix two List of Opera managers at the King's Theatre(1750-1789)

Appendix three Some 18th-century English adaptations, imitations and translations of Goldoni's libretti and plays.

Bibliography

On reading Goldoni's Mémoires I was struck by some remarks he makes about the "Italian Opera House" in London and his working relationship as a writer of libretti with this theatre. On investigation I found that I could trace no study of the connection between Goldoni and England, although the activities of Goldoni outside Italy had been studied by such people as P.P.Rogers, O.Marffy, A.Amfiteatroff in relation to countries as far apart as Spain, Hungary and Russia. Further background research revealed that London was in fact the heart of the cultural activities which linked the English Stage with Italian Opera. Furthermore, the reference by Goldoni to the "Italian Opera House" (1) in London pointed to a specific musical centre, which I now know to have been the King's Theatre in Haymarket, originally called the Queen's Theatre. (2)

My field of interest having been narrowed down to London and to one of its theatres, I decided to make a study of Goldoni's relations with the London Stage. The material I found was abundant but dispersed in all sorts of books and papers. My main sources about the use of Goldoni's libretti in London were catalogues of theatrical events in England and in the world, 18th-century English newspapers and magazines, Diaries, Mémoires and Histories of music. Drawings and reproductions of portraits have also provided valuable details and so have indirect references taken from matters purely concerning English theatre and English actors.

Although previously recorded here and there as scattered items in catalogues and lists of dramatic events, this material has never, to my knowledge, been put together in a comprehensive study; nor has it been evaluated as regards its importance in relation to the history of the London Stage. Thus I have been able to make it available in collected form for further evaluation of the importance of libretti in the life and artistic development of Goldoni himself.

The first difficulty that I had to overcome was the task of

-
- (1) Memorie di Carlo Goldoni riprodotte dall'edizione originale francese, Municipio di Venezia, 1948, vol.2, p.65 (in Opere Complete)
 - (2) Its name was changed on the death of Queen Ann and subsequent accession to the throne of George I in 1714.

organising the bulk of the information into a chronological sequence so as to build up a consecutive record of the performances of all the operas concerned, year by year, from 1749 to the end of the century. 1749 proved to be the date of the first recorded performance in London of an opera based on a libretto by Goldoni: and that was Il Negligente. This was a clear starting point. I chose the end of the century as the other time-boundary for my study because I wanted to limit my research to events which happened in Goldoni's lifetime. In following a chronological method in the exposition of facts, yet a second obstacle had to be overcome. It arose from the fact that track had to be kept of other libretti which were being introduced to the London Stage while earlier ones, that had already been recorded, continued to be used in subsequent performances. The history of Il Filosofo di Campagna is a case in point. This was performed for the first time in 1761 and for the last in 1772, but meanwhile such operas as Il Mondo della Luna (1760-61), La Calamita dei Cuori (1763), La Buona Figliuola (1766-91), to mention but a few, were running up a considerable total of performances alongside Il Filosofo di Campagna.

The third difficulty that had to be disposed of concerned the evaluation of the importance of Goldoni's libretti in relation to the London Stage. This was only possible if the whole history of the London Stage and that of the King's Theatre within it were reviewed. To do this, it seemed best to insert the information which had been organised chronologically into a background study of literary, theatrical and social history. By discussing contemporary topical cultural events and inserting the material relating to Goldoni into a general English context, the nucleus of the research could be used to illustrate points that needed to be made. For the actual value of Goldoni's contribution to the London Stage lies in its having found a place within English cultural traditions.

The Commedia dell'Arte formed a central part of such traditions, as is shown by the history of the English theatre before 1700. In the 18th century Harlequin came back to England through France; and a new form of Commedia dell'Arte, then called pantomime, was born. Meanwhile two other types of entertainment, which had some basic elements in common with the Commedia dell'Arte, came into the limelight: these were farce and burlesque.

Before this revival of the Commedia dell'Arte took place, Italian Opera - that is "serious" Opera - had become an integral part of the London theatrical life as a result of the prevailing economic and social conditions of 18th-century London. The revived interest in Commedia dell'Arte reinforced existing links between musical entertainments and English 18th-century pantomime. This encouraged the establishment of Comic Opera and led the managers of the King's Theatre to choose comic operas based on libretti by Goldoni on account of their being congenial to the taste of the times. It is significant in this connection that the famous pantomime impresario John Rich became also a Comic Opera impresario and put on comic operas based on Goldoni's libretti at Covent Garden. For this Rich needed a great deal of scenery and so it was that he employed painters specifically for that purpose, thus making scene painting a profession in its own right rather than part of a painter's duties.

Just as Goldoni's partnership with Ciampi, Galuppi and other Venetian composers led to the establishing of Comic Opera in London in the 1750s, so his collaboration with the Neapolitan composer Piccinni in 1760 helped the development of this musical genre into a new type of "sentimental" Comic Opera. This happened under the influence of the proto-Romantic movement, which was affecting literature as well as music and the arts. Goldoni was seeking to use the influence of Richardson when he wrote the play Pamela in 1750 and again later when he transformed it into the

libretto of La Buona Figliuola. It is also significant that Mrs. Francis Brooke, one of the managers of the King's Theatre, with whom Goldoni had dealings, belonged to Richardson's circle and was herself a novelist in the "sentimental" genre.

During the earlier period which I have surveyed, the links between Goldoni's work as the author of libretti and their utilisation in productions on the London Stage were largely indirect. Indeed these may have been productions which were put on without Goldoni's permission and without profit to him. At some time between 1765 and 1769 an important change takes place. Goldoni's collaboration with the King's Theatre now becomes direct: we find him in correspondence with the management, sending libretti in response to specific requests made to him for new, or newly available, material. We know that he was by then in financial difficulties. Moreover, from being an established and acclaimed playwright in Venetian theatres he had moved to Paris and had become Teacher of Italian to the Royal Children at the French Court; and from being a reformer of the Italian theatre he had become an adaptor of libretti for foreign theatres and a writer of scenarios for Italian companies in Paris. His patrons were dying one by one and the society which had bred them was about to be overturned by the French Revolution. Finally Goldoni resorted to writing his Mémoires to obtain the patronage of the King of France himself - to whom he dedicated them - and to earn much needed money from subscribers who had an interest in the Italian Theatre.

By the time the 18th century was coming to its close a new phase in the history of the London Stage was about to start. In this new phase, too, Goldoni had a part to play: the influence of the master-craftsman of the 18th-century stage is seen after his death, shaping the taste of yet another generation, while "melodrama", in its 19th-century meaning, takes over where "sentimentality" and "sensibility" have left off.

The first record of any of Goldoni's libretti being used in London is of a performance by the King's Theatre Company at the Little Haymarket Theatre. This was on Tuesday, 21st November 1749. The King's Theatre was also known as the Italian Opera House and this indicates that the history of the London Stage in the 18th century is tightly bound up with the history of Italian Opera. A fairly comprehensive list of Italian composers, singers, dancers, scene designers, librettists who had connections with the Italian Opera in London would include hundreds of names. There were other composers, such as Handel, J.C. Bach, Gluck, Mozart who must also be remembered as composers of "Italian" operas. It is therefore to Goldoni's credit that he should have been formally invited to take an active part in the cultural life of eighteenth-century London.

There is a passage in Goldoni's Mémoires where he tells us of his engagement with the "Italian Opera House" in London. It reads as follows:

"On me demandoit à Londres; c'est le seul pays qui puisse disputer en Europe la primauté à Paris: J'aurois été bien aise de le voir; mais j'entendois parler de grands mariages à Versailles; j'avois assisté a tous les convois de la Cour, je voulois m'y trouver dans le temps des réjouissances.

D'ailleurs ce n'étoit pas le Roi d'Angleterre qui me demandoit, c'étoit les Directeurs de l'Opéra qui vouloient m'attacher a leur Spectacle.

Je tâchai cependant de tirer parti de l'opinion avantageuse qu'ils avoient de moi; je donnai de bonnes raisons pour faire agréer mes excuses, et je leur offris mes services sans l'obligation de quitter la France.

Mes propositions furent acceptées; on me demanda un Opéra-comique nouveau, et on me chargea de raccomoder tous les vieux Drames, qu'ils avoient choisis pour le courant de l'année.

On ne parla pas de la récompense, je n'en fis pas mention non plus, je travaillai: les Anglois furent contents de moi; je fus très-satisfait de leur honnêteté.

Cette correspondance eut bien pendant plusieurs années; elle ne cessa que lorsque les Directeurs cederent à d'autres leur entreprise, et je reçus à cette occasion une marque bien

(1) Mémoires de Goldoni, Paris, 1797, t. 1, p. 105.

(2) E. J. Denton, A Social History of English Music, London, 1964, p. 87.

certaine de leur satisfaction, car ils ne payerent un Opéra dont ils n'étoient plus dans le cas de se servir; cette direction étoit entre les mains de femmes, et les femmes sont aimables par-tout. (1)

In his article "The Eighteenth Century" in A Social History of English Music E.D.Mackerness suggests that the popularity of opera in general throughout that century was due to a startling and rapid change in the economic situation, which in turn influenced people's taste and attitudes. In 1688, he says, the standard of living in England increased to an unprecedented degree. Moreover, a law which was introduced in 1697 to restrain financial speculations gave further momentum to this process by lending respectability to a profession whose purpose was the making of money - namely stock-broking. "Henceforth the pursuit of wealth as an end in itself became a respectable calling". (2) At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were ten times more people in business than in the reign of King Charles II. Money afforded an opportunity for non-business activities and stimulated a liking for forms of art that had the mark of novelty. E.D.Mackerness cites James Brydges, 1st duke of Chandos, as a symbol of an age when opulence, social prestige and artistic inclinations could all combine in one man - he achieved a high rank in civil service, was a successful investor in South Sea shares and actively sponsored musicians, men of letters and architects.

The artists and musicians who operated in this century were very often foreigners who, as well as being moved by a spirit of adventure, had discovered that there existed a demand for their skills in England. Italian musicians had been heard in this country since before the Restoration but it was the re-opening of the English theatres after their closure during the Commonwealth that helped to bring about a situation favourable to the creation of a network of theatrical enterprises

-
- (1) Quoted as printed in Memorie di Carlo Goldoni riprodotte dall' edizione originale francese, in Opere complete, ed.G.Ortolani, Municipio di Venezia, 1948, vol 2, p. 65
- (2) E.D.Mackerness A Social History of English Music, London 1964 p. 87

and epilogues. Drama performances were only allowed in theatres which had either been given a Royal Patent by the King or a licence by the Lord Chamberlain.

that led to the continuous use of a theatre solely for the production of Italian operas by Italian companies. This was the King's Theatre, originally called the Queen's Theatre. (1) The Commonwealth and puritanism had done so much to divert people's attention from the theatre that those who dared patronize private companies had to resort to tricks to obtain permission to put on shows in play-houses. In 1656 Lord Davenant (1606-1668) thought up a sort of musical drama, The First Days Entertainment at Rutland House, and The Siege of Rhodes to evade puritan regulations. Sir William Davenant and Thomas Killigrew each had a company, called respectively the Duke's company on account of the Duke of York's patronage, (2) and the King's company. They managed to secure a monopoly of theatrical enterprises for themselves and operated separately at Dorset Gardens and the Theatre Royal in Bridges Street, respectively. They united in 1682 only to separate again in 1695. After that the principle of a two-company monopoly managed to survive in spite of violations and opposition, till 1737 when it was rigorously legalized by the Licensing Act. (3) Perhaps Lord Davenant did not realize the historical importance of his experiment but the fact remains that "operatic" spectacles were repeatedly attempted during the Restoration period (1660-1685) to the delight of audiences. None the less the English operatic movement never went much beyond Henry Purcell (1658 ? - 1695) and later Italian Opera was introduced to fulfill what had become a need for music and spectacle. As Emmett L. Avery and Arthur H. Scouten aptly say: "With the restoration of Charles II early in 1660, an opportunity arose for the theatrical world to begin anew and the player, manager, playwright and spectator to restore the drama to its former position in England's culture. By 1660 the principal actors of the days of James I and Charles I had died or had so drifted out of touch with dramatic enterprise that the continuity of acting had

(1) See Appendix No. 1

(2) He later became James II (1633-1701)

(3) The Act set limitations to the Sovereign's power to grant Royal Patents to theatres and gave the Lord Chamberlain authority to licence or forbid all new plays, additions to old plays, prologues and epilogues. Drama performances were only allowed in theatres which had either been given a Royal Patent by the King or a licence by the Lord Chamberlain.

been impaired, though certainly not lost....In addition, the playwrights of the old regime were no longer productive..The professional theatre, experienced actors and knowledgeable spectators had to be re-created. In bringing the theatre to life again, the managers, playwrights, performers, and the public developed after 1660 many practices, including some striking innovations, which set the pattern for the London professional theatre for the next hundred and fifty years." (1)

The 18th-century critic and musician Charles Burney points out, in his General History of Music, that "whatever attempts were made at musical dramas in England during the seventeenth century, the language in which they were sung, was always English. The stilo recitativo was, indeed, brought hither from Italy, early in that century by Nicholas Lartière; but it was applied to English only..Italian Music was long talked of and performed in England, before we heard of Italian singing". (2)

Love of Italian music was fostered in London by the good relations existing between the English Court of Charles II (1630-1685) and that of France, where Charles had spent his exile from 1646 to 1660. Musical drama was held in great favour in France and the Italian-born composer G.B.Lulli (1632-1687) worked under the patronage of Louis XIV. Moreover, love of music in general was encouraged by Charles II's habit of having concerts and musical entertainments at Court. This helped the growth of public concert halls. In 1670 J.Bannister, a composer and musician, started giving concerts at his house, which he called "Musick School". He was soon imitated by a number of musicians and the public demand for concerts was so great by the end of Charles II's reign that he officially gave his royal patronage to York Buildings. A curious imitation of theatre procedure then developed at Concert Halls: spoken prologues and epilogues were introduced, foreign performers brought to London and concerts organised for visiting Royalty. This was a godsend for Italian musician and singers who were trying to make a name for

-
- (1) E.C.Avery and A.H.Scouten, The London Stage (1660-1700), Critical Introduction, Southern Illinois Univ.Press, 1968, p. XXI-XXII
 - (2) F.Mercer ed., A General History of Music, 1935, vol. 2, p. 651

themselves. By 1713 Thomas Hickford had set up subscription concerts at his rooms off the Haymarket; in 1738 he transferred to Brewer Street and operated from there till 1770. In E.D.Mackerness' view this kind of business shrewdness was a reaction to an attitude of the age:

"The period was one in which technical prowess was beginning to command a high market value. Musicians...needed to make contact with a public larger than the small circle of friends...in private houses". (1) As a result, theatrical managers felt justified in trying their hand at full-scale Italian operas rather than in limiting themselves to the presentation of excerpts, although these were, of course, much cheaper.

Parallel to the development of public concerts was that of the entr'acte. The theatre people who were all out to re-awaken in the public a taste for theatrical entertainment, introduced a mixed form of show and also enlarged their programmes. At first they had music and simple entr'acte numbers in the form of unspoken allegories which were danced and mimed; there was also singing and rope-dancing, that is dancing with the addition of rope skipping and rope twirling. This type of entertainment was typical of Fairs but it has also been recorded as a favourite number at Whitehall Palace and at the Banqueting Hall. The public soon came to expect this kind of show and in time the new concept of theatre as a variety of entertainments became established. It is important to stress the development of the Concert Hall type of show and of the entr'acte because together they later encouraged the vogue for pantomime and comic opera which, backed by the Commedia dell'Arte tradition and the new trends in music, made Goldoni's invitation to collaborate with the King's Theatre not only a feasible but almost an inevitable proposition.

Entr'acte performers were plentiful. Encouraged by Charles II French and Italian troupes - mainly rope-dancers and Commedia dell'Arte actors - came to London every year from 1660 to 1685 with the

(1) E.D.Mackerness, A Social History of English Music, London 1964, p. 89

exception of 1662-63, 1665-66-67-68 and 1680-81. (1) They were either directly invited by the King or protected by the Crown. In 1660 Charles II offered a grant to Giulio Gentileschi to bring Italian Opera to London; in 1678-9 the Duke of Modena's company came and in 1683-84 that of the Duke of Orange. The Italian dancer and acrobat Tiberio Fiorelli (1608-1694) enjoyed Charles II's particular favours and in the 1670s he became the rage in London after he had become famous in Paris as a maskless Scaramouche at the Petit-Bourbon. Serious English actors and actresses, too, such as John Lacy (d.1681), Nell Gwyn (1650-1687), Joseph Haines (d.1701) Anne Bracegirdle (1663-1748) were required to be able to dance, sing and play an instrument. (2)

Less enthusiastic patronage under James II (1685-1688), William and Mary (1688-1702) and Ann (1702-1714) did not entirely discourage the flow of foreign troupes from the continent. Ann was not an outstanding patron of the arts but was fond of music. It was during her reign that Italian Opera, sung in Italian, was first put on in a public theatre. This was the Queen's Theatre in the Haymarket, on the site of the present Her Majesty's Theatre. It had not been built for opera. It was the creation of the architect and dramatist John Vanbrugh (1664-1726), was the first theatre to be built in London in the eighteenth century and set a pattern, for size and design, for all other theatres in eighteenth-century England. It opened on April 19th 1705 with an opera, The Loves of Ergasto, by G.Greber, only because opera was then the fashion, none the less a great actress, Mrs.Bracegirdle, was called upon to speak the prologue.

Thomas Betterton (1635-1710) moved in with his company for the season 1705-6 and Congreve took charge of the management. Operas were given occasionally with Italian vocalists; but in 1708 Drury Lane began to present plays only, thus leaving it entirely to the Queen's Theatre to provide London audiences with opera, twice weekly. Apparently the

-
- (1) E.L.Avery and A.H.Scouten, The London Stage (1660-1700), Critical Introduction, Southern Illinois Univ.Press, 1968, p.CXL-CXLI
 - (2) The date of birth of John Lacy and that of Joseph Haines are unknown.

Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.

acoustics of the Queen's Theatre were not suited to drama and players did not like to act in it. After some structural and managerial changes drama production was abandoned. Operas, too, finally ceased in 1716-17 following the flight of the manager Owen Swiny with the takings of Theseus and the failure of a co-operative enterprise by John Jacob Heidegger. The political situation also contributed to keeping Royalty away from the Opera while Joseph Addison's Cato was alluring spectators to Drury Lane.

In 1719 a novel enterprise was started. A group of aristocrats got together and founded a society which they called the Royal Academy of Music. Opera became these associates' business. With the patronage of George I (1714-1727) to back them up they appointed J.J.Heidegger (1659-1749) manager and Paolo Antonio Rolli librettist. (1) Ariosti, Bononcini and Handel were resident composers at the Opera House which was now called King's Theatre. George I, who could neither speak nor understand English, relied on foreign entertainment and it now fell to the Hanoverians to help Italian opera to establish itself as part of the London Theatre. Season tickets were offered to the public with a guarantee of a minimum number of opera productions and the best foreign singers available were engaged. But they asked for astronomical wages, they argued among themselves dragging the public into their quarrels, the women singers fought for precedence on play-bills. The actual production of Italian Opera presented two major difficulties: the first arose from the libretti which had to be adapted to English requirements, the second from the great deal of machinery, costumes, sets needed to achieve a suitable air of grandeur. E.L.Avery points out that "In England, according to Riva, the requirements included few recitatives, some thirty arias and at least one duet, all of these to be distributed throughout three acts. The subject matter should be tender and heroic,

(1) P.A.Rolli (1687-1765), author, critic, poet and translator, lived in London between c.1715-1744. He was tutor to George II's children and played an important part in making Italian Opera known in England. Among his libretti, which were used in London are: Numitore, Muzio Scevola, Floridante, Griselda, Erminia, Scipione, Alessandro, Ariadne in Naxos, Enea nel Lazio, Polifemo, Ifigenia in Aulide, Orfeo, Sabrina, Parthemius, Nerone e Selinunte, Olimpia, Busiri, Deidamia, Penelope, Maraspe, Rossane, Alfonso, Rosalinda, Aristodemo, Alceste - all these produced between 1720-1744

preferably Roman or Greek, but not Gothic. Because of the composition of the company, there must be equal parts for the two leading women, Cuzzoni and Faustina; they should have a duet, which must come at the end of Act 2. As Senesino was the principal castrato, his part must be heroic, and the other three castrati must sing one aria apiece in each act." (1) In achieving a suitable air of grandeur it was difficult to reconcile the traditionally spectacular nature of Italian Opera as performed in Italy with the slender means of the Italian Opera companies in London. As early as 1711 Aaron Hill, opera manager at the Queen's Theatre for the season 1710-11, had written that Opera would be better received if an effort were made to "fill the Eye with more delightful Prospects so at once to give Two Senses equal Pleasure." (2). Clumsy attempts at this were criticized by some newspapers, such as the Spectator. At the same time the playgoers who relished spectacular entr'acte numbers demanded the same kind of entertainment and more so from Opera.

In 1728 financial disaster hit the Royal Academy of Music and its operatic enterprise came to an end in the Spring of that year. Opera production was resumed in 1729 under the joint management of Heidegger and Handel with George II (1683-1760) as patron and the financial support of the Prince of Wales (1707-1751), that is Frederick Louis, son of George II and Queen Caroline and father of George III. Unfortunately Handel had disagreements with some of his aristocratic supporters as well as with singers and collaborators. This made it the more difficult to cope with the managerial problems the Opera House had inherited from the seventeen-twenties and in 1733 a new and separate opera company was formed under the sponsorship of the Prince of Wales and a few aristocrats. It was headed by the Italian Nicola Porpora (1686-1766) and settled in at the King's Theatre in 1734, forcing Handel to move to Covent Garden. The rivalry soon ended but so did Handel's and

-
- (1) E.L.Avery, The London Stage, 1700-1729, Critical Introduction, Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1968, p. lxxxvll
 - (2) Rinaldo, text by Giacomo Rossi with a preface by A.Hill, music by G.F.Handel, London 1711

(3) The London Stage, 1700-1729, Critical Introduction, Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1968, p. lxxxvll
J. Davis, The Critical Works, ed. J.G. Eccles, Baltimore, 1973, pp. 11-12

Heidegger's enterprise. It took the money and the determination of Lionel Cranfield Sackville, Duke of Dorset and later Earl of Middlesex (1688-1765) to bring Italian Opera back into the limelight. He was impresario from 1741-1748 and engaged a resident composer who, on account of his collaboration with Goldoni, was later to become one of the most famous comic-opera composers of the century. His name was Baldassarre Galuppi and he became known in London as a composer of serious operas. By the time he had gone back to Italy to become vice maestro di cappella at St. Mark's in Venice in 1748 Italian Opera in London had taken root. It was, in the words of Samuel Johnson, "an exotick and irrational entertainment which has been always combated and always has prevailed." (1) Among other things, the opponents of Italian Opera did not think it dignified for Britons to listen to eunuchs singing; on the other hand the grand-tour craze had helped to encourage a passion for Italian culture and, in intellectual circles, a genuine taste for it.

The Grand-Tour and in particular the Italian section of it, made an indispensable contribution to the taste of English gentlemen at a time when a controversy about "Taste" was raging. Addison, returning from a three-year sojourn in Italy in 1703, wrote Remarks on Several Parts of Italy (1705). This was reprinted in 1718 and sold at five times the price of the original edition.

In 1702 John Dennis (1657-1744) had written a Large Account of the Taste in Poetry and the Causes of the Degeneracy of it, whose general principles can be applied to the Opera and which he re-affirmed in 1725. His contention was that, unlike the audiences of Charles II's reign, 18th-century audiences were made up of uncultured upstarts: "Younger Brothers, Gentlemen born, who have been kept at home, by reason of the pressure of the Taxes. Several People, who made their Fortunes in the late War; and who from a state of obscurity, and perhaps of misery, have risen to a condition of distinction and plenty." (2) He

(1) S. Johnson, Lives of the English Poets, ed. G. Hill, Oxford 1905, vol. 2, p. 160

(2) J. Dennis, The Comical Gallant or the Amours of Sir John Falstaffe with a dedicatory epistle to George Granville, London 1702 (in J. Dennis, The Critical Works, ed. E. N. Hooker, Baltimore, 1939, vol. i, p. 293-4)

also blamed foreigners who insisted upon "Sound and Show, where the business of the Theatre does not require it, and particularly a sort of a soft and wanton Musick, which has used the People to a delight which is independent of Reason, a delight that has gone a very great way towards the enervating and dissolving of their minds". (1) Tempora et mores are, of course, equally blamed on the assumption that in days of financial speculation and commercial turmoil people who would be capable of serious judgment have neither the time nor the peace of mind for it. "By reason that they are attentive to the events of affairs and too full of great and real events to receive the impressions from the imaginary ones of the Theatre" (2) business men are only interested in relaxation. (3)

It seems reasonable to accept E.D.Mackerness' conclusion: "hence their readiness to sample a new form of entertainment, one which promised to be in good taste, was highly gratifying to the senses and left some kind of impression even though imperfectly understood. Such was the Italian Opera." (4) *Arct. Ravenscroft's Masques* (1672) which was made up from excerpts taken from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* and *Panurge* (2); *Scavenger* (1677), from *Le Mariage Forcé*, and *Scapin* (3). Dryden himself borrowed from Molière (*L'Étourdi*) for his *Sir Martin Mar-all* (1667) and so did Shadwell (from *L'Avare*) for his *Misog* (1672) (4). The ever resourceful Widdow wrote an adaptation of *L'Avare* in 1733 and used *Hedecoin malgré lui* for his *Heck Doctor* in 1732 (5). No borrowings were made from the Italian Theatre, except on technical grounds and from *Commedia dell'Arte* only. In common with *Commedia dell'Arte*, farce made use of a few basic devices: disguise and concealment, exuberant physical activity, naive and overdrawn characters. Moreover, it used the trick of repetition when a specific movement, phrase or acting technique would provide the right kind of response - *Commedia dell'Arte*, of course, was even freer in this respect, since improvisation was inherent to its nature. Repetition led to multiplication

- (1) J.Dennis, op.cit., vol. 1, p. 293-4
- (2) J.Dennis, op.cit., vol. 1. p. 294
- (3) In his writings J.Dennis also took a stand in favour of theatrical effectiveness even if that meant departing from the rules and from tradition. *Biographia Dramatica or A Companion to the Playhouse*.
- (4) E.D.Mackerness, op.cit., p. 93
- (5) *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 217 under the title *The Citizen turned Gentleman*
- (6) *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 227: "The author boasts of having written this piece after the Italian manner, and by that means brought a new species of drama on the English stage."
- (7) *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 236 and 248
- (8) *Ibid.*, vol.2, p. 239 under the title *The Dumb Lady cured*.

Students of Shakespeare have produced enough evidence of Commedia dell'Arte references in his plays to show that the Italian Theatre was not just superficially known in Tudor England but constituted part of the English culture. As early as 1577-78 the capocomico Drusiano Martinelli, from Mantua, visited England, before joining the company of I Confidenti, which was led by the famous Commedia dell'Arte actress Vittoria Piissimi; in 1673 Tiberio Fiorelli acted in London under the patronage of Charles II. Most of all the influence of Commedia dell'Arte can be seen in direct borrowings from scenarios, such as Mrs. Aphra Behn's The Emperor of the Moon (1687), which includes a number of masked characters and is in fact copied from an Italian-French scenario by Fatouville (1684). (1)

An important form of entertainment, which was akin to Commedia dell'Arte, developed in England between the 17th and the 18th century. It was the farce. Scenes were taken out of Molière's plays at the end of the 17th century and changed into comic pieces, usually very short one-act plays. Examples of this are: Ravenscroft's Mamamouchi (1672) which was made up from excerpts taken from Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme and Pouce-augnac (2); Scaramouche (1677), from Le Mariage Forcé, and Scapin (3). Dryden himself borrowed from Molière (L'Etourdi) for his Sir Martin Mar-all (1667) and so did Shadwell (from L'Avare) for his Miser (1672) (4). The ever resourceful Fielding wrote an adaptation of l'Avare in 1733 and used Medecin malgré lui for his Mock Doctor in 1732 (5). No borrowings were made from the Italian Theatre, except on technical grounds and from Commedia dell'Arte only. In common with Commedia dell'Arte, farce made use of a few basic devices: disguise and concealment, exuberant physical activity, noise and overdrawn characters. Moreover, it used the trick of repetition when a specific movement, phrase or acting technique could provoke the right kind of response - Commedia dell'Arte, of course, was even freer in this respect, since improvisation was inherent to its nature. Repetition led to multiplication of scenes as well as characters. Plots which are complicated by

-
- (1) D.E.Baker, Biographia dramatica or A Companion to the playhouse, London, 1782, Vol. 2, p. 103
 (2) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 217 under the title The Citizen turned Gentleman
 (3) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 327: "The author boasts of having written this piece after the Italian manner, and by that means brought a new species of drama on the English stage."
 (4) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 236 and 345
 (5) Ibid., vol.2 , p. 239 under the title The Dumb Lady cured.

disguises and twin characters are found in Shakespeare, The Comedy of Errors is an example, as well as in Goldoni - I due Gemelli Veneziani and Il Servitore di Due Padroni.

In its extremes disguise becomes transformation and people can be turned into non-human beings or even objects, either in earnest or in fun. (1) Commedia dell'Arte used inanimate figures a great deal and the French Tableaux Vivants are an offshoot of this.

There was, however, a concealment device which was to become very important in the development of yet another 18th-century entertainment, pantomime. This device was darkness. What the English came to call "Italian Night Scenes" was imported into England from France and brought to the English Theatre a Harlequin who danced and mimed in silence. (2) He also carried a magic wand instead of the traditional stick. This came about because the actors of the Paris Foires had been forbidden to use the spoken word, whether in speech or song. This prohibition was caused by the jealousy of the "serious" theatres which saw the audiences flock along to the Foires and enjoy themselves at some crude farce. The actors of the Foires found a way out of their predicament by unrolling scrolls in front of the audience which revealed the plot in writing. At the same time they adopted miming as a way of acting out their plots. When the ecriteaux, too, were made illegal, the plots and the songs were printed and handed out to the spectators who sang for the actors. This is how 18th-century pantomime was born; and because the shows at the Foires included characters from the Commedia dell'Arte, pantomime took over those characters and became a genre in its own right.

It was in this new form that Commedia dell'Arte reached England in the 18th century. The old form of Commedia dell'Arte, which had been changed into horse-play to suit an earlier trend in the English Theatre (Ravenscroft's Scaramuche, a Philosopher, 1677 and Mountford's Dr. Faustus, 1685) was dead. (3)

-
- (1) In Harlequin Grand Volgi Harlequin turns into a rose tree
(2) L.Hughes, The English Farce, Princeton Univ.Press, 1956. See also D.E.Baker, op.cit., vol. 2, p. 146: "A Night Scene in grotesque characters...built on the exploits of a notorious house-breaker at that period...the substance with which this hero was to be covered would be composed of chewed gingerbread."
(3) L.Hughes, op.cit., Princeton U.P., 1956

The name "pantomime" seems to have been the outcome of some misunderstanding. In 1767 Drury Lane presented a "new dramatic entertainment after the manner of the ancient pantomime". This was The Loves of Mars and Venus, a ballet with a mythological subject by John Weaver.⁽¹⁾ Later on a similar ballet, called The Shipwreck, showed Harlequin and Columbine as Perseus and Andromeda. This caused confusion and "pantomime" came to indicate a ballet-afterpiece, regardless of its being either a harlequinade or a classical fable, especially when both types of show began to be used together to satisfy an insatiable public. Harlequin remained a comic character until romantic traits were introduced into the show, with the misfortunes of Harlequin and Columbine as the eloping lovers who are pursued by Pantaloon and his servant.

In time a pattern was established, with an opening scene where Harlequin received his magic wand from an immortal being or where, later in the 18th century, the lover and his sweet-heart were saved by a good fairy and changed into Harlequin and Columbine. This was a variation on the French plots where Harlequin impersonated and burlesqued leading characters in contemporary plays. In England the burlesque disappeared and Harlequin simply became someone else in disguise.

The man whose name is tightly linked to 18th-century English pantomime is John Rich, the manager of the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre from 1717 to 1732, when he moved to Covent Garden. He did not actually start pantomimic shows on the English stage - J.Weaver's The Tavern Bilkers or The Cheats was shown in 1702 - (2) and it seems that he turned to pantomime after he had failed twice on the stage in straight parts. He became the greatest Harlequin of his time under the stage name of Lun and used pantomime as a business weapon for competition with the rival theatre Drury Lane. He was the first to devise a mixed type of pantomime (Amadis 1718) and he combined the dumb show of Harlequin and Columbine's adventures - which made up the grotesque part

-
- (1) D.E.Baker, op. cit. vol. 2, p. 204
 - (2) Ibid. vol 1, p.465: "He wrote or invented several pieces, called dramatic pantomimes...He was the first restorer of pantomimes after the ancient manner, without speaking."
 - (3) P.Sawyers, J.Rich's contribution to the Eighteenth-Century London Stage, in The Eighteenth-Century English Stage, ed K.Richards and P.Thomson, London 1972

of the plot - with serious and mythological parts to which he added recitative and songs. (1) In 1723 Drury Lane put on Thurmond's Harlequin Doctor Faustus but a month later Lincoln's Inn Fields presented The Necromancer or Harlequin Doctor Faustus with great success. Both shows were based on an old play. By 1724 it seemed that pantomime had triumphed over farce. It was John Rich who, unwittingly, caused a revival of plays when he put on Gay's The Beggar's Opera in 1728. From then on pantomime became one of three or four favourite forms of entertainment, until it was boycotted by the London audiences on account of the admission tickets being too costly.

The Beggar's Opera was in the tradition of the burlesque type of play Buckingham had started with his The Rehearsal which satirised Dryden and the heroic verse-play (1671). This genre was actively cultivated in the 18th century, when ridiculing and criticising were almost national pastimes. It proved an almost inexhaustible source of afterpieces (2) and between 1730 and 1737 Fielding wrote an average of one burlesque afterpiece a year.

The history of English farce, pantomime and burlesque is complicated by the fact that the three genres developed together in the same century. Only pantomime, however, consistently borrowed from the Italian Theatre although a farce such as The Twotts, which was performed at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1718, was a translation of Gherardi's Les deux Arlequins and comprised improvised scenes. (3) The fact that the acting company was French is irrelevant since such companies often relied on Italian Commedia dell'Arte actors for their existence. The famous "Lelio" - Luigi Riccoboni, son of Antonio - who wrote invaluable books on Commedia dell'Arte, came to London from Paris in 1727 with his company and two of his books were written there. One was translated and published in England in 1741.

Pantomime was not readily accepted in England by the critics and by

-
- (1) P.Sawyer, op.cit.
(2) This was the name given to short, usually comic pieces, which followed a serious programme.
(3) D.E.Baker, op.cit., vol. 2, p. 385

some sections of the public, who even called for laws to curb the spread of the craze for pantomime. The Reverend James Miller, himself a playwright, had a poem printed anonymously in 1731 attacking the most famous pantomime actor and pioneer, John Rich:

Long labour'd Rich, by Tragic Verse to gain
The Town's Applause - but labour'd long in vain;
At length he wisely to his Aid call'd in,
The active Mime and checker'd Harlequin.
Nor ruled by Reason, nor by Law restrain'd,
In all his Shows, Smut and Prophaneness reign'd.

Colley Cibber, the famous actor and poet, justified the popularity of pantomime by saying, in his An Apology for the life of Mr. Cibber, that dancing had to be resorted to in order to attract crowds when Italian Opera had displaced English music. He adds: "To give even Dancing, therefore, some Improvement, and to make it something more than Motion without Meaning, the Fable of Mars and Venus, was form'd into a connected Presentation of Dances in Character, wherein the Passions were so happily expressed, and the whole Story so intelligibly told, by a mute Narration of Gesture only, that even thinking Spectators allow'd it both a pleasing, and a rational Entertainment." (1)

In 1736 Henry Fielding even made his character Machine (Tumble-Down Dick) say that Aristotle himself had been concerned with theatrical entertainments and give the rule that Harlequin must always be rescued!

How Sir? why, by Bribery. You know Sir or may know, that Aristotle, in his Book concerning Entertainments, has laid it down as a principal Rule, that Harlequin is always to escape; and I'll be judg'd by the whole World, if ever he escap'd in a more natural Manner. (2)

Some professional scene painters, such as the Italian Servadoni, were very highly paid. Servadoni probably took over from Glenici at the King's Theatre in 1721, only to leave later to take up a job at the Opéra in Paris and to organize shows at the Salle de Machines. He was

-
- (1) C. Cibber, An Apology for the life of Mr. C. Cibber, London 1740 p. 299
 (2) H. Fielding, Tumble-Down Dick or Phaeton in the Suds, London 1736
 This burlesque was dedicated to Mr. John Lun, i.e. the famous pantomime actor and impresario John Rich.
 (3) Les Inconnus de l'Opéra, Oxford, 1973. The first names of only some of these painters are known.

In the early 1720s John Rich began to present Italian operas in English as well as pantomimes and found that he needed a great deal more scenery and also machines (1) Something should be said at this point about the scene painters who worked in the theatres and at the Opera House in London. Like the opera singers they contributed to the establishment of Italian Opera in general and, more specifically, of Comic Opera in the second half of the century. By then pantomime had created a climate in which Comic Opera could flourish, particularly Goldoni's type of Comic Opera with its Commedia dell'Arte elements.

Among the scene painters who worked for Rich was John Devoto, an Italian who worked for the Drury Lane Theatre as well as the King's Theatre. Scene painters had begun to be used in London theatres following the growing popularity of Italian Opera and the ensuing demand for spectacle. Among those who are recorded as working in London are: Marco Ricci and G. Pellegrini (1708-9), Roberto Clerici, Giovanni Servadoni (at the King's Theatre), Iacopo Amigoni (1729), Antonio Jolly (1744-48), Bigari, Conti, Colomba (at the King's Theatre), Waldre, Cipriani. (2)

Scene painting did not start as a separate profession but was an adjunct to the painters' traditional employment. It is only in 1724-1725 that we find John Rich employing John Harvey as a scene painter. George Lambert was similarly employed at Rich's new theatre, Covent Garden, in 1732. By 1785-86 this theatre was employing some ten artists as scene painters and their assistants. The former had a contract for the season, the latter were paid by the day, the free-lance according to the job.

Some professional scene painters, such as the Italian Servadoni, were very highly paid. Servadoni probably took over from Clerici at the King's Theatre in 1721, only to leave later to take up a job at the Opera in Paris and to organise shows at the Salle de Machines. He was

-
- (1) D.E. Baker, *Op.cit*, vol.2, p. 146 : "Harlequin Sourcerer...contains a great deal of very fine machinery, and brought crowded houses to the manager of Covent Garden Theatre for several seasons after its revival in 1753."
- (2) S. Rosenfeld, A Short History of Scene Design in Great Britain, Oxford, 1973. The first names of only some of these painters are known.

back in London in 1747 to work for Rich.

Although nothing or very little is extant of the works of these scene painters - except for the main artists - a great deal can be inferred from the comments of contemporaries. It appears that these artists, especially the Italians, were the heirs to the great era of baroque decoration although some, like the Venetian Ricci, brought with them a lighter and more naturalistic style. The baroque style was destined to die, in the second half of the century, thus completing a process which had started with the Hanoverians. The new trend was towards more realism and authenticity. This was advocated by Roger Pickering in his Reflections upon Theatrical Expression in Tragedy: "If the Streets, Buildings, Rooms and Furniture, Gardens, Views of the Country etc. be executed in the Tast (sic) of the Country where the Scenes of Action in the Play lies, and the Keeping and Perspective be good the whole House never fails to give the most audible Evidence of their Satisfaction." (1)

The Venetian Algarotti in his Essay on Opera (1767) pursued the same line: "E molto più faria mestieri che dagli odierni pittori seguite fossero le tracce di un San Gallo, e di un Peruzzi, perchè ne' nostri teatri il tempio di Giove, o di Marte non avesse sembianza della Chiesa del Gesù, una piazza di Cartagine non si vedesse architettata alla gotica, perchè insomma nelle scene si trovasse col pittoresco unito insieme il decore, e il costume. Le Scene prima di qualunque altra cosa nell'Opera attraggono imperiosamente gli occhi, e determinano il luogo dell'azione, facendo gran parte di quello incantesimo, per cui lo spettatore viene ad essere trasferito in Egitto, o in Grecia, in Troia e nel Messico, nei Campi Elisi, o su nell'Olimpo," (2)

Up to this time the décor, which had always been subservient to the actors and the play, was mainly expected to provide the public with an impression of the period in which the action took place. Interestingly

-
- (1) In: R. Pickering, Two dissertations on the Theatres, London 1756, p. 59
(2) F. Algarotti, Saggio sopra l'Opera in music, Livorno MDCCLXIII, p. 57

enough the neoclassical style did survive in Opera and in pantomime. Pantomime, mixing fun with the seriousness of classical themes, called for the rustic type of scenery traditionally associated with satire and wickedness. "Noble" settings were suited to noble people who lived in palaces rather than to the likes of Harlequin who was hatched from an egg and leapt through windows. The machines pantomime used for its tricks were inherited from the baroque period. When Rich had Covent Garden built in 1732 he also had special machinery incorporated in the structure which could lift the whole stage if required by the action of the play.

Sybil Rosenfeld says that when Harlequin Sheppard was put on at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1724 "the escape involved tearing down shutters and leaping through a window and the ceiling. The magic bat of Harlequin effected its transformations by means of a flap hinged to the scene. A wing was divided horizontally, one half scene above another below. The flap which completed the lower scene was attached above and, when it fell, revealed its reverse side, which completed the top half which its fall had discovered. These flaps are familiar from 19th-century toy-theatre designs. De Saussure was impressed by the decorations and machinery of the pantomimes.(1) He describes how bushes appeared out of rocks and grew into trees, so that the stage resembled a forest in which flowers bloomed, 'the most surprising and clawing picture you can imagine'. The barrel, groove and weights for these trees which were raised through a slot in the boards are listed in the Covent Garden inventory." (2)

used in minor theatres, but excluded from the major theatres which belonged to the Aristocracy and favoured Opera Seria. Until Pergolesi's La Serva Padrona was performed in 1733 with astounding success and started a new genre, what was understood as Opera Buffa was a strictly Neapolitan type of "scherzo drammatice". It had derived from the commedia della libreria and consisted of arias and recitatives sung by comic and satirical characters in the Neapolitan

(1) He was a famous traveller of the time. undermined the old theory

(2) S.Rosenfeld, op. cit., p. 71-72

(1) See chapter one, p.12

(2) This was another name for comic operas

(3) Among these La Commedia In Commedia, music by Rinaldo da Capua,

words by Vareschi and La Finta Pazzoiana, music by L. Leo, words by

(4) Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, ed.N.Slom, 1954-61 London under the heading Opera Buffa

Goldoni's Il Negligente, as it was performed at the Little Haymarket Theatre in 1749 (1) was set to music by Vincenzo Ciampi. At this time Ciampi was in London where he held the position of Maestro at the King's Theatre. Burney says that Ciampi was brought from Italy with a company of Venetian singers by the manager of the Opera, John Francis Croza. This is not without relevance in the history of Italian Comic Opera in England. First of all, the "burlettas" (2) which were produced by the Italian company in the season 1748-49 and 1749-50 were announced in the General Advertiser (8th November 1748) as "the first of this Species of Musical Drama ever exhibited in England" (3); secondly, the singers were, allegedly, all Venetians, in contrast with the fact that Ciampi was a citizen of the Kingdom of Naples and, to all intents and purposes, a composer of the Neapolitan school. There are doubts about Ciampi's place of birth and education but G.Grove says that "in the librettos of his first operas, as well as in those of some of the operas produced in London under Ciampi's own directions, he is described as a Neapolitan" (4). It was as a composer of comic operas in the Neapolitan style that he became famous in Italy before 1747. He then moved to Venice where his collaboration with Goldoni resulted in three comic operas and one intermezzo: Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno (Venice, Teatro San Moisè, Autumn 1749); La Favola dei Tre Gobbi (Venice, Teatro San Moisè, Carnival 1749).

The type of "comic" music Venice had traditionally known up to the first decades of the 18th century was restricted to "farsette", that is comic intermezzi which were used in minor theatres, but excluded from the major theatres which belonged to the aristocracy and favoured Opera Seria. Until Pergolesi's La Serva Padrona was performed in 1733 with astounding success and started a new genre, what was understood as Opera Buffa was a strictly Neapolitan type of "scherzo drammatico". It had derived from the cantata a llengua and consisted of arias and recitatives sung by comic and serious characters in the Neapolitan dialect. Recent studies have seriously undermined the old theory

-
- (1) See chapter one, p.12
 - (2) This was another name for comic operas
 - (3) Among them La Commedia in Commedia, music by Rinaldo da Capua, words by Vanneschi and La Finta Frascatana, music by L.Leo, words(?)
 - (4) Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, ed.E.Blom, 1954-61 London under the heading Opera Buffa

that Comic Opera derived from Intermezzi. Unlike Intermezzi, which originated in Venice circa 1706, Opera Buffa had more than three characters and plenty of choruses and ensemble pieces rather than a series of arias and recitativi secchi followed by a duet at the end. Intermezzi, it now appears, were introduced in Naples in 1722, after Opera Buffa had established itself. (1)

Distinguishing features of Comic Opera are a prima and seconda buffa, a primo buffo tenore and a secondo buffo caricato, with the addition of a buffo basso. A man and a woman for serious parts complete the cast. After 1730 Opera Buffa began to be written in Italian rather than in Neapolitan dialect and the music to be composed by well known musicians, such as Cocchi and Latilla, just to mention two who worked with Goldoni. As early as 1736 Goldoni, in Venice, was writing libretti for comic operas such as La Fondazione di Venezia (music by Maccari) and, a year later, Lucrezia Romana in Corte (music by Maccari). He had been writing Intermezzi since 1730. (2) At this point Comic Opera could no longer be called Opera Buffa Napoletana. If anything, "Veneziana" seems more appropriate, especially when we consider the double link existing between Comic Opera and the Venetian Goldoni on the one hand, and Comic Opera and 18th-century composers on the other. Goldoni wrote at least fifty-two comic-opera libretti. A comprehensive list of composers who set these to music includes the following: (3)

F.G.Bertoni (Le Pescatrici 1752; I Bagni d'Abano 1753). He was born at Salò, lake Garda, on 1725 and in 1752 became organist at St.Mark's, Venice. He was appointed maestro di cappella there in 1785 following the death of Galuppi. Between these two appointments he spent time in London at different intervals. He was engaged at the King's Theatre. Died in Desenzano in 1813.

V.L.Ciampi (La Scuola Moderna, 1748; Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno, 1748; Il Negligente, 1749) was probably born in Piacenza in 1719 and

-
- (1) According to Florimo's chronology, as quoted in Enciclopedia dello Spettacolo, Bompiani, Roma, 1960
 - (2) La Cantatrice (1730); Il Buon Padre (1730); Il Gondoliere Veneziano (1732 or 1733); La Pupilla (1734); La Birba (1735); L'Ippocondriaco (1735); Il Filosofo (1735); Monsieur Petiton (1736); La Bottega da Caffè (1736); L'Amante Cabala (1736). Other Intermezzi were written later.
 - (3) The titles in brackets are those of libretti by Goldoni

died in Venice in 1762. After 1747 his works seemed to find success in Venice and from Venice Ciampi moved to London in 1748 to be engaged by the King's Theatre as Maestro.

G.Cocchi (La Mascherata, 1751; Le Donne Vendicate, 1751) was probably born in Naples in 1715 and died in Venice in 1804. He was maestro di cappella at the Ospedale degli Incurabili in Venice up to 1757 and returned there in 1773 after a long spell in London where he, too, was employed at the King's Theatre.

B.Galuppi (L'Arcadia in Brenta, 1749; Il Conte Caramella, 1749; L'Arcifanfano Re dei Matti, 1749; Il Mondo alla Roversa, 1750; Il Paese di Cuccagna, 1750; Il Mondo della Luna, 1750; La Mascherata, 1751; Le Virtuose Ridicole, 1752; La Calamita dei Cuori o La Straniera Riconosciuta, 1753; I Bagni d'Abano, 1753; Il Filosofo di Campagna, 1754; Il Povero Superbo, 1755; Le Nozze, 1755; La Diavolessa, 1755; La Cantarina, 1756; Le Pescatrici, 1756; La Donna di Governo, 1763; La Cameriera Spiritosa, 1766). He was born on the island of Burano in 1706 and died in Venice in 1785. Studied music in Venice. In 1741 went to London as composer at the King's Theatre, but in 1748 was back in Venice to become vice maestro di cappella at St Mark's. In 1766 went Petersburg but returned to Venice to take up an appointment as director of the Conservatorio degli Incurabili.

F.L.Gassmann (Gli Uccellatori, 1759; Filosofia e Amore, 1760; Il Viaggiatore Ridicolo, 1766; L'Amore Artigiano, 1767; La Notte Critica, 1768; Il Filosofo Innamorato, 1771; Le Pescatrici, 1772; La Buona Figliuola, 1773). He was born near Brux in 1729 and died in Vienna in 1774. He was in the service of Count Leonardo Veneri in Venice till 1764, when he became director of Opera Buffa at the Burg Theatre in Vienna. In 1772 he became conductor of the Court orchestra.

G.Latilla (L'Amore Artigiano, 1760) was born in Bari in 1711 and died in Naples in 1791. He was chorus master at the Conservatorio della Pietà,

in Venice, in 1756 and then secondo maestro at St Mark's when Galuppi became primo maestro.

A. Lucchesi (L'Inganno Scoperto ovvero Il Conte Caramella, 1773) was born near Treviso in 1741. He was a pupil of Cocchi and lived in Venice from 1765 to 1771, before going to Bonn and then becoming Court conductor in the service of Maximilian Frederick.

A. Salieri (La Calamita dei Cuori, 1774; Il Talismano, 1779 and 1788; Il Mondo alla Roversa, 1794). He was born in Verona in 1750 and died in Vienna in 1825. He studied in Venice under the patronage of the Mocenigo family then went to Vienna where he spent fifty years in the service of the Court.

G. Sarti (Le Nozze o Fra i due litiganti il terzo gode, 1782) was born in Faenza in 1729 and died in Berlin in 1802. He studied music either in Padua or in Bologna. From 1753 to 1775 he was in the service of the Danish Court, then went to Venice and was director of the Conservatorio dell'Ospitaletto for four years before going to Milan and then to Russia where he stayed till 1802, and finally to Berlin.

G. Scolari (La Cascina o La Campagna, 1755; Le Donne Vendicate, 1757; La Buona Figliuola Maritata, 1762; I Viaggiatori Ridicoli, 1770). He was born near Vicenza in 1720 and died in Venice (1769), where he had spent most of his life, except when he was travelling abroad, especially in Spain and Portugal.

T. Traetta (La Buona Figliuola Maritata, 1765; Germondo, 1776) was born in Bari in 1727 and died in Venice in 1779. He settled in Venice (1765) where he was Maestro at the Conservatorio dell'Ospedaletto for three years, before taking Galuppi's place as Maestro in the service of Catherine II. Then, in 1775, he went to London to the King's Theatre.

As can be seen, all these composers have one point in common: Venice, where they either studied or worked whether or not they had been born there. Many of them have something else in common: their travels

abroad and the high position they achieved whether at public theatres or in the service of royalty. In previous centuries travelling comedy companies of comedians had taken with them the best samples of the Italian theatre and individual players, such as Darbes in the 18th century, had had the honour of being the heralds of that theatre; so now these 18th-century composers, most of whom cultivated one special musical genre, took their music and skills abroad. They followed in the footsteps of those players and musicians who had taken Italian music to other countries through the centuries and they often took over where another had left off, as if working to a common end. Galuppi had acquired fame in Venice and Turin as composer of serious operas. We find him in London in 1741 where he composed Penelope (1741), Scipione in Cartagina (1742), Enrico (1742), Sirbano (1743), Antigono (1746) with the help of librettists such as Rolla, Venassotti, Stampà, Metastasio. His operas were repeated several times, apart from Penelope, and there is no doubt that Galuppi contributed a great deal to the establishment of Italian Opera in London. It is relevant that Burney, who had a high opinion of Galuppi, blamed his lack of success with Penelope on the taste of the English who were used to "Handel's solidity and sublimity" rather than the "hasty, light and flimsy style" that characterized Italian music at the time. (2)

Galuppi's collaboration with Goldoni was only just beginning in Italy when the first attempt at introducing Italian Comic Opera to London audiences took place. The result was encouraging. Il Negligente was repeated at least eight times in the season 1749-50, the last "By Desire of Several Persons of Quality". The other "barletta" had about 30 performances in all.

The habit of stressing the fact that a particular opera had been requested by distinguished people was quite widespread in the 18th-century, although the names of the nobles involved were never revealed. Such a phrase might have been used as a publicity stunt by shrewd managers to attract larger audiences; but in view of the aristocratic

(1) Details of performances in ch. 7 and 10.

(2) S. Burney, *op.cit.*, vol 2, p. 839-40

Chapter five

An important event in the history of Comic Opera was the partnership between Goldoni and Galuppi. In 1749 this resulted in L'Arcadia in Brenta which was produced at the Teatro Sant'Angelo for the Fiera dell'Ascensione. By 1776 Goldoni had collaborated with Galuppi on 18 comic operas, seven of which were put on in London: L'Arcadia in Brenta, Il Mondo della Luna, Il Filosofo di Campagna, L'Assemblea, The Coquet, La Calamita dei Cuori, Le Nozze di Dorina. (1) None the less Galuppi did not start his career as a composer of comic operas. After a difficult start with the opera Gli Amici Rivali or La Fede nell'Incostanza, which was hissed off the stage at Chioggia in 1772, Galuppi had acquired fame in Venice and Turin as composer of serious operas. We find him in London in 1741 where he composed Penelope (1741), Scipione in Cartagine (1742), Enrico (1742), Sirbace (1743), Antigono (1746) with the help of librettists such as Rolli, Vanneschi, Stampa, Metastasio. His operas were repeated several times, apart from Penelope, and there is no doubt that Galuppi contributed a great deal to the establishment of Italian Opera in London. It is relevant that Burney, who had a high opinion of Galuppi, blamed his lack of success with Penelope on the taste of the English who were used to "Handel's solidity and science" rather than the "hasty, light and flimsy style" that characterized Italian music at the time. (2)

Galuppi's collaboration with Goldoni was only just beginning in Italy when the first attempt at introducing Italian Comic Opera to London audiences took place. The result was encouraging. Il Negligente was repeated at least eight times in the season 1749-50, the last "By Desire of Several Persons of Quality". The other "burlettas" had about 30 performances in all.

The habit of stressing the fact that a particular opera had been requested by distinguished people was quite widespread in the 18th-century, although the names of the nobles involved were never revealed. Such a phrase might have been used as a publicity stunt by shrewd managers to attract larger audiences; but in view of the aristocratic

(1) Details of performances in ch. 7 and 10

(2) C. Burney, op.cit., vol 2, p. 839-40

patronage which is associated with Opera in the first half of the 18th century, we can safely assume that such a statement was genuine, As such, it is further proof of the popularity of some operas - in this case Il Negligente - although it is often difficult to say when the popularity of the work was due to the successful combination of music and words rather than the favour bestowed on the individual singer by the public. Unlike serious Opera, Comic Opera did not rely heavily on the quality of singing. Virtuoso singing did not exist in Comic Opera, on account of the fact that only the four natural types of voice were used - soprano, alto, tenor and bass - and there were no parts either for castrati or prima donnas. This is not to say that arie di bravura were not sung but rather that they were used for parodies. Some buffi, especially in the first half of the century, doubled up as serious singers and this might explain the popularity of some individual singers such as Gaetano Guadagni. He was in London for the season 1749-50 with Signora Frasi, Signora Galli, Signora Giacomazzi, Signora Mellini, Signora Moretti, Laschi and maybe a few others. He was still in London in 1770 when, on account of special favours bestowed on him by some admirers, he ended up by being heavily fined in Court. In his Memoirs Horace Walpole relates that Mr.G.Hobart, the manager of the Haymarket Theatre and brother of Lord Buckingham (1) gave a part to his mistress, Signora Zamperini, thus slighting Signora Guadagni and her brother Gaetano. A small bunch of aristocratic women, led by Lady Harrington, the Duchess of Northumberland, arranged a series of entertainments for Guadagni at Madame Cornelys's place, in Soho Square. Unfortunately she was denounced to the authorities by Hobart for giving concerts and masquerades without a licence and for using the premises for indecent purposes. The whole affair ended before the magistrate.

Guadagni was one of the principal singers in Il Negligente in 1749-50 and it cannot be ruled out that his personal charm and talent

(1) G.Hobart (1732-1801). He became manager of the King's Theatre in 1769. He was four times a member of Parliament between 1754 and 1774 and Secretary at the embassy of St.Petersburg in 1762.

(2) J.Hobart, 1711-1786.
(3) He was King of Sicily from 1734 to 1758. He was a patron of the arts, sciences and commerce.

contributed to the success of the opera. Handel must have thought well of him, since he gave him important parts in his oratorios Messiah and Samson. Burney, who helped Guadagni to prepare for these parts, says that "his manner of singing was perfectly delicate, polished and refined".(1) Guadagni also counted Garrick among his friends and patrons, for it was Garrick who trained him as an actor (2) and Guadagni proved such a good pupil that Burney could write of him: "As an actor, he seems to have no equal on any operatic stage in Europe: his figure was uncommonly elegant and noble; his countenance replete with beauty, intelligence, and dignity; and his attitudes and gestures were so full of grace and propriety, that they would have been excellent studies for a statuary". (3)

To complete this picture of theatrical life something should be added about the identity and pursuits of Mrs. Theresa Cornelys. She was in fact Teresa Imer, the daughter of the Italian capocomico Giuseppe Imer who, in 1734, had employed Goldoni as company poet for the Teatro S. Samuele and the Teatro S. Giovanni Grisostomo. Teresa became a singer and was seconda donna in Gluck's La Caduta dei Giganti in London, in 1746. Her name then was Teresa Pompeati and she sang with her sister Marianna in operas by Gluck, Lampugnani and Galuppi. Her travels and profession took her to Vienna, Hamburg, Bayreuth, Holland. In 1749 she seems to have been in Copenhagen with the company of Mingotti, the future manager of the King's Theatre. She certainly was in London from 1760 till her death in 1797, in the Fleet prison. She had the patronage of the best people in the London society and of the Royal Family, lovers such as Casanova and Margrave Friedrich (4) and theatrical connections to make her the envy of her peers.

-
- (1) C. Burney, op.cit., vol. 2, p. 876
 - (2) R. Edgcumbe, Musical Reminiscences of an old amateur, 1773 to 1823, London 1827, p. 43
 - (3) C. Burney, *ibid.*
 - (4) He was King of Russia from 1740 to 1786. He was a patron of the arts, science and commerce.

Goldoni's libretto Il Negligente included the following characters: Filiberto, Lisaura sua figlia, Pasquino e Porporina servi, Aurelia orfana in casa di Filiberto, Cornelio amante di Aurelia, Dorindo amante di Lisaura, un Conte che non parla. (1)

The story is that of Filiberto who is nagged by his daughter, cheated by his friends and associates, made a fool of by his servants because his own laziness and apathy prevent him from taking his own affairs in hand. He falls in love - or he fancies he does - with Aurelia, who plots robbery and betrayal behind his back with a more favoured suitor, Cornelio. Luckily for Filiberto his daughter's and her lover's counter-action save him money and peaceful way of life and he can continue his lazy existence surrounded by the bickering of family and servants - what seems bickering to him but is the bliss of married life for Dorindo and Lisaura, for Pasquino and Porporina.

As will be seen Il Negligente has several elements of Commedia dell'Arte. Filiberto is "benestante" (i.e. middle class), ricco, negligente" says Goldoni (2). Underneath this façade he is in fact an updated version of the old Pantalone, who was also rich and like Filiberto had a daughter and a servant to contend with. Pantalone was, in the traditional Commedia dell'Arte, a man afflicted by the contradictions of senility, one moment unable to hold his temper and the next thinking sweet thoughts of love. Filiberto, too, feels tempted to marry Aurelia but lack of energy prevents him from overcoming the obstacles in his way and he is beaten by his rival Cornelio. As he says at the opening of Act One: "Oh che dolce dormir quando s'ha sonno!" and in Act Three, Scene Five:

"Levarsi dopo il sole
E andar prima di quello
Nel letto a riposar
Questa si può chiamar
Vita beata.
Chi faticar si suole
Consuma il suo cervello
E al fine ha da cefepar.
Compiango a lavorar la gente nata."

(1) See cast list of Il Negligente

(2) Ibid. Signor Filiberto Vies qua
Pas. Sua posura Fil. Furchet
Pas. In molazione Fil. Fovering, in ragione
Vies qua e poi veroni.

(3) G. Mallinard, Il Negligente, London 1975, p. 144

In Filiberto, Pantalone becomes a figure of fun.

Ortolani has suggested a comparison between Filiberto and Anselmo Terrazzani, the weak husband of "La famiglia dell'antiquario" and has also suggested that a caricature of a weak husband is to be found in Nelli and Fagiuoli.⁽¹⁾ Filiberto is undoubtedly a traditional figure and Goldoni chose to revive him as a middle-class laughable individual.

Pasquino and Porporina are very much like Harlequin and Columbine. Born as a Zanni out of northern Italian folklore, to represent the demons of the earth, Harlequin took second place after the first Zanni, Brighella Cavicchio, and assumed the part of the servant, always pre-occupied with food, lazy, slow witted and cunning, credulous and interfering. Says C.Molinari in his Theatre through the ages that the Zanni assumed a servant-porter role, the "lowest form of life in working-class township and almost the proclamation of the common man's predestined condition of servitude...This profound meaning, flowing from the character's primitive ambiguity, continually comes to the surface as permanent hunger (2), conflict with his master, village wisdom and the need to make a come-back which, even when it comes off, never really lasts." (3)

Corallina or Colombina, on the other hand, was one of the Zagne, the female counterparts of the Zanni, gossipy and cheerful, crafty and ready to fight for her rights. Together, in Il Negligente, Pasquino and Porporina stage a parody of courtly love that is typical of the Commedia dell'Arte, in contrast with the "serious" love of Lisaura and Dorindo (Act Three, Scene One):

<u>Lisaura</u> :	"Ma quando sarà il giorno Che potrò senza tema
<u>Dir</u> :	'Dorindo, sei mio?'
<u>Dorindo</u> :	Nulla di più desio. Oggi se mi seconda amica sorte, Spero di divenir a voi consorte.
<u>Lisaura</u> :	Lo voglia il ciel.
<u>Dorindo</u> :	Vedrete Qual sia l'affetto mio. Oggi ci rivedrem. <u>Lisaura</u> , addio.

-
- (1) G.Ortolani ed., Carlo Goldoni, Opere Complete, Mondadori, 1936
 (2) The following is an example taken from Il Negligente, Act 1 Scene 3.

<u>Pasquino</u> :	Signor	<u>Filiberto</u> :	Vien qui
Pas.	Non posso	Fil.	Perchè?
Pas.	Fo colazione	Fil.	Poverino, ha ragione. Finisci e poi verrai.

 (3) C.Molinari, Theatre through the ages, London 1975, p. 164

And again, in Act Two, Scene Seven:

Dorindo: Pria ritornare al fonte
Vedrai torrente altero
Che all'amor mio sincero
Che alla mia fè costante
Tempre vedrai cangiar
Nà per ingiurie ed onte
D'avversa iniqua stella,
Questo mio core amante
Della sua fiamma bella
Mai si potrà scordar.

A parody of courtly love can be seen in an excerpt from a love scene between Pasquino and Porporina in Act Three, Scene Six:

Porporina: Compatisca, signor
Pasquino: La compatisco.
Dove, padrona?
Porp. Dove mi porta il piè
Pasq. È in collera con me?
Porp. Parmi averne ragione
Pasq. Io ho più ragion di lei
Porp. Lei badi a' fatti suoi, ch'io bado a' miei
Pasq. Bella cosa davvero
Lasciar per un amante il suo marito!
Porp. Veramente polito!
Trovarsi un'amorosa,
E abbandonar così la propria sposa!
Pasq. L'ho fatto per vendetta
Porp. E io per far servizio alla padrona
Pasq. Con Aurelia scherzai, credilo a me.
Porp. Giuro ch'io non amai altri che te.
Pasq. Dunque tu mi vuoi ben?
Porp. Purtroppo, ingrato
Pasq. Ed io son di te sola innamorato.

In the original Commedia dell'Arte "the lovers" were always without mask, fashionably dressed and spoke Tuscan. They belonged to the literary tradition, and were borrowed from the learned theatre which the Commedia dell'Arte was created to oppose. In Il Negligente they still keep the original character but the fact that everybody else speaks Tuscan levels down the differences of class and education that were so marked in the original Commedia dell'Arte pieces.

-
- (1) G. Goldoni, Il Teatro Comico, Act 2, scene 10
 - (2) See Goldoni's letter to the printer Battistoni, 29 Aprile 1752, in G. Biondi, Lettere di Goldoni, Mondadori, vol. 14, n. 427-454
 - (3) G. Goldoni, Scenari, part 1, n. 13, op. cit., Fondazione di Venezia, 1948

It is worthwhile noting that the year of Il Negligente was the year before the play Il Teatro Comico, Goldoni's manifesto of his reform of the theatre. It was also the year before Il Padre di Famiglia, a play which is historically if not artistically important in showing the gradual disappearance of masks, dialect and improvisation from Goldoni's plays. Il Padre di Famiglia was performed at first with Pantalone, Dottore, Arlecchino and Brighella as mask characters, all speaking a dialect. It was also partly improvised. The following year the language became Tuscan and the improvised parts disappeared. When published by Paperini in 1754, the names of the masks were taken out, with the exception of Arlecchino's. This disappeared later, in the final edition of 1764. In doing this Goldoni seems to have followed the principles advocated by Orazio a year later in Il Teatro Comico:

"Guai a noi, se facessimo una tal novità: non è ancor tempo di farla. In tutte le cose non è da mettersi di fronte contro l'universale. Una volta il popolo andava alla commedia solamente per ridere, e non voleva vedere altro che le maschere in iscena; e se le parti serie facevano un dialogo un poco lungo, s'annojavano immediatamente: ora si vanno avvezzando a sentir volentieri le parti serie, e godono le parole, e si compiacciono degli accidenti, e gustano la morale, e ridono dei sali e dei frizzi cavati dal serio medesimo, ma vedono volentieri anche le maschere, e non bisogna levarle del tutto, anzi convien cercare di bene allogarle e di sostenerle con merito nel loro carattere ridicolo, anche a fronte del serio più lepido e più grazioso." (1)

It is interesting to see that in Il Negligente (1749), a libretto, Goldoni actually implemented the principles he appeared to be justifying in Il Teatro Comico in 1750 and only dared to follow openly and for the first time in the play Pamela (1750) (2). This is even more remarkable when we consider that Goldoni did not think of libretti as a high form of literature and stated that he only wrote them for financial gain:

"Ce ne sont pas des Drames bien faits; ils ne peuvent pas l'être: je ne me suis jamais avisé d'en faire par goût, par choix; je n'y ai travaillé que par complaisance, et quelquefois par intérêt. Quand on a un talent, il faut en tirer parti; un Peintre en histoire ne refusera pas de peindre un magot, s'il en est bien payé." (3)

-
- (1) C. Goldoni, Il Teatro Comico, Act 2, scene 10
 - (2) See Goldoni's letter to the printer Bettinelli, 29 Aprile 1752, in C. Goldoni, Tutte le Opere, Mondadori, vol 14, p. 427-454
 - (3) C. Goldoni, Mémoires, part 3, ch. 13, op.cit., Municipio di Venezia, 1948

If we are to believe contemporary critics and opponents of Italian Opera, London spectators were not even in a position to appreciate plain Italian language, let alone the subtleties of Goldoni's dramatic idiom. But they went to Il Negligente and liked it. As a play it lent itself to a type of acting technique that made use of facial expressions, of gestures, of mime, of ridicule that was conveyed through bodily movements as well as the music and the songs. Filiberto who fell about with sloth in the middle of important business could be acted amusingly whatever the language. This was the type of acting technique and situation London audiences appreciated because pantomime, which had its roots in the ever living Commedia dell'Arte, had been a favourite entertainment with them since the 1720s.

The company was a great deal larger than that of the King's Theatre, with 63 actors and actresses, 24 dancers, 7 singers. The manager was David Garrick, recently back from a tour of French theatres.

At Covent Garden, on the other hand, Rich was trying out Italian burlettas. He put on four new ones: Gli Amanti Gelosi (music by G. Cocchi, text by G. Giordani) which was performed at least 12 times before it transferred to the Bartholomew Fair where it ran for 4 nights under the title of The Birth of Harlequin; Lo Studente alla Moda (music by Pergolesi, text altered from A. Palomba's La Violante) which was performed at least 4 times; L'Assur Content (music by L. Leo, author of text unknown) which was also performed 4 times and finally La Capriciosa accorta or The Artful Chambermaid with music by Gabrieli and text by unknown author. (1) Rich engaged an entire Italian family of actors for these burlettas, the Giordani, who came over from France and acted in Italian and in French. The Gray's Inn Journal commented on 22.12.1755: "A great deal of whatever humour this production may contain is certainly lost to an English audience; and the manner of acting, being a burlesque upon what people here are not very acquainted with, is not universally felt." None the less one of the actresses, Nicolina Giordani, was highly praised.

(1) This could be Goldoni's Il Filosofo di Campagna performed under one of its numerous titles.

The season 1749-50 was not particularly good for the King's Theatre in spite of the success enjoyed by Il Negligente. Only six different operas were put on, with about 40 performances. The company was small, the manager, Croza, absconded with the takings. The result of this was that the Italian Opera House was forced to close down for three seasons. In November 1753 it reopened under the management of Vanneschi who thought it wiser to leave comic operas aside till the financial situation got healthier. He succeeded in producing about 29 performances of four different serious operas. This compared badly with the activities of the Drury Lane Theatre which managed 192 shows, with 3 new tragedies, a new pantomime and the first performance of an afterpiece operetta. The company was a great deal larger than that of the King's Theatre, with 63 actors and actresses, 24 dancers, 7 singers. The manager was David Garrick, recently back from a tour of French theatres.

At Covent Garden, on the other hand, Rich was trying out Italian burlettas. He put on four new ones: Gli Amanti Gelosi (music by G.Cocchi, text by G.Giordani) which was performed at least 12 times before it transferred to the Bartholomew Fair where it ran for 4 nights under the title of The Birth of Harlequin; Lo Studente alla Moda (music by Pergolesi, text altered from A.Palomba's La Violante) which was performed at least 4 times; L'Amour Costant (music by L.Leo, author of text unknown) which was also performed 4 times and finally La Cameriera accorta or The Artful Chambermaid with music by Galuppi to text by unknown author.⁽¹⁾ Rich engaged an entire Italian family of actors for these burlettas, the Giordani, who came over from France and acted in Italian and in French. The Gray's Inn Journal commented on 22.12.1753: "A great deal of whatever humour this production may contain is certainly lost to an English audience; and the manner of acting, being a burlesque upon what people here are not very acquainted with, is not universally felt." None the less one of the actresses, Nicolina Giordani called Spiletta was highly praised.

(1) This could be Goldoni's Il Filosofo di Campagna performed under one of its numerous titles.

Rich continued to put on pantomimes as an alternative to burlettas. His own Harlequin Sorcerer and Harlequin Skeleton were performed 80 times as an afterpiece, out of a total of 183 nights. Rich's company was large, with 63 actors and actresses, 13 dancers and 4 singers.

The season 1754-55 saw a tentative return to comic operas at the King's Theatre, but none of the libretti appears to have been by Goldoni. His Arcadia in Brenta, with music by Galuppi, and Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno, with music by Ciampi, were in fact put on at Covent Garden on Monday 18.11.1754 and 9.12.1754 respectively. L'Arcadia in Brenta, which was repeated once only on Friday 22.11.1754, was probably sung by Signora Francesca Baratti, Signora Ninetta de Rossennaw, Signora Anna Castelli, Signora Eugenia Mellini, Gaetano Quilici, Gaetano Guadagni, Christiano Tedeschini Koerlitz.

The reason for these two operas being performed at Covent Garden and not at the King's Theatre was that Vanneschi was still being cautious and relying mainly on tried-out operas to attract audiences, while Rich had found a new profitable type of show in Italian burlettas, especially now that pantomime seemed to be declining in popularity.

Other performances of Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno are recorded for Monday 16.12.1754, Thursday 19.12.1754, Monday 23.12.1754, Friday 3.1.1755. Seven years later, on Monday 11.1.1762, this comic opera was performed at the King's Theatre by Command of their Majesties and announced as new. It was then repeated on Tuesday 19.1.1762. This play was fairly successful in London but not as much as it had been in Paris where it was first produced by the Bambini company in 1753. A number of parodies of this comic opera were written in French. The most famous was Favart's Le Caprice Amoureux or Ninette à la Cour (1755), probably set to music by Duni. A parody of this parody was Favart's Le Retour au Village. Anseaume added his own to Favart's comic operas under the title Bertholde à la ville. In England there were at

(1) D.E.Baker, op.cit., vol. 2, p. 203, records this comic opera as an alteration of D'Urf's Les Amoureux à la Cour.

least two adaptations of Goldoni's Bertoldo Bertoldino e Cacasenno but both based rather on Favart's works than Goldoni's original. One was Robert Lloyd's The Capricious Lovers, which was performed 9 times as a mainpiece and 7 times as an afterpiece in the season 1764-65. It was set to music by Rush. The other was Phyllis at Court by T.Giordani and was first performed in Dublin in 1767. (1)

Il Mondo della Luna, with music by Galuppi, followed in the season 1760-61. It was performed at the King's Theatre on Saturday 22.11.1760 with Carlo Paganini, Angiola Paganini, Christiano Tedeschini, Angiola Calori, Gaetano Quilici, Teresa Eberardi. Cocchi was the musical director. This comic opera was repeated 9 times in the season 1760-61, the last time as a benefit for the dancer Miss Asselin. In fact, three more operas with libretti by Goldoni were performed that season. One was I Tre Gobbi Rivali. It was performed once only on Monday 9.3.1761, with a good cast of singers, the two Paganini, Quilici and Tedeschini; and the additional attraction of dances by Gherardi, Mlle Asselin, Binetti and Anna Binetti, Miss Polly Capitani, Mr.Tariot. Presumably the managers had high enough hopes for this opera since they used it as a benefit performance for the Paganini who were highly regarded by the public.

Le Pescatrici, with music by Bertoni, was performed on 28.4.1761 and repeated 5 times: on Tuesday 5.5.1761, Tuesday 12.5.1761, Tuesday 19.5.1761, Thursday 28.6.1761, Monday 2.6.1761.

By far the most successful of Goldoni's libretti in this period was Il Filosofo di Campagna. It was first performed at the King's Theatre on Tuesday 6.1.1761. The original music, by Galuppi, was adapted by Cocchi. This opera was, in Burney's opinion, a success and the Paganini distinguished themselves. It was repeated at the King's Theatre at least 13 times in 1760-61 and at least 7 in 1761-62. The performance of Thursday 16.4.1761 was a benefit for the General Lying-in Hospital. The Public Advertiser of that day carried a long advertisement

(1) D.E.Baker, op.cit., vol 2, p. 280, records this comic opera as an alteration of Lloyd's The Capricious Lovers.

inviting everybody to support that charity and at the same time to take the opportunity "of seeing a very pleasant Burletta". It said: "3428 helpless women have already been received and preserved, besides 800 out-patients supplied with medicine etc, and many soldiers' and seamens' (sic) wives have been taken out of the streets penniless, starving and with labour pains upon them and admitted at several hours of the night or day without any letter or recommendation whatever."

The "benefit" was a theatrical tradition which had started probably at the end of the 17th century to offer occasional help to actors, authors and charities. In the 18th century it was also used to relieve individuals in distress such as widows, bankrupt traders, gentlewomen whose guardians could no longer support them, families thrown onto the street by fire. Following a pattern which became established in the first half of the century, authors could have a benefit on the 3rd, 6th and 9th night of performance, whilst the period between Spring and early Summer was reserved for actors and that just before Christmas for charities. Individuals could have a benefit at any time of the year. The rest of the season was reserved for profit-making performances. After 1738 a special benefit is recorded, that for the support of "Decayed Musicians and Their Families". This is an example of how eighteenth-century humanitarianism found an outlet in the world of entertainment. More specifically, a field of entertainment which was peculiar to the century and differed from drama in as much as it was not expected to be involved in the social problems of the day and provide food for thought in the way a play was. This type of benefit came about because some musicians got together and organised a "Fund" to help colleagues and their families in distress. The first benefit of this kind took the form of a concert and this was performed at the King's Theatre in 1739. Later vocal parts were added and most musicians and singers in London contributed to the concert, whether or not they were engaged at the King's Theatre. A typical example of this is the *Leire* in 1775, when it was announced as a "favourite *Coste Opera*" and given new attraction with dances by *Mlle. Valani*, a star singing dancer.

(1) Studied under *By*. Was first a dancer at Stuttgart with *Reverre* - who is known as "the father of modern ballet" - then at the Paris Opera in 1766, then in London from 1771 to 1775.

Grand Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Music given at the King's Theatre on Monday 25th April 1763:

Atto I: Overture del Signor Bach; Song - Signora Cremonina, Furia di donna irata (Piccinni); Concerto: Bassoon - Miller; Song - Giardini, Vedi Amor nel mio sembiante (Ciampi); Song - Signora De Amicis, Quando saprai chi sono (Traetta).

Atto II: Concerto violoncello; Song - Signora Cremonina, Misero Pargoletto (Piccinni); Song - Quilici, Sarò qual è il Torrente (Galuppi); Song - Giardini, Stàte lungi sol per poco (Galuppi)

Atto III; Song - Quilici, Fieri Tormenti (Jomelli); Song - Giustinelli, Di questo Cor le Pene (Traetta); Concerto: violin: song - Signora De Amicis, Madre non mi conosci (Zingoni). God Save the King.

The song Furia di donna irata, given anonymously, is in fact from Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola, Act I, scene 14 (Marchesa Lucinda sings about her jealousy).

Thus, charitable benefits were the Theatre's contribution to the social effort of the time. While relying on the patronage of the richer and more powerful stratum of society to remain a flourishing business, the theatre in turn patronised the poor and underprivileged through institutions such as St. George's hospital, the Women's hospital in St. Luke Street and the Fund for the Support of Decayed Musicians and their Families.

The performance of Il Filosofo di Campagna which took place on Monday 15.2.1762 was by Command of Their Majesties, and that of 22nd February 1762 "by Desire"; thus showing the continuing success of this comic opera, a success which only faded out in 1772. Between 1762 and 1772 there were at least 16 more performances at the King's Theatre. Of these the most notable were: Thursday 21.4.1768 (benefit for Lovattini), Tuesday 26.4.1768 "by Command", Thursday 5.5.1768 with famous dancers and dances (benefit for the dancer Slingsby and Signora Moriggi). The first two performances of the season 1768-69 were both "by particular desire" (Saturday 10.9.1768 and Saturday 17.9.1768). The seasons 1768-69-70 saw 5 performances in all of this opera. It was still in the repertoire in 1772, when it was announced as a "favourite Comic Opera" and given new attraction with dances by Mlle Heinel, a star among dancers(1).

(1) Studied under Epy. Was first a dancer at Stuttgart with Noverre - who is known as "the father of modern ballet" - then at the Paris Opera in 1768, then in London from 1771 to 1775.

Unfortunately the death of Her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales on 8.2.1772 kept the King's Theatre closed till Tuesday 18.2.1772, when it reopened with Il Filosofo di Campagna. This was then repeated 4 times.

It was not by chance that Il Filosofo di Campagna was accompanied by a full programme of dances. The vogue for dances between acts or even scenes of plays coincides in England with the Restoration and the re-awakening of theatrical activities. In fact, this was the fashion even before Italian Opera. At first, dances were used to enhance the "atmosphere" of a play, to introduce the characters, to turn a show into a spectacle. Later they were used as a practical implementation of the theory that the theatre was a place and a source of entertainment.

As a form of private entertainment, dancing was already fashionable in the 15th century when all the arts were freed, to a large extent, of religious restraint. The invention of printing had the effect of suddenly making it possible for hundreds of scores for string and keyboard instruments to be published. Dancing became an important social asset and the courtier of the day was trained in it, as shown in Castiglione's Il Cortegiano. Later, pageants took the place of religious processions and mystery plays. Henry VIII staged a Masque based on the legendary Robin Hood in 1510; Raphael was in charge of the decor for the performance of Ariosto's Suppositi in the Vatican in 1518. In 1581, a dance spectacle was held in France, at Fontainebleau, which proved to be the precursor of modern ballet. This spectacle was organised by Catherine de Medici, the Queen Mother, with the help of choreographer Baldassarre Belgioioso, and is known as Ballet Comique de la Reine. It had a theme and it was precisely its having a single dramatic theme that separated it from the other dance entertainment of the time. From then on ballet found its greatest patrons in France. Among them le Roy Soleil who encouraged the vogue of introducing ballets into operas. He also entrusted Pierre Beauchamp, his ballet teacher for twenty years, with inventing rules and defining a ballet technique. From this it followed that from

1661 dancers could be trained to be professionals at the Royal Academy of Dance and when this took over the Palais Royal Theatre in 1673 dancing became a stage entertainment. Dancing on a stage meant that new positions and new steps had to be invented, since the dancers were now facing the audience, not being surrounded by it as in a ballroom. The organisers of a dance now included choreographers, directors, teachers, musicians and, in the 18th century, even singers. By the first decade of that century the aristocracy had changed from being amateur dancers to being professional spectators and the most influential Courts and theatres in Europe provided a permanent home for ballet companies. (1) In England, it was once more John Rich who saw a chance for profit in the booming of ballet companies. He engaged talented dancers such as Madame Camargo, Nivelon, Poitier, Duprè, Salle.

In the 1760s and 1770s the narrative type of dance was the most fashionable. It could deal with a historical subject, trades, nationalities, even characters taken from operas. Two examples will illustrate this point. On Thursday 23.5.1771, a pasticcio, La Schiava, was put on at the King's Theatre with a new dance that introduced "the principal scenes and characters in the favourite Opera of La Buona Figliuola". This dance was repeated on Saturday 22 June 1771. The opera from which the characters were taken was Goldoni's, set to music by Piccini. On 16th November 1775 the dance Il Filosofo Amorofo was performed after act 1 of La Sposa Fedele and on Tuesday 28th December 1775 it was repeated. No scenario of this dance is extant to prove its being an adaptation of Goldoni's Il Filosofo di Campagna but the remarkable success of that comic opera, its being also known as Il Filosofo Amorofo and the trends of the day make it plausible that a dance should have been derived from it.

Goldoni's Il Filosofo di Campagna also inspired a very successful song which was sung by an actress, Mrs. Clive, who was known for her *vis comica*. The song was "A Mimic Comic Opera Song from Il Filosofo

(1) R.Kraus, History of the Dance in Art and Education, New Jersey, 1969

di Campagna" and was sung at Drury Lane on Wednesday 1.4.1761, on Monday 13.4.1761, by Particular Desire, on Wednesday 15.4.1761 by Command, on Tuesday 21.4.1761, on Friday 8.5.1761, on Monday 21.3.1763 and on Monday 9.5.1763. By this time Goldoni's comic opera was so successful and Italian Opera so well established that it is hard to believe this Comic Song was just a satire. It is likely that Drury Lane was profiting from the audience's increasing liking for Italian Comic Opera.

The ten years between 1753 and 1763 were quite propitious for comic operas even taking into account the spell of serious opera productions at the King's Theatre. To recapitulate on what has already been said, there were 4 burlettas at Rich's Covent Garden in 1753-54, 2 comic operas with libretti by Goldoni at Covent Garden in 1754-55, 5 different comic operas with libretti by Goldoni at the King's Theatre between 1760 and 1762 - they ran up a total of 39 performances of which 31 in the season 1760-61: Il Mondo della Luna 10, I Tre Gobbi Rivali 1, Le Pescatrici 6, Il Filosofo di Campagna 14. A few more comic operas remain to be mentioned. It seems that Samuel Foote, the manager of the Little Theatre in the Haymarket, caught up with Rich's enterprises at Covent Garden and in 1760-61 he put on 4 "Italian Burlettas translated into English". They were: The Stratagem, with music by Galuppi, The Servant Mistress with music by Pergolesi, The Ridiculous Guardian with music by Hasse, The Coquet (or The Coquette), an adaptation by Storace of Goldoni's Le Coquet, with music by Galuppi. The number of performances of all these comic operas is high since they were put on daily, in rotation, for the whole of the months of August and September. The first two and the last had been previously produced at the summer theatre at Mary-le-bone Gardens with great success. In the season 1758-59, for instance, they had been performed at least 41, 35 and 34 times respectively.

To complete the picture four libretti by Goldoni should be mentioned: Il Mercato di Malmantile (season 1761-62) and Le Nozze, La Casina, La Calamita dei Cuori (season 1762-63). The first comic opera (music by Fischietti) was performed on Tuesday 10.11.1761 by Their Majesties's Command, with the two Paganini, Giambattista Zanca, Pietro Leonardi, Signora Eberardi, Rosa Curioni, Angiola Sartori. It was repeated on Tuesday 17.11.1761, Monday 23.11.1761, Wednesday 2.12.1761, Monday 4.1.1761 and "by Desire" on 25.1.1762. In all, 9 performances are recorded. This comic opera was no doubt a favourite with the Royal Family since six years later it was once more performed by Command of Their Majesties on Saturday 28.2.1769 and repeated on Saturday 4.2.1769, Saturday 11.2.1769, Saturday 18.2.1769.

(2) Il Teatro, the London Stage, 1760-1800 Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1966

The season 1768-69 saw six performances of Il Re alla Caccia. Felice Alessandri wrote the music for the London performances of Thursday 2.3.1769 (benefit for Lovattini), Saturday 4.3.1769, Tuesday 7.3.1769, Saturday 11.3.1769 (by Command of Their Majesties), Saturday 18.3.1769, Saturday 1.4.1769. This was followed by a disastrous performance of Lo Speciale on Saturday 6.5.1769. The music was by Fischietti and Pallavicino and Goldoni's text was slightly altered.

L'Assemblea, with text by Goldoni altered by Bottarelli and music entirely new by Pietro Guglielmi, was performed at the King's Theatre in the season 1771-72. A first performance is recorded for Tuesday 24.3.1772. This was followed by three more performances, on Saturday 28.3.1772, Tuesday 31.3.1772, Tuesday 7.4.1772.

No libretti by Goldoni seem to have been used in the season 1772-73 except for La Buona Figliuola which was performed once, on Tuesday 1.6.1773, but the following season saw a first performance of La Contessina on Tuesday 11.1.1774. This opera does not seem to have been very successful since it was repeated only once on Monday 17.1.1774.

After a gap of three years, it seems, three comic operas with libretti by Goldoni were performed at the King's Theatre in one season. (1) They were Vittorina, with music by Piccinni, L'Amore Artigiano, with music by Gassmann and Il Marchese Villano, with music by Paisiello and Piccinni. Vittorina was performed twice only, on Tuesday 16.12.1777 and on Tuesday 23.12.1777. L'Amore Artigiano was more successful with 6 performances: Tuesday 10.3.1778, Tuesday 17.3.1778, Tuesday 31.3.1778, Tuesday 7.4.1778, Tuesday 21.4.1778. All performances were accompanied by dances. The dancers were Simonet, Mlle Baccelli, Mlle Banti, Signor & Signora Zucchelli. The singers were Jermoli, Rossi, Coppola, Micheli Signora Jermoli, Signora Prudom, Signora Todi. Il Marchese Villano was performed once, on Thursday 26.3.1778. The text is attributed to Goldoni by the compilers of The London Stage (2) who also attribute the

-
- (1) In the season 1776-77 Germondo, a serious opera by Traetta with text by Goldoni, was produced at the King's Theatre where Traetta was resident composer. The Public Advertiser of 27.1.1777 called it "a senseless, impertinent Opera..with Music, in point of Dullness, extremely well suited to the Book". An early work by Goldoni called Germondo is recorded in the Zatta edition of 1794.
- (2) C:B.Hogan, The London Stage, 1776-1800 Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1968

music to Paisiello and Piccinni, whereas Lowenberg attributes the music to Paisiello only and the text to Chiari without even mentioning a London performance. (1)

In 1780-81 L'Arcifanfano re dei matti was produced at the King's Theatre as a pasticcio arranged by G.B.Bianchi. The music was chiefly by Scolari and the text by Goldoni. This opera only had one performance and its lack of success was commented upon by The Public Advertiser of 27.11.1780. The popularity of comic-opera libretti of the type Goldoni had written was beginning to decline. In 1784 there were three performances of Le Gelosie Villane which was based on Goldoni's Il Feudatario although the actual text was by Grandi. The first performance, with music by Sarti, was on Thursday 15.4.1784, the second on Saturday 17.4.1784 and the third on Tuesday 4.5.1784. The same season saw a revival of Le Nozze under the title I Rivali Delusi. This opera, which in 1762 had been produced under the title Le Nozze di Dorina and with the music of Galuppi, was performed 21 times in 1784. The new music was by Sarti and it was well received from the beginning. The first performance was on Tuesday 6.1.1784.

Finally, after a five-year gap, Goldoni's La Vendemmia was performed on Saturday 9.5.1789. The text was adapted by Bertati and the music was by Gazzaniga, Storace and Tarchi. This opera was repeated 3 times, the last on Thursday 14.5.1789.

By this time new composers had come into the limelight and with them new librettists. Among the composers D.Cimarosa should be mentioned, whose operas reached a total number of performances as high as 53 in the period 1786-89. His librettists were Livigni, Petrosellini, Diodati, Palomba. The composer Paisiello, whose librettists were Lorenzi Bertati, Tonioli, Chiari, Palomba and Casti, was very successful with 115 performances of 9 operas in the period 1786-1795. Other new writers were Giovannini, Moretti, Badini, Gamerra, Andrei, Lanfranchi. But perhaps the historically most significant opera in the last twenty

(1) A.Lowenberg, Annals of Opera 1597-1940, Societas Bibliographica, 1955, Genève, vol. 1

years of the 18th century was Th. Holcroft's The Follies of a Day or The Marriage of Figaro. It was based on P.A. de Beaumarchais' Le Mariage de Figaro and it exemplifies the social and cultural changes that were taking place. It was performed at Covent Garden, Drury Lane and The Haymarket, sometimes at all three theatres in the same season and it had about 80 performances in the period 1784-92.

In all, the performances of this opera in London during Goldoni's lifetime amounted to at least 100. The breakdown of the performances is as follows: 1766-67, 27; 1767-68, 11; 1768-69, 9; 1769-70, 4; 1770-71, 9 (1); 1771-72, 2; 1772-73, 1; 1773-74, 1; 1774-75, 3; 1775-76, 6; 1776-77, 1; 1777-78, 3; 1778-79, 3; 1779-80, 2; 1780-81, 1; 1781-82, 6; 1782-83, 1; 1783-84, 6; 1784-85, 1; 1785-86-87-88, 1; 1788-89, 1; 1789-90, 1 (2); 1790-91 as a part of an entertainment of music and dancing.

The story of La Buona Figliuola or Cecchina is that of a peasant girl who rises in society to become a "marchesa" after her noble origin is discovered through happy albeit strange circumstances. But her true nobility is in her inner nature and she remains as dignified and virtuous after her marriage to a nobleman as she had been before.

This mixture of sentimentality, piety and comedy, all held fast onto the safe structure of the 18th-century social order, allowed room for the emergent middle classes and so managed to please everybody. In Rome La Buona Figliuola was even turned into a puppet-show. Says Ginguené, who was a friend of the composer Piccini: "A Rome, on ne pouvait plus entendre d'autre musique; toutes les classes du peuple voulaient en jouir. On la donna sur les plus petites théâtres, sur celui des Burattini, ou comédiens de bois, et les gens du bon ton y allaient encore en foule. Les titres voisins ne rivalisaient qu'à la Cecchina. Toutes les modes en portèrent le nom. Si des auberges ou des gainguettes s'établissaient, et voulaient réussir, elle prenait

-
- (1) On Thursday 23.5.1771 La Buona Figliuola was performed with a pastiche by Piccini called La Soubaya. The dances included a "New Dance" with principal scenes and characters from La Buona Figliuola. This dance was repeated, with the programme, on Saturday 27.5.1771
 - (2) One act only, at the Haymarket Theatre.

On Tuesday 25.11.1766 the King's Theatre put on a performance of La Buona Figliuola with music by Piccinni. The singers were: Miss Young, Signore Zamperini e Gibetti, Savoi, Lovattini, Morigi, Micheli. G.G.Bottarelli was responsible for the required alterations to the text.

On Tuesday 2.12.1766 the play was repeated by Command of Their Majesties. In all, the performances of this opera in London during Goldoni's lifetime amounted to at least 100. The breakdown of the performances is as follows: 1766-67, 27; 1767-68, 11; 1768-69, 9; 1769-70, 4; 1770-71, 9 (1); 1771-72, 2; 1772-73, 1; 1773-74, 1; 1774-75, 8; 1775-76, 6; 1776-77, 1; 1777-78, 3; 1778-79, 3; 1779-80, 2; 1780-81, 1; 1781-82, 8; 1782-83, 1; 1783-84, 0; 1784-85, 1; 1785-86-87-88, 1; 1788-89, 1; 1789-90, 1 (2); 1790-91 as a duet by Signora Sestini and Davide as part of an entertainment of music and dancing.

The story of La Buona Figliuola or Cecchina is that of a peasant girl who rises in society to become a "marchesa" after her noble origin is discovered through happy albeit strange circumstances. But her true nobility is in her inner nature and she remains as dignified and virtuous after her marriage to a nobleman as she had been before.

This mixture of sentimentality, piety and comedy, all held fast onto the safe structure of the 18th-century social order, allowed room for the emergent middle classes and so managed to please everybody. In Rome La Buona Figliuola was even turned into a puppet-show. Says Ginguené, who was a friend of the composer Piccinni: "À Rome, on ne pouvait plus entendre d'autre musique; toutes les classes du peuple voulerrent en jouir. On la donna sur les plus petits théâtres, même à celui des Burattini, ou comédiens de bois, et les gens du bon ton y allaient encore en foule. Les têtes romaines rêvaient qu'à la Cecchina. Toutes les modes en portèrent le nom. Si des auberges ou des guinguettes s'établissaient, et voulaient réussir, elle prenaient

-
- (1) On Thursday 23.5.1771 La Buona Figliuola was performed with a pasticcio by Piccinni called La Schiava. The dances included a "New Dance" with principal scenes and characters from La Buona Figliuola. This dance was repeated, with the programme, on Saturday 22.6.1771
- (2) One act only, at the Haymarket Theatre.

(4) S. Crocker, A History of Musical Style, N.Y. 1946

la Cecchina pour enseigne, et il y a une espèce de vin qu'on appelle encore ainsi. La maison Lepri ayant dans ce temps-là fait bâtir près de Rome une villa sur un de ses fiefs, elle lui donna le nom de la Cecchina." (1)

The craze for this comic opera in the 1760s' could be said to be comparable to the modern craze for some successful "pop" group. As we have seen, it went further and those with a quick eye for the commercial exploitation of social weaknesses found a way to profit from the situation.

Underneath this striking but superficial notoriety lay the foundations for a historical event. Unknown to the fickle ladies of Italy and the shrewd merchants, the appearance on stage of La Buona Figliuola with the music of Niccolò Piccinni marked an important moment in the history of Comic Opera. Libretti for comic operas had gradually changed over the years from being almost crude farce to being a complex story with characters. Goldoni's libretti had the added advantage of bearing the mark of his personality and skill because, unlike any other librettist of his day, he was first and foremost a playwright. His ideas about a theatrical situation did inevitably come through in his best libretti however half-heartedly and hurriedly he wrote them. As he tells us in his Mémoires (2) he had financial gain in mind rather than the advance of literature when he provided libretti for composers. An artificial situation such as that in Il Negligente (London 1749) had none the less a basis in the realities of Goldoni's times, as has been pointed out.(3) In the eyes of the audience this surely enhanced the effect of contrasting situations where apparent seriousness alternated with open comedy. Writing of this nature gave the composers scope for using both the serious and the comic style of music that were traditional in Opera but they restricted the use of heavy orchestral recitatives and grand arias to special effects and caricature. (4) As the century progressed more stress was put on pathos, so that when La Buona Figliuola appeared on

(2) See quotation in ch. 6, p.41

(1) C.Goldoni, Tutte le Opere, Mondadori, 1936, under the heading La Buona Figliuola (Notes)

(3) See ch. 6

(4) R.Crocker, A History of Musical Style, N.Y. 1966

the stage it showed a combination of sentiment and comedy that was something new and so acceptable to the theatre-goers of the day. Far from being completely in advance of its time La Buona Figliuola was a blend of traditional and up-to-date elements. And so was the music Piccinni had written for it, although students of 18th-century Comic Opera seem to consider Piccinni's pathetic style more strikingly new in the history of music than Goldoni's sentimentality in the history of libretti. An example of such musical style, which is often quoted, is an adagio in Act III, where Cecchina is gently teased by her noble suitor before he reveals to her that they can now marry. (1)

Andrea Della Corte (2) says that Piccinni's music was superior to Goldoni's libretto and to Duni's interpretation of it. "Secondo noi - he says - il valore dell'intuizione picciniana sta nel rilievo della psicologia di Cecchina...Il resto della Commedia musicale si confonde nella innumerevole produzione del teatro comico dell'opera". He also says: "Sembra che una nuova intuizione dell'anima femminile si riveli a noi, sembra che, mutato il cielo e il paesaggio, un nuovo pathos salga e vibri nelle cantilene e nelle armonie. È un più fine ed intenso dramma. È una più nobile e squisita interpretazione della vita. Il cosiddetto genere comico si potenzia di più calorosa energia drammatica, e s'espande nel canto delle avverse e diverse passioni, fuori d'un circolo troppo angusto, fino a trovare i convenzionali limiti del cosiddetto genere serio, toccarli, sfiorarli ed allontanarsene. È una donna che libera il proprio dramma e il proprio palpito. Non ha un nome sonoro, nè è un'eroina avulsa dalla mitologia o dalla storia. Una umile donna piange, umanamente si lamenta, fra eventi che noi chiamiamo comici, ci intenerisce. Parve un miracolo, e fu segno d'arte eccellente. Il valore estetico dell'opera è tutto nell'espressione della sensibilità, una sensibilità che reca una data precisa ed eloquente, 1760. Nella convenzionale distinzione delle parti, l'afflitta Cecchina fu assegnata

(1) R.Crocker, Op.cit.,

(2) A.Della Corte, L'Opera Comica Italiana nel '700, Bari 1923, p.198-99

al gruppo comico. Fortuna per l'arte! poichè, designata parte seria, avrebbe cantato alla maniera delle virtuose accademiche. Cantò invece umanamente, artisticamente. Dalla sensibilità affiora il nuovo sentimento, quel tenero, quel commovente che più si effonderanno nel teatro della seconda metà del secolo, nella Comédie Larmoyante, nella commedia della Rivoluzione, nel primo Romanticismo". (1)

Goldoni, as we know, took the subject of his La Buona Figliuola from his own play Pamela, which he had written in 1750. This play, in turn, had been taken from Richardson's Pamela, whose first two volumes had appeared in Prevost's translation in France in 1740 while in Venice a translation had been published by Bettinelli in 1744-45. In 1756 Pamela went back to England in its Italian form in a translation of Goldoni's play, as recorded by Spinelli in his Bibliografia Goldoniana. (2) This is a factor when trying to assess the reasons for the repeated and successful performances of Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola in London, and the general intellectual climate of 18th-century London should be considered.

Richardson's novels, especially Pamela and Clarissa, were extraordinarily fashionable in England at mid-century. E.Gosse explains Pamela's success saying that "for the first time the public was invited, by a master of the movements of the heart, to be present at the dissection of that fascinating organ, and the operator could not be leisurely enough, could not be minute enough, for his breathless and enraptured audience". (3)

In France Richardson's Pamela influenced novelists such as Marivaux and, later Diderot and Sedaine. It was also favourably received by the general public whose taste had been shaped for the new type of sentimentality by the plays of Nivèlle de la Chaussée. (4) He was the creator, in the 1730s' of what was called "comédie larmoyante". This type of play took its characters from classical comedy but expressed bourgeois feelings. A new morality was reflected in N. de La Chaussée's plays - that is to say a concept of man as an imperfect but not irredeemable

-
- (1) A.Della Corte, Piccinni, Bari 1928, p. 33-34
 - (2) A.G.Spinelli, Bibliografia Goldoniana, Milano 1884
 - (3) E.Gosse, A History of Eighteenth-Century Literature (1660-1780), London 1912, p. 246
 - (4) Pierre-Claude Nivèlle de la Chaussée (1692-1754)

creature, rather than a corrupted being deserving of pitiless ridicule, as had been thought in the previous century. The Comédie Larmoyante was more concerned with moral teachings than study of character and had a happy ending. By the time Rousseau had been affected by the new trends, French culture had moved away from the Comédie Larmoyante and was embarking upon the great adventure of Romanticism. (1)

In England such pre-romantic attitudes began to show in the didactic poetry of Robert Blair (Elegy in Memory of William Law, 1728) and John Dyer (The Ruins of Rome, 1740) while a new sentimentality, tied to the study of nature, was expressed in Thomson's Seasons (1726). Of his Winter E.Gosse says: "It is peculiarly delightful as the outpouring of a picturesque memory, exactly stored with all those beautiful trifling incidents of life and nature which most men see only to forget. Such vignettes as those of the redbreast helping himself to crumbs, the family waiting anxiously for the man who is perishing in the snow... these have a sharpness of outline, an impassioned simplicity and truth, which the poet never surpassed." (2)

Sentimentality - the novelty in La Buona Figliuola - is still not powerful enough to obliterate the presence of Commedia dell'Arte elements. Tagliaferro, the soldier, is a traditional character. He is a mixture of the Capitano and the Lanzicheneco which were so common in the old scenari. The violent language he speaks, in a half-Italian and half-German idiom, is meant to create an impression of almost wild belligerency. This exaggerated violence results in comedy - probably enhanced by a suitable dress and appropriate reaction from the other players, as in Act 2, scene VI: (Tagliaferro is talking to Mingotto who is feeling suicidal on account of Cecchina)

Tu canaglia, poltrone,
Foler disperazione
Spada per ti passar? Se fol morire
Calantone onorate,
Alla gherra fenir, morir soldate
.....
E per donna Talian star disperato?

(1) Laffont-Bompiani, Dictionnaire universel de Lettres, Paris and G.Lanson, Nivelle de la Chaussée et la Comédie Larmoyante, Paris 1887

(2) E.Gosse, Op. cit., ch.VII, p. 223

Tatesco niente importa
Per gherra, per onor, perder la pelle,
Ma no morir per queste pacatelle.
Fenir, fenir con me.

.....
Sì, sì/paesan, fenir
Che alla gherra contenti
Star tutte sorte de difertimenti.

Star violone, star violine,
Star strumenti quantità,
Belle fraile graziosine
Per ballare vissasà.
Se nemigo star lontan,
Trinch vain lanzman,
Quando in campo defe andar,
Sempre lustiche ti sta
Salta, balla vissasà.

And again in Act 3, scene VIII:

Fol feder, fol parlar; poi andar subite
Con patron colonello in Ongaria
Per combattere Turchia. No poder star,
Se testa no tagliar. Esser io state
Anz, zoa, trai campagne bon soldate.

Ah come tutto je consolar
Quando nemigo testa tagliar!
Quando fascina porta trinciera,
Quando cornetta porta bandiera,
Quando cannona sente fa bu,
Fatta la breccia, subite su.
Spada alla mano sempre menar.
Ih, che la gherra me consolar.
Ih, che contento sempre mi star.

In his less swaggering moments Tagliaferro is equally funny on account of the difficulty he encounters in expressing himself and of the impression of toughness he has previously established. This is evident in the scene where Paolina and Sandrina, thinking they have caught him taking advantage of Cecchina, sarcastically accuse him. Tagliaferro, overwhelmed with emotion, can only utter confused half-sentences.

Sandrina and Paoluccia are the "zagne" of the Commedia dell'Arte. They are two of a kind, so much so that in some editions of La Buona Figliuola only Sandrina is cast and she sings both parts. This is the

case with a libretto which can be seen in the library of Casa Goldoni in Venice. The heading reads: "La Buona Figliuola da rappresentarsi nel Teatro privilegiato vicino alla corte l'anno MDCCLXIV - in Vienna, nella stamperia di Ghelen." The cast includes a "Sandrina lavatrice" and several scenes appear to have been suitably cut and remodelled to make up for the absence of a second zagna.

Mengotto and Sandrina's love-scene in Act 3, scenes V and VI, reminds us of the scene between Porporina and Pasquino in Il Negligente (Act 3, scene VI) (1) but the scene in La Buona Figliuola is not quite so brisk and fast moving. Mengotto, affected by the general "sentimental" trend feels sorry for himself and in the end resigns himself to marrying Sandrina since he cannot have Cecchina. Sandrina behaves accordingly and appears to be tame almost to the point of being sweet. The following example will illustrate this.

Meng. Oh, povero Mengotto!

Sand. Poverino!

Tu resti senza amante: in caso tale,

Non potresti di me far capitale?

Meng. Mi prenderesti tu?

Sand. So che nol meriti

Che sei un traditore

Ma...si potrebbe dar. Son di bon core.

Son tenera di pasta,

Son docile di cor.

Una parola basta,

Mi basta un po' d'amor.

Oh, povero Mengotto,

Barone, furbacchiotto,

Lo so che non lo meriti,

Ma ti vuo bene ancor.

(Act 3, Scene V)

Meng. Mi spiaceria pur tanto

Perder la mia Cecchina; ma pazienza:

Voglio una sposa, e non ne vuo star senza.

Poco più, poco meno,

Quando intorno non han certe magagne,

Son le femmine poi tutte compagne.

(Act 3, Scene VI)

(1) See Chapter Six, p. 40.

The scene already mentioned between the soldier Tagliaferro and the zagne Sandrina and Paoluccia is a lost opportunity for what, some ten years earlier, would have naturally turned into a series of comical misunderstandings. Now the two zagne's attempted mischief is nipped in the bud by a sharp rebuke from Marchese della Conchiglia.

In Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno (1749), Menghina, the wife of young Bertoldino, secretly enters old Bertoldo's room under cover of darkness and fools him into believing that she is someone else, who is in love with him. Surprised by his son Bertoldino the old man decides to take revenge. Disguised as a cavaliere he woos Menghina, only to find that he is in fact pursuing Cacasenno - his grand-son - who is dressed up as a woman. The final discovery is followed by merry duets.

In La Buona Figliuola Cecchina is asleep among flowers in full daylight. The "night-scene" and the "disguise", so typical of Commedia dell'Arte and pantomime have disappeared. Even the "discovery" has become a simple matter of recognising a birth mark on Cecchina's body.

La Buona Figliuola did not change the entire style of Comic Opera all of a sudden and traditional libretti for traditional comic-opera music continued to be written (1); but however little La Buona Figliuola might have been consciously imitated, it could not be entirely ignored after it had appeared on the stage with such success.

(1) A. Della Corte, L'Opera Comica Italiana nel 1700, Bari 1923

(1) In the same season La Buona Figliuola was repeated 27 times.

La Buona Figliuola had a sequel, La Buona Figliuola Maritata. This was performed at the King's Theatre 9 times in the season 1766-67 but the public never really took to it although on two occasions, Saturday 7.2.1767 and Tuesday 17.2.1767, it was performed by Command of Their Majesties. (1) The other performances were on Saturday 31.2.1767, Tuesday 3.3.1767, Tuesday 17.3.1767, Saturday 21.3.1767, Thursday 9.4.1767, Tuesday 5.5.1767 and Tuesday 26.5.1767. It was performed twice in the following season, on Saturday 9.1.1768 (by Command of Their Majesties) and on Tuesday 12.1.1768. Three years later it was used for a benefit performance for Zanca on Thursday 16.5.1771 and again on Saturday 8.6.1771.

Another comic opera with libretto by Goldoni was performed in London for the first time in the season 1766-67. This was Il Signor Dottore, with music by Fischietti. It was first performed on 12.3.1767 for a benefit for Lovattini; then on Thursday 30.4.1767; Saturday 16.5.1767, with alterations and additions of favourite airs from Jomelli's Don Trastullo; Tuesday 16.6.1767 by Particular Desire, with arias from Don Trastullo again. In 1769-70 this opera was performed twice, on Tuesday 1.5.1770 and Tuesday 8.5.1770.

I Viaggiatori Ridicoli, with text by Goldoni and music entirely new by Pietro Guglielmi, was another success in the season 1767-68. It was performed 9 times in all, the first on Tuesday 24.5.1768 and the last, by Particular Desire, on Thursday 30.7.1768. In the following season it was performed 12 times; in 1769-70 four times, including a performance by Particular Desire instead of La Buona Figliuola on Tuesday 22.5.1770, with Signora Guadagni as principal singer. In 1770-71 it was performed once on Thursday 21.3.1771 with Signora Guglielmi instead of Signora Guadagni and new arias; in 1771-72 it was performed 11 times, twice by Command of Their Majesties. It was still in the repertory in 1774-75, when it was performed for a benefit for Lovattini on Thursday 30.4.75 and finally repeated on Tuesday 25.4.1775 with a host of famous dancers, such as Vallouis and Mlle Vallouis, Vitalba, Mlle Sophie, Mlle Baccelli. The singers were Lovattini, Fochetti, Signora Galli, Signora Farinella, Signora Spiletta, Signora Sestini.

(1) In the same season La Buona Figliuola was repeated 27 times

Le Nozze, with music by Galuppi, was performed 3 times only: on Monday 1.2.1762, Monday 8.2.1762, Monday 22.3.1762. But it proved a great success in 1783-84 when it was repeated 20 times, as will be seen in detail later.

La Cascina was performed on Saturday 8.1.1763 by Command of Their Majesties and repeated once, on Monday 10.1.1763. It was a "pasticcio" arranged by G.G.Bottarelli. The original music was by Scolari (Venice, 1755).

Finally, La Calamita dei Cuori, with music by Galuppi, was performed for the first time on Thursday 3.2.1763, by Command of Their Majesties and with an overture by J.C.Bach. It was repeated on Saturday 5.2.1763, Monday 7.2.1763, Saturday 12.2.1763, Monday 21.2.1763, Monday 7.3.1763, Monday 21.3.1763 and Thursday 21.4.1763 (2 acts only) as a benefit for Gallini who also danced a minuet with Signora De Amicis,"by Desire" (1).

From this time to the season 1766-67 there is another gap in the performance of comic operas with libretti by Goldoni. In fact, unless there is a serious lack of evidence, there is a gap in the performance of any comic opera at the King's Theatre. The only operas recorded are serious ones.

In the period between 21st November 1749, when Il Negligente was put on for the first time, and 21st April 1763, when La Calamita dei Cuori was performed for the last time, 11 libretti by Goldoni were used in London, with a total of at least 86 performances. If we add to this Storace's version of Le Coquet, the number of performances rises to about one hundred and fifty.

Meantime Comic Opera had evolved and become a more sentimental genre. From being almost totally zany it was becoming romantic. The

(1) Andrea Gallini was a famous Italian dancer and was maestro di ballo at the King's Theatre. In 1772 he wrote a Treatise on the Art of Dancing (London). He believed in being true to nature but confined this to "comic Dances" only and said that "the stronger they are of the manners and practice of the times, the nearer they will seem to the truth of nature, and the surer at once to be understood and to have a pleasing effect" (p.272). Talking about "inventiveness" he refers to Goldoni: "It is his barrenness of invention that the ingenious Goldoni has so well exposed in one of his plays". He then quotes at length from the play without giving its title (p.103)

turning point in the history of Comic Opera was the collaboration between Goldoni and Piccinni. Its fruit was La Buona Figliuola (Rome 1760). It was first performed in London on Tuesday 25.11.1766 at the King's Theatre and after that achieved at least 100 performances in Goldoni's lifetime.

A new phase in the history of Comic Opera had started. An invitation to come to London which Goldoni received and the names of the women who allegedly were involved in it on account of their managerial position. In his eagerness to show how he valued the patronage of his French friends - in spite of the prestige carried by a London connection - Goldoni omitted to mention relevant dates, names and titles of works. Any information that can be obtained must be by a process of deduction.

If we are to credit what Goldoni says about deaths and nuptials at the French Court, the invitation to move to London must have come between 1768 and 1770. The first is the date of the last of a series of important deaths, the second that of the marriage of Louis XVI to Marie Antoinette. In July 1765 Don Felipe V, Duke of Parma, died; in December 1765 the death of Louis the Dauphin occurred, (1) in February 1766 that of Louis XV's father-in-law, the ex-king of Poland; in March 1767 that of the Dauphine (2). Finally, in June 1768 the Queen of France died, Louis XVI, on the other hand, married on 16th May 1770.

Several factors are against the dates which, at first sight, seem to be deducible from the excerpt quoted. The first is evidence that in the history of the King's Theatre women held a managerial position on two occasions: before 1764 and after 1770; the second is evidence to be found in Favart's letters (3) that at some point at the beginning of 1765 Goldoni decided to stay in Paris in spite of the fact that he was wanted abroad; the third is evidence to be found in Goldoni's letters that he had been thinking of leaving Paris as early as 1763.

On the first point, a list of the King's Theatre managers between 1750 and 1780 shows that the affairs of this theatre were in the hands

(1) Son of Louis XV and father of Louis XVI

(2) Mother of Louis XVI

(3) C.S. Favart, Mémoires et Correspondance Littéraires, Paris 1808

It is known that Goldoni's Mémoires are not entirely a reliable source of accurate information. The excerpt quoted in chapter 2, page 12 is a particularly intriguing example of Goldoni's gift for stretching facts to bring outside events into the history of his own personal life as it unfolded in his memory, not necessarily as it unfolded in reality.

Two main facts require clarification: the date of the invitation to come to London which Goldoni received and the names of the women who allegedly were involved in it on account of their managerial position. In his eagerness to show how he valued the patronage of his French friends - in spite of the prestige carried by a London connection - Goldoni omitted to mention relevant dates, names and titles of works. Any information that can be obtained must be by a process of deduction.

If we are to credit what Goldoni says about deaths and nuptials at the French Court, the invitation to move to London must have come between 1768 and 1770. The first is the date of the last of a series of important deaths, the second that of the marriage of Louis XVI to Marie Antoinette. In July 1765 Don Felipe V, Duke of Parma, died; in December 1765 the death of Louis the Dauphin occurred, (1) in February 1766 that of Louis XV's father-in-law, the ex-king of Poland; in March 1767 that of the Dauphine (2). Finally, in June 1768 the Queen of France died. Louis XVI, on the other hand, married on 16th May 1770.

Several factors are against the dates which, at first sight, seem to be deducible from the excerpt quoted. The first is evidence that in the history of the King's Theatre women held a managerial position on two occasions: before 1764 and after 1770; the second is evidence to be found in Favart's letters (3) that at some point at the beginning of 1765 Goldoni decided to stay in Paris in spite of the fact that he was wanted abroad; the third is evidence to be found in Goldoni's letters that he had been thinking of leaving Paris as early as 1763.

On the first point, a list of the King's Theatre managers between 1750 and 1780 shows that the affairs of this theatre were in the hands

-
- (1) Son of Louis XV and father of Louis XVI
 - (2) Mother of Louis XVI
 - (3) C.S.Favart, Mémoires et Correspondance Littéraires, Paris 1808

of women from 1755 to 1764 (Signora Mingotti and Signora Mattei) and from 1774 to 1778 (Mrs. Yates and Mrs. Brooke). This is well outside the period 1768-1770 suggested by Goldoni's Mémoires and it also does not tally with his statement that his collaboration with the King's Theatre lasted several years. The second piece of evidence comes from C. S. Favart. He was an intimate friend of Goldoni who often met him socially in Paris. He was also on very friendly terms with Count Durazzo (1) to whom he wrote regularly, keeping him informed on literary and theatrical matters and for whom he recruited dancers and actors. It is in one of his letters to Count Durazzo that Favart tells how Goldoni decided to stay in France rather than return to Venice. He relates the events that led to Goldoni being appointed teacher of Italian at Court and in doing this he remarks that Goldoni was wanted in England but luckily the appointment at Court had persuaded him not to leave France. He says: "Goldoni ayant fini son engagement avec nos comédiens Italiens, se préparoit à retourner à Venise, quoiqu'il fût désiré en Angleterre et en Portugal; mais par une heureuse circonstance, qui fait autant d'honneur à notre nation qu'à lui-même, on vient de le fixer en France. Il vint hier m'annoncer, en arrivant de Versailles, qu'il avoit été présenté par Madame la Dauphine à Madame Adélaïde, en qualité de maître de langue italienne." (2)

This letter was written on 5th March 1765 and suggests that the invitation to Goldoni to move to London was made sometime before March 1765. Favart's witness is more reliable than Goldoni's own Mémoires because he writes nearer the time of events he has heard about from Goldoni himself, whereas Goldoni writes from memory 20 years later. It is likely that by that time (1783) the facts and the realities of the situation such as his financial difficulties of the 1760s had, to Goldoni, become a confused memory. It is also more than likely that Goldoni's feelings about his circumstances when he was writing his Mémoires coloured the view he expressed of this invitation. (3) On the other

-
- (1) Count Giacomo Durazzo was official representative of the Republic of Genoa at Vienna. He was also adviser to Count Esterhazy in theatrical matters and later put in charge of the Court theatres.
 - (2) C.S. Favart, *op.cit.*, vol 2, p. 216
 - (3) Goldoni's Mémoires were dedicated to the King of France. The purpose of this dedication and of the actual writing was to obtain financial support and royal patronage without seeming to put too great an emphasis on such a purpose.

hand Goldoni's letters as early as 1763 show his dissatisfaction with Paris, the comedians and the theatre and his preoccupation about his future. Here are some quotations:

"Si è data la mia Commedia, intitolata il Ventaglio, ma non ha fatto quell'incontro, che io credeva. È troppo inviluppata per l'abilità di questi comici. Sono stato risarcito dai Due Fratelli Rivali, picciola Commedia in un atto, che è una cosa da niente, ed ha fatto incontro grandissimo. Non ostante il suo incontro, non la credo buona per Lei; è troppo comica e troppo bassa, e questo è quel che piace a Parigi al Teatro Italiano. Io sono assai malcontento di questa sorta d'applausi, e tanto più mi determino a non prolungare a Parigi la mia dimora." (To Marchese Albergati Capacelli, Paris 13th June 1763) (1)

"L'evento felice di due commedie non mi assicura il mio stato in Francia. Non so quel che pensino di me i Francesi; non so come io possa riuscire per l'avvenire. So di certo non essere io necessario in nessun luogo, ma mi basta di essere compatito dove mi trovo e di continuarmi quel poco di concetto, che ho procurato di acquistarmi. Ciò mi metterà in istato di non essere rifiutato altrove, se al mese d'Agosto avrò finito di restare a Parigi." (To Gabriele Cornet, Paris - no date - 1763) (2)

"Ond'ecco con tre commedie stabilita la mia reputazione a Parigi. Ora per questa parte sono contento ma, se potessi, partirei domani per rivedere l'Italia. Non è che io non ami Parigi, ma mi pare di essere fuori del mio centro, ed è assai difficile di continuar a piacere, senza farmi intender col dialogo ed a forza di situazioni, o ridicole, o patetiche, o interessanti. La cosa è troppo faticosa e troppo incerta e poi la presunzione dei comici, de' quali non mi posso servire, non lascia di darmi delle inquietudini. Aggiungasi a questo che seimila franchi l'anno a Parigi non bastano per un galantuomo e non posso darmi pace, che un attore il più inabile ne guadagni quindicimila e che io abbia a contentarmi di sei. Non resterò certamente a Parigi ad una simile condizione." (To Marchese F. Albergati, Paris, 10.1.1764) (3)

"Ancora non si sono qui rappresentate le mie tre commedie che ultimamente ho fatte, per causa di una dissensione grandissima fra commedianti, per la quale la brava attrice, l'unica attrice buona, la gran Camilla, ha domandato il suo congedo e l'ha ottenuto. Gli altri non vagliono un fico ed io non so più come far commedie. Vedrò a Pasqua quali risoluzioni prenderanno i Gentiluomini della Camera. Così certamente non posso restare a Parigi e vi andrebbe della

(1) E.Masi, Lettere di C.Goldoni, Bologna, 1880, p. 213

(2) Ibid., p. 228

(3) Ibid., p.234. The comedies referred to are Avventure di Arlecchino e Camilla, Gelosia d'Arlecchino, Inquietudine di Camilla

mia reputazione. Non ho ancora deciso niente. Ho varii progetti, che mi vengono fatti. Ella sarà avvisata di tutto." (To Marchese Albergati Capacelli, Paris 19.3.1764) (1)

"Rispetto alle cose mie di Parigi, le dirò succintamente che i Commedianti Italiani (che sono gli stessi per tutto) hanno avuto l'abilità di mettermi in una specie di necessità di lasciare Parigi, ma i Gentiluomini della Camera non vogliono assolutamente ch'io parta. Hanno penetrato i miei dispiaceri senza che io mi sia lamentato e m'hanno date le più generose dimostranze della loro bontà. I commedianti devono considerarmi in avvenire, come indipendente affatto dalla Commedia, e solamente attaccato alla Corte. Devono essi dipendere da me in tutto quello che riguarda alle mie commedie, alla distribuzione delle parti e cose simili." (To Marchese Albergati Capacelli, Paris 6.4.1764) (2)

Goldoni's affairs continued to remain in a state of flux throughout 1765 in spite of his appointment as teacher of Italian at Court. (3) In May 1766 his "status" at Court was still to be officially decided:

"Finalmente la Corte è rasserenata, ed io ho ripreso con Madama il mio ordinario esercizio. Sono otto giorni che la mia Augusta scolara e padrona mi ha nuovamente assicurato che il mio stato si fisserà in Corte quanto prima; mi ha detto coi termini i più consolanti, ch'ella è contenta del mio servizio e della mia condotta, ed ha accompagnato queste parole con un regalo, consistente in una tabacchiera d'oro del valore di sessanta luigi, e cento luigi d'oro in specie, dicendo che questo presente non entra ne' miei appuntamenti, che saranno considerati dal giorno ch'io son venuto al servizio." (To Marchese Albergati Capacelli, Versailles, 26.5.1766) (4)

The letters quoted and those referred to show how concerned Goldoni was with his future and his financial situation. It is against this background of impending poverty and artistic frustration that his collaboration with the King's Theatre should be viewed. He seemingly began to make plans about finding new sources of income in 1763 and it is plausible that he took steps to ensure for himself the patronage of someone who could support his plans. Thus his planning and the actual time of the invitation to move to London do not necessarily coincide.

(1) E.Masi, Op.cit, p. 244-245

(2) Ibidem, p.249-250

(3) Ibid., letters to Marchese Albergati Capacelli 18.2.1765, 18.3.1765, 2.4.1765, 3.5.1765 and to Gabriele Cornet 13.5.1765, p.261, 262, 266, 268, 278-279

(4) Ibid. ,

Evidence of how, how much, and when, authors were paid is usually found in theatre account-books. Those relating to the King's Theatre are missing, except those for the seasons 1786-87 and 1787-88. They might have helped to trace some of the payments which Goldoni received and for which he was so grateful. One conjecture can be reasonably made: that negotiations with Goldoni were started by one of the two women in charge between 1763 and 1764 and completed by someone else later. The records show that after 1764 management fell into the hands of several people: Crawford, Vincent and Gordon (1764-66), Drummond, Vincent and Gordon (1766-69) and George Hobart (1769). It was under the management of Crawford, Vincent and Gordon that Signora Mattei, who had been manager from 1757 to 1763, resumed her place as principal singer at the King's Theatre after a brief absence from England in 1764. Like the other female actor-manager of the King's Theatre, Signora Regina Mingotti Signora Colomba Mattei was not a novice as far as show-business was concerned and knew all the ins and outs of the Italian Opera in London, having had ties with the King's Theatre at least since 1754. She had in fact been in Vanneschi's company, back in the 1750s, with Regina Mingotti. Taking all this into account it cannot be excluded that Colomba Mattei had a hand in clinching a deal with Goldoni even though she simply held the position of singer and Crawford, Vincent and Gordon were the official managers. It seems more likely that help for Goldoni should come from comic-opera singers - who had no quarrel with him on the point of "reformed" theatre and "traditional" Commedia dell'Arte plays - rather than from anyone else. It was to their advantage to use Goldoni's services to keep up the success Italian Comic Opera had achieved in London, since it was his libretti they had been using.

The last point that arises from the excerpt quoted from Goldoni's Mémoires is that of the length of his collaboration with the King's Theatre. He says it lasted several years and in the end he was paid for work he had done although some of it had not been put to use on account

-
- (1) After a slow start in 1755 she began to establish a regular repertoire. Her performance as Helen in Gluck's *Alceste* was such that no other company attempted it during her lifetime.
- (2) The subject of this opera was taken from Favart's *Les Femmes de bien* the music was by W. J. 1755.

of the women concerned having left their position as managers. This seems to point to the two women, Mrs.Yates and Mrs.Brooke, who managed the King's Theatre from 1774 to 1778. The four years of their management, added to a few years of the preceding management or managements, would make up a period of about ten years' collaboration between Goldoni and the King's Theatre. This can reasonably be called "several years!"

Both these women had connections with the theatre. Mrs.Yates was an acclaimed actress who had made her name on the Drury Lane stage. (1) She had disagreements with David Garrick and finally moved over to Covent Garden. But there she quarrelled with the manager George Colman and found herself without employment. It was at this juncture that she and Mrs.Brooke formed a partnership. They had been intimate friends for some years before this happened, the stage being the link between them. In 1756 Mrs.Brooke had written a tragedy called Virginia which she had offered to Garrick only to see it rejected on account of the subject having already been used by several playwrights. This was not the end of Mrs.Brooke's career as a writer of plays. In 1781 her Sinope was staged at Covent Garden - then under the management of Hull. Mrs.Yates played the leading part. In 1783 Rosina, an opera, (2) was put on at the same theatre with remarkable success; in 1788 Marian, also an opera, was produced. But it was as a novelist that Mrs.Brooke had achieved success both in the literary world and socially, long before she had begun to write for the stage. It was in Canada, where she lived between 1763 and 1768, that Mrs.Brooke wrote the "sentimental" novel that made her famous, Emily Montague. Mrs.Brooke was more than a novelist: she had started off as a pioneer in the field of women's periodicals when she produced a weekly paper called The Old Maid, in 1755. At that time she was already one of the Richardson's circle and a friend of Dr. Johnson and Boswell. Later she became a friend of Fanny Burney, the novelist and daughter of the author of the famous General History of Music. After her return to England in 1768 Mrs.Brooke became one of the

-
- (1) After a slow start in 1753 she became an acclaimed tragic actress. Her performance as Medea in Glover's tragedy was such that no other actress attempted it during her lifetime.
 - (2) The subject of this opera was taken from Favart's The Reapers; the music was by W.Shield.

Blue Stockings. She was also a successful translator. In 1760 her Letters of Lady Juliet Catsby to Lady Henrietta Campley was published by Dodsley. This was a translation from the French of Madame Riccoboni's Les Lettres de Milady Juliette Catsby (1759), a novel written in the style of Richardson. Madame Riccoboni was a very close friend of Goldoni and also an intimate friend of Garrick, to whom she wrote almost passionate letters, but she never met her translator, Mrs. Brooke.

It is possible that undiscovered evidence exists of a connection between Goldoni, Madame Riccoboni and Garrick which led to a business deal between Goldoni and the King's Theatre after Garrick's return from his trip to France and Italy in 1763; but such evidence is not in Garrick's letters, in Goldoni's Mémoires and letters and in Madame Riccoboni's letters to Garrick; nor is it in the letters and Mémoires of such theatrical people as Favart, Lekain, Mlle Clairon, Collè, Preville, Dazincourt, Molé. On the other hand Garrick is known to have been such an omnipotent king in the theatrical world, such a beneficent though shrewd patron and such a cultivator of friendships in high and low places, that it is almost with disbelief and regret that one accepts the lack of evidence on the point in question. Goldoni himself ranked Garrick amongst the greatest actors. But did he do so in earnest or did he have cause to acknowledge his gratitude publicly, even though Garrick was no longer alive at the time of Goldoni's Mémoires? (1)

It has already been intimated that the Yates and Brooke's management came to an end in 1778 when Th. Harris became proprietor of the King's Theatre. A.H. Scouten says this occurred in the summer of 1778(2). Since the opera season in 18th-century London ran from November or December to mid-July, it is likely that changes in management took place in the summer months. Another factor could have influenced the course of events, that is the war between England and France and Spain from 1778 to 1782. Communications between France and England would have been difficult or impossible; business relations of

(1) He died in 1779.

(2) E.L. Avery, A.H. Scouten et al., op.cit.

any sort in abeyance.

No women managers are recorded after 1778 and in any case after 1780 the affairs of the King's Theatre became confused, with several changes in management and some law-suits, till 1789 when the theatre was burnt to the ground. The last years of the King's Theatre are very loosely connected with Goldoni. The only link, as has been seen, is the occasional performance of a few comic operas with text by Goldoni. In his Mémoires the playwright himself talks about his collaboration with the King's Theatre as a thing of the past. (1) By 1789, when the glorious "Italian Opera House" was destroyed by fire, not only was taste changing once more and "melodrama" in the 19th-century sense taking root, but the century was drawing to its close. The French Revolution was a reality and brought with it the end of an era of which Goldoni had been part.

Goldoni's attitude to life, his Mémoires and letters afford us many examples of his concern with money in daily matters and it would be fair to assume that one of Goldoni's basic convictions was that money is a commodity like bread, a carriage, a coat; and when a man has not got it he must acquire it. Goldoni's respect for money, as is brought out by his plays, has been discussed by Felicity Firth in her essay A view from the pit (1). She remarks that "contempt for the honourable exchange of goods and money is an attitude which is ridiculed in Goldoni's theatre". In his private life he often displayed dignified concern, as his letters and Mémoires show.

Goldoni's attitude to money in his private life should be viewed in the context of his time. Making allowance for Count Carlo Gozzi's personal enmity towards Goldoni, we can take his opinions as representative of those held by a great part of the Venetian aristocracy in Goldoni's time.

In his Memorie Inutili Count Gozzi goes out of his way to show:

(1) Goldoni's Mémoires were written between 1784 and 1787

(2) G. Aquilicchia, E. B. Cristen, E. Baiphe, Collected essays on Italian Language and Literature presented to E. Speight, Manchester 1971.

There are several observations to be made on how Goldoni fitted in with the London cultural life of his time and how important his contribution was. First of all the irony of the situation should be pointed out, for Goldoni was a playwright of standing, a reformer in the true spirit of the 18th century, a professional theatre man for whom the theatre was not only a source of income but also a way of life; and yet, his success in London depended on a minor side of his professional activity and one he did not care for very much - namely writing libretti. And a bitter irony it is that the most important achievement of his life, the reform of the theatre, should have been ignored. His contribution to the English Stage, as it turned out, was linked up with traditions he had rejected and with a type of writing he himself only accepted for commercial reasons.

The commercial aspect of his work was a point of paramount importance in Goldoni's attitude to life. His Mémoires and letters afford us many examples of his concern with money in daily matters and it would be fair to assume that one of Goldoni's basic convictions was that money is a commodity like bread, a carriage, cocoa; and when a man has not got it he must acquire it. Goldoni's respect for money, as is born out by his plays, has been discussed by Felicity Firth in her essay A view from the pit (1). She remarks that "contempt for the honourable exchange of goods and money is an attitude which is ridiculed in Goldoni's theatre". In his private life he often displayed dignified concern, as his letter and Mémoires show.

Goldoni's attitude to money in his private life should be viewed in the context of his time. Making allowances for Count Carlo Gozzi's personal enmity towards Goldoni, we can take his opinions as representative of those held by a great part of the Venetian aristocracy in Goldoni's time.

In his Memorie Inutili Count Gozzi goes out of his way to show,

(1) G.Aquilecchia, S.N.Cristea, S.Ralphs, Collected essays on Italian Language and Literature presented to K.Speight, Manchester 1971

with elegant haughtiness, that Goldoni was writing out of necessity and not vocation. This seems to imply that good literature and money do not belong together; and a professional writer should write disregarding financial gain. The corollary to this seems to be that only such writers as Count Gozzi who could live on an income aristocratically unearned, are capable of producing good literature. He says of Goldoni: "Agli occhi miei apparve sempre un uomo nato coll'istinto da poter fare delle ottime commedie ma, fosse la poca coltura, il poco discernimento, la necessità in cui era d'appagare la nazione per sostenere de' poveri comici italiani da' quali era stipendiato, o la fretta con cui doveva comporre ogni anno un'infinità di opere nuove teatrali per sostenersi, non v'è nessuna delle sue opere italiane che non sia pienissima di difetti."(1)

Count Gozzi did not understand the concept of the professional writer as one whose job it is to interpret the ideas of the public of his day and make that public identify itself with fictional characters. He mistook such a writer for a commercial opportunist and looked upon those for whom writing was a hobby, as the pure upholders of literature. He, the heart and soul of the Granelleschi, identified academic with professional and individual with amateurish. (2)

Count Gozzi's position was, in all probability, sincerely held. At the time of his Memorie Inutili (1797) he already belonged to the superseded world of aristocracy. The bourgeois world of traders, bankers, shop-keepers, land-lords who had bloodily come to power in France and peacefully taken over in Venice was alien to Carlo Gozzi. He might well bow to inevitability, dedicate his book to his "conciittadini" and have "freedom and equality" printed on the first page. It was still distasteful to him that social revolution should have gone so far as to take literature out of its traditional environment to place it at the mercy of uncultured upstarts. It was bad enough that Carlo Goldoni should be commissioned to write but it was even worse that he should

(1) C. Gozzi, Memorie Inutili, Venezia 1797, ch. XXXIV

(2) His own brother Gasparo was by necessity pushed into commercial enterprises and even allied himself with the world of theatre by marrying an actress. He is one example of an aristocrat who, by his own industry, managed to save the honour of the family and his own without losing his standing in society.

write for a public of small business people and be proud of it. With venomous eloquence Count Gozzi expresses his approval of Goldoni's wisdom in confining himself "alla bassezza de' Pettegolezzi delle donne, delle Femmine Gelose, della Signora Lucrezia, della Putta onorata, della Bona Muger, de' Rusteghi, de' Toderi brontoloni, e di consimili argomenti proporzionati alla sua vena, ne' quali, in vero, egli aveva un'abilità indicibile d'innestare tutti i dialoghi in dialetto veneziano, che ricopiava con immensa fatica manuale nelle famiglie del basso popolo, nelle taverne, nelle biscacce, a' tragitti, ne' caffè, nelle casipole a pian terreno e ne' più nascosti vicoli di Venezia.." (1)

In his relentless campaign against Goldoni Count Gozzi went so far as to dedicate one of his writings - he never published it - to a well known Venetian beggar, to show he had no pecuniary aims; his only purpose was "di combattere possibilmente i cattivi scrittori e di sostenere possibilmente le buone regole e la purità letterale". (2)

Carlo Goldoni, less pompous as an author and more progressive as far as business and professional work was concerned, did not refrain from dedicating every single work he ever wrote to someone who was in a position to offer help. He cannot be blamed, in an age when patronage, a deformation of the great mecenatismo, had begun to come somewhat nearer to the modern system of "commissioned works" and, at a lower level, of "recommendation".

High ranking literati like Count Gozzi had a function as patrons in the eighteenth century. The hierarchy on which society was based was reflected in the workings of patronage. At the bottom there was a network of friendships, built up through introductions to the right people. It often started with some "abate" who was allowed into the "conversazione" of some well known lady - either a noblewoman or just a famous hostess. The obliging abate would drop a word into her ear about that friend of a friend who needed the introduction; the lady would pass the word on to a friend with connections who would see to it

(1) C.Gozzi, op. cit., ch. XXXIV

(2) Ibid.

that someone above him got the word. From the needy fellow in search of powerful friends to the "middle patrons", to the top patrons: the Duke, the Emperor, the Pope, the King: or, to give an actual example, from Parini, to Count Firmian, to Maria Theresa of Austria. Passing the hat on and upwards was inevitable; since the various aristocrats and prelates - the Gozzi's, Paradisi's Rangone's, Quirini's, Valenti's - of that hierarchic society were system-conscious and not inclined to let infiltrators upset their comfortable privileges.

Prestige and reflected glory as well as position were powerful stimuli to patronage. The "middle patrons" - the Cavaliere or the Baron who undertook to present somebody's book to some High Official - were pleased to be able to do so. However low on the hierarchic ladder, they were none the less on it and proud to be.

From such exchange of courtesies the one to gain was the protégé. The patron's name on the book meant that there would be a longer, more substantial list of associates who would buy copies of the book; it meant a University Chair, a High-ranking position in the civil service, a pension or a benefice. It was through the patronage of Count Rangone, Bartolomeo Valdrighi, the Duke Francis III that Agostino Paradisi obtained a Chair in "civic economics" and the deanery of the department of philosophy at Mantua University; with wages, honours and the title of count.

Carlo Goldoni did not shy off from the system. His position was slightly different from that, say, of an Abate Parini; a playwright's final, real patron is not an individual nor an institution such as the Academy of the *Trasformati* of the Austrian Monarchy; it is the public. A mass of individuals which is moody, fickle, changeable by its own nature. The comedians themselves, who actually paid Goldoni his wages, got their money from this public.

Goldoni's relationship with the public was marked by a prudent submissiveness on his part which was far from being passive. He knew

(1) C. Goldoni, *Il teatro veneziano*, vol. II, Roma 1911.

that his livelihood depended on the public's reaction to his plays and he knew he could not afford to lose the public's support. He might find a patron who was prepared to try out a new type of play at his theatre, like Count Grimani, but he would not so easily find comedians who were prepared to collect insults rather than money from the audience. The public had to be pleased and at the same time coaxed into enjoying what was unfamiliar and not quite to its taste. This Goldoni did at the very start of his career, with Belisario, and was still doing at the apex of his career in 1750, when he was advocating a reform of the theatre, albeit a slow one: "In tutte le cose non è da mettersi di fronte contro l'universale". (1)

Belisario (1734), with a moderate amount of gory details and heroes still noble but brought down a peg or two, was a diluted version of a traditional play; Teatro Comico (1750) was a manifesto of what a play should be.

In coaxing the public into sitting down and listening to what their prejudices might not have predisposed them to enjoy, Goldoni was intelligently applying what he had accepted as the rule of the game. The paying public had a right to choice but it was for the author to try and win the public over to his ideas. Nowadays when a book, which has been commissioned, arrives on the market, translations of it appear simultaneously in different parts of the world; different contracts for the rights of sales have already been signed. A film based on the book is often ready to be shown.

The public has no say in this. Bombarded with commercial talks and publicity stunts the gullible public no longer notices that the apparent world-wide fame of that particular book has been rigged by the business people who have put a lot of money into launching it. Translations, write-ups, fabulous sales at the other side of the Atlantic are not signs of genuine worth. But in Goldoni's day it still was more of a fair struggle. Each contender had his own ammunition and each tried to gain his end without exceeding the boundaries of mutual respect.

(1) C. Goldoni, Il teatro comico, Act II, Scene 10

Perhaps more cogent than any argument I can bring forth is Goldoni's closing remark to chapter 23, part 2 of his Mémoires. He explains how he wrote Il Festino to prove to the public that Il Vecchio Bizarro was not the final effort of a dried-up playwright, as the public had been saying. Il Festino was well received and Goldoni concludes:

"Ecoutez-moi, mes confreres, il n'y a d'autre moyen pour nous venger du Public, que de le forcer à nous applaudir." (1)

Goldoni's relationship with the English public, on the other hand, was non-existent. It was not the public who wanted him in London but rather the managers, the singers, the theatre people who were struggling to make their performances attractive enough to draw that public to the theatre. If the public happened to know that Goldoni was the librettist of some favourite operas, they had got the information privately through friends in literary circles and who were interested in Italian culture. Goldoni's name was not advertised. It neither appeared in the papers that carried notices about theatrical events - the Public Advertiser was one such paper - nor, as far as can be ascertained, in the playbills which were displayed at the King's Theatre and in public places. Translations of the libretti of most of the Italian operas performed were published with the original text but the name of the librettist was seldom mentioned.

Goldoni's concern was not with publicity. As has been seen, by the time the invitation to collaborate with the King's Theatre had been made and accepted his financial problems and his whole future had become a worry to him. Most of his French connections had gone. Some of these connections had come about following Goldoni's trip to Parma on the invitation of Don Felipe de Espana, later Duke of Parma. As well as patronizing a company of French actors Don Felipe was interested in Italian opera buffa.

The trip to Parma was a financial success. Goldoni returned with

(1) C. Goldoni, Mémoires, op.cit., Municipio di Venezia, 1948

papers to prove his status as court poet and a pension. Moreover, the patronage of the court of Parma was to prove a godsend in 1765 when Goldoni's potentially most powerful patron in France, Louis the Dauphin, died.

This is how the complex patronage system benefited Goldoni in financially distressing circumstances.

Among the friends he had made at the court of Parma was Françoise de Chalus Duchess of Narbonne-Lara. She was then in the service of the Duchess Louise Elisabeth, Louis XV's eldest daughter. In 1759 the Duchess died and Françoise de Narbonne went to Paris in the service of the Duchess's younger sister, Adélaïde. Some ten years after he had first met her, Goldoni saw her again in Paris, following an introduction to the Dauphine through Mlle de Silvestre who was reader to the French Dauphine. This was Maria Josepha of Saxony. Mlle Silvestre had followed her to Paris from Dresden when her mistress had married Louis the Dauphin. Both the Dauphine and her reader knew the Italian language and literature well and they both knew about Goldoni: his fame had been spread by the comedian Darbes. (1)

Court etiquette did not allow the Dauphine to take Mlle Silvestre's recommendation directly to Madame Adélaïde but she could pass it on to Madame's lady-in-waiting, Françoise de Narbonne. This she did and this is how Goldoni came to be employed by the Royal Princess and her two younger sisters. So pleased was he with the engagement as tutor of Italian that he left the Comédie Italienne without enquiring about his salary at Court. He put his trust in his friends, among them the Venetian Ambassador Gradenigo and the Duke of Choiseul, the minister for Foreign Affairs. And badly did he need friends, for luck was not on his side. The death of the Duke of Parma in July 1765 started a series of deaths which only ended with that of the Queen of France in June 1768.

When mourning was over, the princesses presented Goldoni with a gold casket and some money. They also obtained for him the title of Tutor in Italian to the Royal Children with a pension to go with it. It was, by then, 1769.

(1) This was the famous Pantalone who left the Medebach company in 1749 to accept the King's of Poland invitation. For him Goldoni had written Tonin bela grazia and to him Goldoni was indebted for his partnership with Medebach.

Luckily for Goldoni the Court of Parma had not withdrawn its patronage on Philip V's death. Count Argental - who was also a friend of Voltaire - had seen to it that Goldoni's pension would continue and had made arrangements for the money to be paid in Paris. He had the power to do this since he was Parma's plenipotentiary in Paris. He was also a lover of the theatre and his feelings for Goldoni were genuine.

As it was, Goldoni was alive but out of work and with little chance of being once more the successful playwright he had been. He did his utmost. He wrote more plays for Venice suiting the style to the fashion since he knew that fables had regained favour with the Venetian public. On this point he continues in his Mémoires:

J'étois fâché de ne pouvoir pas contenter mes compatriotes qui m'aimoient toujours, et qui ne cessoient pas de jouer mes Pièces anciennes, et de m'en demander de nouvelles. Je savois que depuis mon départ les troupes de Venise avoient souffert des changemens qui avoient altéré ce zèle, cette méthode qu'on avoit suivi sous mes yeux, et que le succès d'un Pièce de caractère ou à sentiment n'étoit plus aussi sûr qu'il étoit de mon tems; j'imaginai d'envoyer une Pièce dans un genre qui n'étoit pas tout-à-fait le mien, et je réussis on ne peut davantage." (1)

The play was Il buono e il cattivo genio. (1767)

The collaboration with the King's Theatre belongs to this period. Goldoni accepted it because that would give him that precious commodity, money, he so badly needed. Influencing the public and coaxing it into accepting new, reformist ideas was a thing of the past. The managers of the King's Theatre were his employers now and his patrons and they knew what sort of entertainment their public wanted. Ideals had to succumb to the crude realities of show-business and Goldoni, who had already learnt to accept this, willingly submitted to the wishes of his patrons. In doing so, he did, however, unwittingly make a contribution to the English Stage. Italian Opera, and later Italian Comic Opera, had a definite place in the world of 18th-century entertainment in London. A large part of it would not have ever existed had it not been for two

(1) C. Goldoni, Mémoires, part 3, ch. XI, op.cit., Comune di Venezia, 1948

facts: that Goldoni's libretti belonged to the tradition of Commedia dell'Arte as regards both the plot and the handling of it; and that his libretti were in themselves artistically good enough to inspire talented composers. In fact, without the support of Goldoni's characterization and handling of comic situations the operas themselves may never have been acceptable to the London public. The craze for Comic Opera may have come about because of the craze of the London public for a certain type of music; but that type of music also went with a type of libretto which was in the tradition of the 18th-century pantomime which London audiences loved so much. And this, as we have seen, had its roots in the Commedia dell'Arte.

The link with Commedia dell'Arte was kept even in such a "sentimental" libretto as La Buona Figliuola, one of the most successful Comic operas in London. It is an excellent example of how Goldoni's ability to reconcile the old with the new found responsive appreciation in the London audiences. The "sentimentality" that was to lead to "melodrama" in the modern everyday sense, was the new trend in taste in London. Melodrama, in the words of J.J.Rousseau who seems to have invented it when he wrote his Pygmalion, was "un genre de drame, dans lequel les paroles et la musique, au lieu de ~~m~~marcher ensemble, se font entendre successivement, et où la phrase parlée est en quelque sorte annoncée et préparée par la phrase musicale". (1) Later in the 18th century the dialogue was spoken over the music but the term melodrame was kept to distinguish this genre from Opera proper, although it was often used as a synonym for Opera in everyday language. This is still true in Italian where melodramma means opera lirica, whereas the Oxford Companion to Music defines melodrama as "a play or a passage in a play, or a poem, in which the spoken voice is used against a musical background." It is interesting that in France in the 18th century a genre called pantomime dialoguée should have originated from melodrame.

Gradually the music disappeared and melodrama became "a form of

(1) J.J.Rousseau, Observations sur l'Alceste de M.Gluck, 1774, in Oeuvres completes, Paris 1836-37, III, p. 563

dramatic composition in prose partaking of the nature of tragedy, comedy, pantomime, and spectacle, and intended for a popular audience. Primarily concerned with situation and plot, it calls upon mimed action extensively and employs a more or less fixed complement of stock characters, the most important of which are a suffering heroine or hero, a persecuting villain, and a benevolent comic. It is conventionally moral and humanitarian in point of view and sentimental and optimistic in temper, concluding its fable happily with virtue rewarded after many trials and vice punished. Characteristically it offers elaborate scenic accessories and miscellaneous divertissements and introduces music freely, typically to underscore dramatic effect". (1)

J.L.Smith, in his book Melodrama explains what, in his opinion, is the difference between melodrama and tragedy. Tragedy is basically an inward conflict which leads to personal awareness; melodrama is a fight against external pressures such as "an evil man, a social group, a hostile ideology, a natural force, an accident or chance, an obdurate fate or a malign deity. It is this total dependence upon external adversaries which finally separates melodrama from all other serious dramatic forms" (2)

Simple, uncomplicated situations call for uncomplicated solutions and these in turn generate uncomplicated emotions; the result of conflict is the point of interest in melodrama, not its development, as it is in tragedy. The audience tend to identify with persecuted, innocent lovers and their final happy fate will please them. In tragedy, on the other hand, the spectator has to come to terms with the inadequacies of the characters before he can identify with them. Equally, in melodrama excuses for the villain's wickedness are usually found on account of what J.L.Smith calls "sentimental faith in the innate perfectibility" of man. This seems to bring us back, full circle, to la Comédie Larmoyante, Richardson and Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola. As well as maintaining a link with the past Goldoni created a link with the future.

(1) F.Rahill, The World of Melodrama, Pennsylvania, 1967

(2) J.L.Smith, Melodrama, London 1973, ch. 1, p. 7-8

When his collaboration with the King's Theatre was over Goldoni played his last card and wrote his Mémoires dedicating them to the King of France whom he regarded as a most powerful patron.

In this he miscalculated. Perhaps he did not altogether understand that revolution was imminent. Perhaps he did but could not bring himself to believe it would happen. In the dedication Goldoni wrote to Louis XVI we read:

"Je demande à la Providence qu'il lui plaise m'accorder encore quelques jours d'existence pour voir prospérer les projets d'ordre et de bienfaisance, dont Votre Majesté s'est si utilement et si vigoureusement occupée.

C'est au milieu de Notable de son Royaume, c'est sous les yeux de l'Univers entier que Votre Majesté a déployé ses vues, et manifesté ses intentions pour le bien de ses Etats et pour le soulagement de son Peuple.

Le Patriotisme des François dans cette occasion ne s'est pas démenti; leurs avis, leurs conseils, leurs vœux, n'ont fait que seconder le zèle paternel de Votre Majesté.

Que de Reglements salutaires pour le présent! Que de perspectives heureuses pour l'avenir! Le coeur de Votre Majesté ne respire que pour rendre heureux ses fideles Sujets, et pour assurer la gloire de son siecle et de sa Couronne." (1)

Poverty alone did not inspire these words.

Had he been younger, Goldoni might have had the stamina, and would have had the time, to work out a suitable and honourable compromise with the system. For it was in his personality to act tactfully and thus do what was best for himself - as has been seen - without upsetting anybody. But in 1787 Goldoni had no choice. He was too old for the times. In 1787 Goldoni had lived his life; and it had been a life of uninterrupted dependance on and loyalty to an aristocratic, hierarchic system; a system Goldoni had accepted and used for his ends with fairness and intelligence. After this it would have been impossible for him to side with the revolutionaries. His fate was involved with that of the former system.

By the time repentant Officials of the Revolution had decided to continue to pay the pension the King had awarded him, Goldoni had drawn his last breath.

(1) C. Goldoni, Mémoires, op.cit., Comune di Venezia, 1948

It was not long before the music of Gioacchino Rossini (1792-1868), which was to transform Italian Opera, was heard at the King's Theatre.

(2) But that was the music of the time "after the Revolution".
 was an indicator of decline. Perhaps all the true reasons for his moving to France have not yet been established. It is clear, however, that just as he had left employment with Metzbach in 1753 in order to accept the patronage of the patrician Vendramin, so now he abandoned Venice - in response to invitation - in order to obtain far more powerful patronage, that of the most splendid monarchy in Europe.

Our research for this thesis shows that the professional openings which Baldoni proceeded to exploit on arrival to Paris and with the help of a whole network of theatre contacts and patrons, included the King's Theatre in London. Furthermore, it reveals, what has until now been quite unrecognised or ignored, that Baldoni continued actively writing and re-writing libretti for London for a number of years.

The success that came to him in England was basically due to the fact that his superb and unique skills found a new outlet in the particular conditions of the English stage and in special developments in public taste in London. Perhaps the most important factor was the presence of Italian Opera which had been established in London by the creation of the Royal Academy of Music in 1719 and by the use of the King's Theatre for the purpose of performing Italian operas - hence its popular name "The Italian Opera House". This enterprise followed in a long tradition of musical and theatrical entertainments in which Italian performers and the Italian Theatre had often been the main features. These performers were singers but musicians but above all Commedia dell'Arte players. Commedia dell'Arte influences on 16th and 17th-century English Theatre can of course be traced in Shakespeare as well as in less known writers such as Aphra Behn. London and the

(2) The first of Rossini's operas to be performed at the King's Theatre was Il Barbiere di Siviglia (10th March 1818) an favoured Italian "serious" Opera. As a type of entertainment this was considered most suitable for providing relaxation while stimulating the intellect and the emotions of the audience. These audiences were the product of the age. They learnt that there was a useful measure of respecta-

It has been and is still generally assumed that Goldoni left Venice for Paris in 1761 because he felt that his popular support was in danger of decline. Perhaps all the true reasons for his moving to France have not yet been established. It is clear, however, that just as he had left employment with Medebach in 1753 in order to accept the patronage of the patrician Vendramin, so now he abandoned Venice - in response to invitation - in order to obtain far more powerful patronage, that of the most splendid monarchy in Europe.

Our research for this thesis shows that the professional openings which Goldoni proceeded to exploit on arrival to Paris and with the help of a whole network of theatre contacts and patrons, included the King's Theatre in London. Furthermore, it reveals, what has until now been quite unrecognised or ignored, that Goldoni continued actively writing and re-writing libretti for London for a number of years.

The success that came to him in England was basically due to the fact that his superb and unique skills found a new outlet in the particular conditions of the English stage and in special developments in public taste in London. Perhaps the most important factor was the presence of Italian Opera which had been established in London by the creation of the Royal Academy of Music in 1719 and by the use of the King's Theatre for the purpose of performing Italian operas - hence its popular name "The Italian Opera House". This enterprise followed in a long tradition of musical and theatrical entertainments in which Italian performers and the Italian Theatre had often been the main features. These performers were singers and musicians but above all Commedia dell'Arte players. Commedia dell'Arte influences on 16th and 17th-century English Theatre can of course be traced in Shakespeare as well as in less known writers such as Aphra Ben. Towards the end of the 17th century, however, the popularity of Commedia dell'Arte had waned on account of social and historical conditions which favoured Italian "serious" Opera. As a type of entertainment this was considered most suitable for providing relaxation while stimulating the intellect and the emotions of the audiences. These audiences were the product of the age. They learnt that there was a useful measure of respecta-

bility in acquired wealth, although not the high-minded, uncontaminated respectability which was attached to inherited wealth. They were also fortunate in having money at their disposal to spend for pleasure and just at a time when the English Theatre was struggling to recover from the long-lasting effects of the closure during the Commonwealth. In the following century the Commedia dell'Arte from France slowly won its way back to prestige and support in England, through the medium of pantomime. Peculiar to 18th-century pantomime was the use of darkness as a device for forwarding and complicating the plot, just as farce - another 18th-century form of entertainment - used disguise, concealment, transformation and excessive physical activity, to achieve comic effects. All these devices were in fact borrowed from Commedia dell'Arte. Pantomime became the rage in London and almost the only form of entertainment worth supporting - at least in the opinion of a large section of London audiences - till burlesque was introduced on the London Stage in 1728 with the musical play The Beggar's Opera, which stole some of the audience from pantomime. None the less the adventures of Harlequin and Columbine continued to draw spectators till the end of the century.

The importance of pantomime and its Commedia dell'Arte elements cannot be stressed enough when considering the next step in the development of English taste in music for the stage. This resulted in the introduction of Italian Comic Opera and the consequent employment of specialised Italian librettists at the King's Theatre.

Around 1750 the nobility tired of supporting "serious" Italian Opera, while at the same time theatres had to overcome grave financial difficulties in order to provide the public with the kind of spectacle and standard of singing it demanded. Comic Opera was already flourishing in Italy as a full-scale operatic genre born from the Neapolitan cantata a llengua and the Venetian intermezzo. It was also flourishing elsewhere in Europe supported by travelling companies and enthusiastic patrons who had a liking for this product of Italian culture. Comic Opera, from the point of view of the managers of the King's Theatre, had two advantages: it was cheaper to produce - less machinery and simpler costumes were required - and it suited the audience's taste for

pantomime and comedy. Daniel Nalbach, in his book The King's Theatre 1704-1867 (1) says that Comic Opera was cheap but the prices were for laughs. If he only refers, as he might seem to do, to the bad quality of the production, he is over-simplifying a situation which was not really so straightforward. He has failed to see that the laughs were at least partly genuine and caused by delight at seeing a pantomime-plus-Commedia dell'Arte situation set to music. This is certainly true of Goldoni's libretti, in which features of the Commedia dell'Arte tradition are numerous, albeit disguised under cover of contemporary characters as in Il Negligente (King's Theatre's Company at the Little Haymarket Theatre, 1749) and La Buona Figliuola (King's Theatre, 1763).

According to theatrical records Il Negligente was the first of Goldoni's libretti to be used in London. This was the beginning of a collaboration which was to continue for about forty years. At first, Goldoni's libretti were chosen because the singers, quite naturally, liked to keep to operas they knew and they had already sung successfully elsewhere, often in Venice itself. In the case of Il Negligente the composer of the music, Vincenzo Ciampi, was also Maestro at the King's Theatre and in charge of a Venetian company when that Comic Opera was performed at the Little Haymarket in 1749. The manager of the King's Theatre, John Francis Croza, was also an Italian. Regrettably he went down in history as being the first of a number of Italian managers who absconded with the takings and brought financial ruin to the King's Theatre and its employees.

Whether Goldoni suffered financially on account of such managerial misappropriation of funds is not known. What our research shows is that people in the theatre business in London felt, at some point, that Goldoni's direct collaboration with their Italian Opera House would be to their advantage.

The phrase "people in the theatre business" is used here in a broad sense to include a number of influential English actor-managers who had an interest in the King's Theatre. David Garrick, for instance, owned shares in the Opera House; Mrs. Yates, one of the most famous tragic actresses of the English Stage and a member of Garrick's company, was

(1) D.Nalbach, The King's Theatre 1704-1867, London 1972

manageress of the King's Theatre from 1774 to 1778. Her husband Richard, also an acclaimed Shakespearian actor, owned that theatre for a time. Mrs. Yates' co-manager was Mrs. F. Brooke, a distinguished dramatist and novelist, a prominent "Blue Stocking", a member of Richardson's circle, a friend of Dr. Johnson, Boswell, Fanny Burney and Garrick. She translated into English the works of Madame Riccoboni, who was a neighbour and a close friend of Goldoni in Paris and an intimate friend of Garrick.

Whether the result of general pressure from international theatrical circles or direct action taken by one individual, an invitation to come to London was sent to Goldoni sometime before March 1765. This date can be deduced from letter written by Ch. S. Favart - another distinguished writer and actor manager of the French Stage and intimate friend of Goldoni - to Count Durazzo. Goldoni declined to leave France because of his avowed loyalty and affection for the French Royal Family - or so he says in his Mémoires. A hint of other factors which influenced him is given when he adds that it was not, after all, the King of England who was inviting him, but only the Italian Opera House. At the same time Favart's letters to Count Durazzo confirm that a renewed sign of favour from the French Court, namely appointment to the position of Teacher of Italian to the Royal Children, helped Goldoni to make up his mind not to leave.

It is true, then, that Goldoni valued the patronage of the French Court enough to turn down invitations from England as well as others from Portugal, although his own letters from 1763 to 1765 show a deep dissatisfaction with his situation as a dramatist in France where he was treated like a low paid writer of scenarios. An intense desire to go back to Italy is also evident. At this juncture Goldoni was a bitterly disappointed man with very little hope for the future. This must have encouraged him to accept the opportunity to write for the King's Theatre and he was pleased to make arrangements to send work to London from Paris.

This collaboration continued for several years, through the successive managements of experienced actor-managers such as the singers Regina Mingotti, and Colomba Mattei with her husband Trombetta, in addition to Mrs. Yates who has already been mentioned. Our research

shows that this association came to an end when the ladies in charge, whom we have been able to identify as Mrs. Yates and Mrs. Brooke, relinquished management of the Opera House sometime in 1778. In the same year a war broke out between England, France and Spain making business transactions between these countries impossible.

One further point must be made. Goldoni's association with the King's Theatre is also important from a historical point of view. As a business enterprise this theatre was constantly near collapse. Goldoni's contribution of the right material at the right time in history helped to keep the King's Theatre open, until it was destroyed by fire - and with it some of the Account Books and official records of Carlo Goldoni's association with London. Goldoni thus helped to save from closure one of London's - indeed we should perhaps say England's - most glorious public theatres and make it the centre of a revival of the Commedia dell'Arte tradition which, as we shall further elaborate below, was to lead on to new developments on the English Stage.

In conclusion regarding this point it should be noted that Goldoni's name, though held in esteem by connoisseurs, was not known to a wide circle of people in England. Some of his plays were published either singly or in collections for a selected public who had a specific interest in the Italian Theatre. For instance, in 1756 J. Nourse, a London publisher, brought out an edition of two of Goldoni's plays under the title Pamela, by Charles Goldoni (with The Father of a Family). The same publisher was responsible for a collection of selected plays which appeared in London in 1777 and which was followed by another in 1785.

The libretti of the operas which were performed in London, on the other hand, were published for the benefit of the vast audiences who crowded the theatre. An English translation was invariably printed alongside the Italian text. A curious fact is that in the course of this research no 18th century libretto was found which bore the name of Goldoni as the writer. The 18th-century newspapers which were scanned for advertisements were equally uninformative on this point. This confirms the suggestion made above that the majority of the theatre-going public were more interested in the entertainment itself than in the writer who had provided it and that in view of this the invitation

which was made to Goldoni to move to London must have come from someone in the theatre business. Only such people would know where to get the material needed to meet the audience's demands.

Imitations and adaptations in English of Goldoni's libretti were numerous. The most famous were The Capricious Lovers (written by R.Lloyd, set to music by W.Rush) which was based on Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno (London, Drury Lane 1764); The Wedding Ring (text and music by Charles Dibdin) which was based on Il Filosofo di Campagna (London, Drury Lane 1773); The Maid of the Vale (translated by T.Holcroft, set to music by M.Arne) which was based on La Buona Figliuola (Dublin 1775).

Two of the libretti by Goldoni which were used at the King's Theatre have been closely analysed in this thesis and we have shown that Commedia dell'Arte traits are abundant. It was precisely as a playwright with an unrivalled understanding of Commedia dell'Arte traditions that Goldoni was asked to take active part in the cultural life of London. Certainly he was not asked as the reformer of the theatre, which Venice had acclaimed. Indeed Goldoni's association with the King's Theatre was the natural outcome of a sequence of cultural developments which tended to perpetuate the Commedia dell'Arte traditions. He would have had cause to be proud of such an association if he had been in a position to look at events in a historical perspective. As things were he could only be grateful for an association which had financial advantages in times of hardship and which added to his international fame. More than two centuries later we are able to assess his contribution to the London Stage rather differently: we can but correct the assumption which is made generally that Goldoni wanted to eliminate Commedia dell'Arte influences totally. We must see him as ^{fostering} ~~the continuator of~~ such influences ^{and securing} ~~who secured~~ their triumph in an international context.

This is even clearer when we consider La Buona Figliuola (London 1763), a comic opera which was performed all over the world and even at such a remote Court as that of the Emperor of China. Goldoni took the material for this libretto from his own play Pamela (1750). This had been written with the success of Richardson's novel Pamela in mind. The result was that a kind of sentimentality unknown before in

Goldoni's plays was borrowed from Richardson under the influence of the proto-Romantic movement. At that time the English sentimental novel was enjoying astounding success in France where the Comédie Larmoyante of the 1730s had already prepared the public for the new morality that was to ensue from the writings of Marivaux and, later, Diderot and Sedaine.

Goldoni renamed his libretto La Buona Figliuola, a title full of sentimental promise, but was careful to keep some traditional Commedia dell'Arte characters. The most important are Tagliaferro, the soldier, and Sandrina/Paoluccia, the zagne. They provide the comic relief, the complications and the ensuing solutions which are indispensable to a Commedia dell'Arte situation.

The mixture of sentimentality and comedy, traditional and new, that Goldoni had interwoven in his libretto appealed to the composer Piccinni. Comic Opera had slowly changed over the past few years and had become a study of characters, but nobody before Piccinni - such is the opinion widely held by music critics - had achieved such a delicate balance between comic and serious styles, old and new techniques, in Comic Opera scores. This was a turning point in the history of music which could not have been achieved without Goldoni's skillful writing. At the end of the century and after Goldoni's death La Buona Figliuola was still being performed. We have recorded in this thesis one hundred London performances in Goldoni's lifetime over a span of just under thirty years.

The importance of sentimentality in the history of libretti writing goes further: it led to "melodrama" in the 19th-century sense. In the 18th century the word melodrame was first used by J.J. Rousseau to indicate a particular kind of musical drama; then it was used to distinguish other musical forms from Opera but also as a synonym of Opera. Finally it came to indicate a play with unsophisticated characters of conventional morality. But the most interesting development from Rousseau's melodrame was pantomime dialoguée. It was a play for stock characters who mimed their way through a tragi-comic plot till, in the end, the good were rewarded and the bad were punished. The presentation was visually spectacular and the music was used to heighten the dramatic

effects. It is difficult to fail to see the connection between Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola, as set to music by Piccinni, and the developments in "melodrama" which took place later. This shows another contribution Goldoni made to the London Stage, namely to return to it what he had borrowed from the 18th-century English novel, in a form which was strikingly new and in a field which was entirely different. Thus while he was keeping alive the traditions of the Commedia dell'Arte Goldoni was also opening the way to the modern forms of melodrama. century and set a pattern, for size and design, for all other theatres in 18th-century England. Although it had not been built for opera it opened on 19th April 1705 with an opera (1) The Loves of Ergasto, merely because this type of entertainment was then fashionable. Thomas Betterton moved in with his company from Lincoln's Inn Fields for the season 1705-06 and Congreve took over the management. Operas were given occasionally with Italian vocalists; but in 1708 Drury Lane began to present plays only, thus leaving it entirely to the Queen's Theatre to provide London audiences with opera, twice a week. After some structural changes the production of drama was abandoned, on account of the acoustics not being suited to drama. Operas, too, stopped being produced between 1716 and 1719. Production of opera was resumed with the founding of the Royal Academy of Music in that year (1719). The Queen's Theatre was, by then, called the King's Theatre. Throughout its history this theatre had to struggle to keep its place among the most important London theatres. This was due to financial difficulties connected with the production of operas and not to any diminishing cultural value in its offerings. After 1700 the affairs of the King's Theatre became confused, with changes in management and law-suits. The licence to run the theatre was granted to William Taylor, first, then to Thomas Harris, then to Andrea Gallini, then to Taylor again and six trustees while he was in jail. Lastly, the dancer Gallini was granted a licence for a few months in the Summer of 1765. After the King's

(1) This theatre was called the Queen's Theatre when it opened. Following the death of Queen Ann in 1714 and the accession to the throne of George I, the Queen's Theatre became known as the King's Theatre.

Main London Theatres operating in the 18th century: The King's Theatre and the Treatres Royal Covent Garden, Drury Lane, Lincoln's Inn Fields and The Little Haymarket.

The King's (originally Queen's) Theatre (1705-1867)

This theatre was the creation of the architect and dramatist John Vanbrugh. It was the first theatre to be built in London in the 18th century and set a pattern, for size and design, for all other theatres in 18th-century England. Although it had not been built for opera it opened on 19th April 1705 with an opera (1) The Loves of Ergasto, merely because this type of entertainment was then fashionable. Thomas Betterton moved in with his company from Lincoln's Inn Fields for the season 1705-06 and Congreve took over the management. Operas were given occasionally with Italian vocalists; but in 1708 Drury Lane began to present plays only, thus leaving it entirely to the Queen's Theatre to provide London audiences with opera, twice a week. After some structural changes the production of drama was abandoned, on account of the acoustics not being suited to drama. Operas, too, stopped being produced between 1716 and 1719. Production of opera was resumed with the founding of the Royal Academy of Music in that year (1719). The Queen's Theatre was, by then, called the King's Theatre. Throughout its history this theatre had to struggle to keep its place among the most important London theatres. This was due to financial difficulties connected with the production of operas and not to any diminishing cultural value in its offerings. After 1780 the affairs of the King's Theatre became confused, with changes in management and law-suits. The licence to run the theatre was granted to William Taylor first, then to Thomas Harris, then to Andrea Gallini, then to Taylor again and six trustees while he was in jail. Lastly, the dancer Gallini was granted a licence for a few months in the Summer of 1785. After the King's

(1) This theatre was called the Queen's Theatre when it opened. Following the death of Queen Ann in 1714 and the accession to the throne of George I, the Queen's Theatre became known as the King's Theatre.

was burnt to the ground in 1789 Taylor, Gallini and O'Reilly formed an alliance and then double crossed one another, in an attempt to get permission to build a new theatre in Leicester Fields. After a public hearing in 1790 O'Reilly was licenced to perform operas at the Pantheon Theatre, which had originally been built for masquerades and balls in 1772. It opened on 9th February 1791. William Taylor, on the other hand, was given permission to build a new theatre but was denied a licence for operas. His theatre opened on 21st February 1791 with "Music and Dancing". In 1792 the Pantheon burnt down and Taylor was allowed a licence for operas which was to be in the name of three trustees: the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Bedford and the Marquis of Salisbury. Taylor acted as manager on and off till 1812.

Covent Garden (1732-1808)

This theatre was built for John Rich by the architect Edward Shepherd on land leased from the Duke of Bedford. Their Graces of Bedford, Norfolk, Richmond and Chandos were among the share-holders who provided the capital. Covent Garden opened on 7th December 1732 with W.Congreve's The Way of the World. This theatre had a capacity of about 1,400 people when it was built but in 1782 it was enlarged to contain about 2,180 spectators. Like its rival, the Drury Lane Theatre, it had a Green Room for actors to rest in, to meet admirers and to receive guests. And like the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre - from which J.Rich had moved - it had a pit, a "King's front box", side boxes, balconies, boxes over the stage boxes, first and second galleries. The scenery was painted by Lambert and Harvey and the ceiling decorated by Amiconi. A fire destroyed this theatre in 1808.

Drury Lane (1674-1791)

A Drury Lane Theatre operated in Bridges Street, Drury Lane, from 1663 to 1672 when it was destroyed by fire. A second Drury Lane Theatre was built by Sir Christopher Wren to house the company of

Thomas Killigrew - the King's Company - which had temporarily moved to Lincoln's Inn Fields. The new Drury Lane opened in 1674 with the play The Beggar's Bush and a prologue by John Dryden. The King's Company occupied it till 1682 and the United Company took over in 1695 under the management of Betterton. He was succeeded by Christopher Rich and a period of prosperity followed in spite of strife and rivalry created by the opening of the Queen's Theatre in 1705. Three actors took over management in 1709: Colley Cibber, Robert Wilks and Thomas Doggett. They were followed by Charles Fleetwood and then by David Garrick in 1747. The Drury Lane's most glorious period is known as Garrick's period because of Garrick's management, his talent as an actor and the high standard of acting achieved by his company as a whole. Throughout his management (1747-1776) Garrick strove to improve his theatre. It is said that after the introduction in 1767 of a new system of illumination Garrick had seen in Paris, the Drury Lane was the best lit theatre of its day. Garrick was helped in his efforts by his co-manager J. Lacy and his acting manager George Colman. Garrick and Lacy were the lease-holders but the actual land and buildings belonged to the Duke of Bedford. As well as the theatre proper there were annexes, such as "The Sparrow Nest" which was used to store clothes and costumes, the Theatre Hall and other buildings. They were sublet to tradesmen just as Covent Garden's cellars were sublet to wine-merchants. Drury Lane was redecorated by the Adam brothers in 1775, demolished in 1791 and then rebuilt by Henry Holland, the architect of the Brighton Pavilion. In 1809 it was burnt down by a fire and by 1815 it had become something of a fair-ground booth.

Lincoln's Inn Fields (1661-1732)

This was originally a tennis court, called Lisle's Tennis Court. It was changed into a theatre by Davenant and it opened with The Siege of Rhodes in June 1661. The Duke's Company continued to act

there till 1671 when it moved to Dorset Gardens. The King's Company took over the premises temporarily till 1674 when the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane, Bridges Street, burnt down in 1672. In 1674 the buildings in Lincoln's Inn Fields reverted to being a tennis court till Thomas Betterton leased them and used them as a playhouse from 1695 to 1705. The place remained unused till John Rich received a licence and opened a completely rebuilt playhouse on 18th December 1714. The opening play was The Recruiting Officer by G. Farquhar. John Rich's practice of offering new and old English dramas was rewarded but it was with pantomimes and The Beggar's Opera that he reached unprecedented financial success. He left Lincoln's Inn Fields for Covent Garden in 1732, but had the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre in mind when he planned the structure of Covent Garden. The Little Haymarket (1720-1820) Signora Regina Kingotti (1750-55). He only began to produce operas in 1753.

The Little Haymarket (1720-1820) Signora Regina Kingotti was the principal singer and had This theatre was often advertised as the "New Theatre over-against the Opera House in the Hay-Market". For about forty years from the time when it was built it was used by professional French and Italian comedians and by English amateur companies for short periods at a time and nearly always without a licence. In 1766 a patent was granted to the English actor-manager Samuel Foote and the Little Haymarket became one of London's Theatres Royal.

- J.C. Bach.
 - 1763-64 Signora Mattel left England for a time, having relinquished her position as manager in 1763 and taken up that of principal singer. Management was in the hands of Signora Kingotti and Giardini. Matthias Vento was resident composer.
 - 1764-65 Crawford, former treasurer, Vincent and Gordon, musicians, became managers.
 - 1766-69 The banker Drummond, Vincent and Gordon were proprietors and managers.
-

List of Opera managers at the King's Theatre (1750-1789)

- 1750-51 Miss Elizabeth Pappett obtained a licence but never made use of it although she had hoped to follow in the footsteps of her father, J.J.Heidegger
- 1751-55 Francesco Vanneschi managed with the assistance of the musician Domenico Paradies and of the treasurer Crawford. Vanneschi had previously been assistant manager and librettist under Lord Middlesex in the 1740s, that is before Francis Croza's management and Vincenzo Ciampi's production of "burlettas" at the King's Theatre and The Little Haymarket (1748-50). Vanneschi took over Miss Pappett's licence in 1751 although it had originally been given to her for five years (1750-55). He only began to produce operas in 1753.
- 1755-56 Signora Mingotti and Giardini took on joint management. Signora Regina Mingotti was the principal singer and had previously been in Vanneschi's company. In fact, according to some sources, Vanneschi was still the licensee in 1758. Giardini was a musician and the director of the orchestra.
- 1756-57 Signora Colomba Mattei managed with her husband Trombetta.
- 1757-63 Signora Mattei was sole manager. She favoured a mixed company of comic and serious singers. Her resident composer for the period 1757-61 was G.Cocchi and for the season 1762-63 J.C.Bach.
- 1763-64 Signora Mattei left England for a time, having relinquished her position as manager in 1763 and taken up that of principal singer. Management was in the hands of Signora Mingotti and Giardini. Matthias Vento was resident composer.
- 1764-66 Crawford, former treasurer, Vincent and Gordon, musicians, became managers.
- 1766-69 The banker Drummond, Vincent and Gordon were proprietors and managers.
-

- 1769-73 George Hobart was patentee and manager and Crawford seems to have been acting manager and treasurer.
- 1773-78 Mrs. Yates and Mrs. Brooke were joint managers. Mrs. Yates seems to have been Head Manager, since she occupied the Head Manager's apartment. This information comes from Fanny Burney who once visited Mrs. Brooke at the King's Theatre.
- 1778-79 Th. Harris and R.B. Sheridan were the proprietors, Mr. Le Texier was acting manager.
- 1779-80 R.B. Sheridan was sole proprietor and Mr. Le Texier was still acting manager.

After 1780 business was in the hands of Taylor first, then Harris, then Gallini, then Taylor and six trustees while Taylor was in jail. Simon Slingsby, James Sutton and Michael Novosielski were temporary licensees. Lastly the dancer Gallini got a licence in the Summer of 1785 but had to shut down in August. Finally in 1789 the King's Theatre was burnt to the ground. Taylor was licenced to rebuild it in 1790 and to produce operas in 1792 under the supervision of three trustees: the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Bedford and the Marquis of Salisbury.

The Accomplish'd Maid, a Comic Opera. Text by R. Sims, music by R. Pignani. London, Covent Garden, 1756. A translation of Goldoni's la Finta Pigianda.

The Maid of the Vale, a Comic Opera. Text by T. Holcroft, music by H. Arne. A translation of Goldoni's la Duchessa Padovana. Dublin, Sweet Alley, 1775.

The Hotel of the Poodle Palace, a Farce by Th. Vaughan, London, Drury Lane 1779. Based on Goldoni's Il Serwizore di due Padroni.

The Sinner, a comedy by Elizabeth Griffith, with an epilogue by George Wulpole, London, Drury Lane 1779. Based on Goldoni's Le Scaramelle.

Appendix three

Some 18th-century English adaptations, imitations and translations of Goldoni's libretti and plays which were performed in London and Dublin.

The Capricious Lovers, a Comic Opera. Text by R.Lloyd, music by W.Rush. London, Drury Lane, 1764. Based on Goldoni's Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno.

Phyllis at Court. Text (?), music by Giordani. Dublin, Smock Alley, 1767. Based on an unidentified adaptation of Goldoni's Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno.

The Family in an Uproar. Text (?), music by G.Cocchi. London, King's Theatre, 1762. Based on Goldoni's Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno.

Phoebe at Court, a Comic Opera. Text and music by Dr.T.A.Arne. London, Haymarket, 1776. Based on an adaptation of Goldoni's Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno.

The Wedding Ring, a Comic Opera. Text and music by Ch.Dibdin. London, Drury Lane 1773. Based on Goldoni's Il Filosofo di Campagna.

The Guardian Tricked. Text (?), music (?). Dublin, Smock Alley, 1762. Based on Goldoni's Il Filosofo di Campagna.

The Accomplished Maid, a Comic Opera. Text by E.Toms, music by N.Piccinni. London, Covent Garden, 1766. A translation of Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola.

The Maid of the Vale, a Comic Opera. Text by T.Holcroft, music by M.Arne. A translation of Goldoni's La Buona Figliuola. Dublin, Smock Alley, 1775.

The Hotel of The Double Valet, a farce by th.Vaughan, London, Drury Lane 1779. Based on Goldoni's Il Servitore di due Padroni.

The Times, a comedy by Elizabeth Griffith, with an epilogue by Horace Walpole, London, Drury Lane 1779. Based on Goldoni's Le Bourru Bien-faisant.

- Algarotti, F.: Saggio sopra l'Opera in Musica, Livorno, 1763
- Angelo, H.: The Reminiscences of H. Angelo, London, 1828
- Aquilecchia, G. et al.: Collected Essays on Italian Literature and Language, Manchester, 1971
- (Lenep), Avery E.C., et al.: The London Stage (1660-1800), Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1968
- Baker, D.E.: Biographia Dramatica or A Companion to the Playhouse, London, 1782
- Baker, H.B.: The London Stage from 1576 to 1888, London, 1889
- Barrett, C.F. ed.: Diary and Letters of Fanny Burney, 1778-1840, London, 1842
- Barrière, M.Fs. ed.: Mémoires de Clairon, de Lekain etc., Paris, 1846
- Bécharide, H.: Parme et la France de 1748 à 1789, Paris, 1928
- Berengo, M.: La Società Veneta alla fine del Settecento, Firenze, 1956
- Boaden, J.: The Private Correspondence of David Garrick, London, 1835
- Bompiani (Publisher): Enciclopedia dello Spettacolo, Firenze, 1958
- Bragaglia A.G. ed.: A Perrucci: Dell'Arte Rappresentativa premeditata e all'improvviso, Firenze, 1961
- British Diplomatic Representatives in Paris 1689-1789, Historical Society's volumes, Foreign and Commonwealth Office Library
- Broadley, A.M.: The Story of the Haymarket, Westminster Library Archives, 1911
- Burney, C.: A General History of Music, F. Mercer ed., London, 1935
- Volume I: Dr.C.Burney's Continental Travels 1770-1772, H.Glover ed., London, 1927
- Volume II: The present state of music in Germany, the Netherlands etc. London, 1775
- Volume III: The present state of music in France and Italy, H.E.Poole ed., London, 1969
- Burney Collection: A Collection of notebooks dealing with British actors and actresses (1560-1816)
- Volume I: Playbills of London Theatres, 1768-1817
- Volume II: Theatrical Register (History of the Stage in England, 1660-1801)

- Burney, F.: Diary and Letters, 1778-1840, C.F.Barrett ed., London 1842
 : The Early Diary of F.Burney 1768-78, A.R.Ellis, ed.,
London, 1889
 : Mémoires of Doctor Burney, London, 1832
Campardon, E.: Les Comédiens du Roi de la Troupe Italienne, Paris, 1880
Cibber, C.: An Apology for the Life of Mr.Colley Cibber, London, 1740
Clairon (Legris de la Tude): Memoires de Clairon, de Lekain etc.,
M.Fs.Barrière ed., Paris, 1846
Collé, C.: Journal et Mémoires, Paris, 1868
 : Journal historique 1761-62, Paris, 1864
 : Correspondance inédite, Paris, 1864
Crocker, R.: A History of Musical Style, New York, 1966
Crosby, E.A.: Une Romancière oubliée, Paris, 1924
Cunningham, P.: The letters of H.Walpole, London 1891
Davies, T.: Dramatic Miscellanies, London 1784
 : Memoirs of the life of D.Garrick Esq., London 1808
Dazzi, M.: C.Goldoni e la sua poetica sociale, Torino, 1957
Della Corte A.: L'Opera Comica Italiana nel '700, Bari, 1923
 : Piccinni, Bari, 1928
Dennis, J.: The Critical Works, E.N.Hooker ed., Baltimore, 1939
Dent, E.ed.: Lowenberg, A.: Annals of Opera, Genève, 1955
Dibdin C.I.M.: History and Illustrations of the London Theatre,
London, 1826
Dibdin, T.J.: Reminiscences, London, 1827
Dictionary of Music and Musicians, G.Grove ed., London 1961
Dictionary of National Biography, L.Stephen, Lee S. ed., London,
1885-1901
Dictionnaire Universel des Lettres, Laffont-Bompiani ed., Paris
Duchartre, P.L.: La Comédie Italienne, Paris, 1924
Ellis, A.R.ed.: The Early Diary of Fanny Burney 1768-78, London 1889
Enciclopedia dello Spettacolo, Bompiani ed., Firenze, 1958
Encyclopedia of Comic Songs, London 1820
Favart, C.S.: Mémoires et corrépondance litteraires, Paris, 1808
Ferretti, E.: Maschere Italiane nel teatro di Goldoni, Roma, 1904
Ferrante, L.: I Comici Goldoniani, Bologna, 1961

- Fielding, H.: Tumble-Down Dick, London, 1736
- Fitzgerald, P.H.: Life of D.Garrick, London, 1889
- Gallini, G.A.: Treatise on the Art of Dancing, London, 1772
- Garrick, D.: The Life of David Garrick, A.Murphy ed., London 1801
- _____ : The private correspondence of D.Garrick, J.Boaden ed., London, 1831
- _____ : Letters, Little, D.M. & Kahrl, G.M. ed., Harvard U.P 1963
- Genest, J. : Some account of the English Stage, 1660-1830, Bath, 1832
- Glover, C.H.ed.: Dr.Burney's Continental Travels 1770-1772, London 1927
- Goldoni, C.: Tutte le Opere, G.Ortolani ed., Milano, 1936
- _____ : Opere complete, G.Ortolani ed., Venezia, 1948
- Gosse, E.: A History of Eighteenth-Century Literature, London, 1912
- Gozzi, C.: Memorie Inutili, Venezia, 1793
- Gray, C.H.: Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795, New York, 1931
- Grove, G.ed.: Dictionary of Music and Musicians, London, 1954-61
- P.Hartnoll ed.: The Oxford Companion to the Theatre, London 1967
- Hedgcock, F.A.: A cosmopolitan actor. D.Garrick and his French friends. London, 1912
- Hill, G.B.ed.: S.Johnson: Lives of the English poets, Oxford, 1905
- Hill, Aaron: The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, London, 1753
- Hogarth, G.: Memoirs of the Opera, London, 1851
- Hooker, E.N. ed.: J.Dennis: The Critical Works of J.Dennis, Baltimore, 1939
- Hughes, L.: A century of English Farce, Princeton U.P., 1956
- _____ : The Drama's Patrons, Univ. of Texas Press, 1971
- Johnson, S: The Lives of the English poets, G.B.Hill ed., Oxford, 1905
- Jones, C.E.ed.: Isaac Reed: Diaries 1762-1804, Los Angeles, 1946
- Kelly, M.: Reminiscences, London, 1826
- Kraus R.: History of the Dance in Art and Educations New York, 1969
- Laffont-Bompiani ed.: Dictionnaire universel des Lettres, Paris
- Lanson, G.: N.de la Chaussée et la Comédie Larmoyante, Paris, 1887
- _____ : Histoire de la Littérature Francaise, P.Tuffrau ed., Paris, 1951
- Lee, H.: Memoires of a Manager, Taunton, 1830
- Pickering, N. (The dissertation on the Theatre, London, 1753)

- Legris de la Tude: Mémoires de Mlle Clairon, de LeKain, de Prévaille, de Dazincourt, de Molé, de Garrick, de Goldoni, M.Fs.Barrière ed., Paris, 1846
- LeKain, H.L.: Mémoires de Henry Lekain. Suivis de une correspondance inedite de Voltaire, Garrick, Colardeau, Lebrun etc., Paris, 1801
- Le Texier T.: Recueil des pièces de theatre, Paris, 1785
- Little, D.M., Kahrl, G.M.: Letters of David Garrick, Harvard U.P.1963
- Lunel, E.: Le Théâtre et la Revolution, Genève, 1970
- Mackerness, E.D.: A Social History of English Music, London, 1964
- Maddalena, E.: Libretti del Goldoni e d'altri, Torino, 1900
- Marotti, F.: La Commedia dell'Arte, Firenze, 1970
- Masi, E.: Lettere di Goldoni, Bologna, 1880
- Mongrédien, G.: Daily life in the French Theatre at the Time of Molière, London, 1969
- Monnet, J.: Mémoires, London, 1772
- Monnier, P.: Venise du XVIII^e Siècle, Paris, 1907
- Mount-Edgcumbe, R.D.: Musical Reminiscences 1773 to 1823, London, 1827
- Murphy, A.: The life of David Garrick, London, 1801
- Nalbach, D.: The King's Theatre 1704-1867, London, 1972
- Nichols, J.: Literary Anecdotes, London, 1812-15
- Nicoll, A.: A History of English Drama 1660-1900, Cambridge, 1952
- Oreglia, G.: The Commedia dell'Arte, London, 1968
- O'Reilly, R.B.: An authentic narrative relating to the Opera-House from the year 1778, London 1791
- Ortolani, G.ed.: Tutte le Opere di C.Goldoni, Milano, 1936
- Ortolani, G.: Opere complete di C.Goldoni, Venezia, 1948
- Ortolani, G.: La Riforma del Teatro nel Settecento, Venezia, 1962
- Pandolfi, V.: La Commedia dell'Arte, Firenze, 1958
- Parke, T.: Musical Reminiscences, London, 1830
- Parsons, F.: Garrick and his circle, London, 1906
- Pedicord, H.W.: The Theatrical Public in the time of Garrick, N.Y.1954
- Perrucci, A.: Dell'Arte Rappresentativa premeditata e all'Improvviso, A.G.Bragaglia ed., Firenze, 1961
- Prévaille: Mémoires de Prévaille par K.S.H., Paris, 1812
- Pickering, R.: Two dissertations on the Theatre, London, 1756

- Poole, H.E.ed.: C.Burney: The present state of music in France and Italy, London, 1969
- Préville: Mémoires of Préville par K.S.H., Paris, 1812
- Price, C.: Theatre in the age of Garrick, Oxford, 1973
- Ralph J.: The Taste of the Town, London, 1731
- Rahill, F.: The World of Melodrama, Pannsylvania, 1967
- Rasi, L.: I Comici, Italiani, Firenze, 1905
- Reed, I.: Diaries 1762-1804, C.E.Jones ed., Los Angeles, 1946
- Richards, K., Thomson, P.: The 18th-century English Stage, London, 1972
- Rosenfeld, S.: Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces 1660-1683, Cambridge U.P. 1939
- _____ : Foreign theatrical companies in Great Britain in the 17th and 18th centuries, London, 1955
- _____ : Troupes in England under Charles II 1660-1683, London, 1955
- _____ : A Short History of Scene Design in Great Britain, Oxford, 1973
- Scholes, P.A.: The great Dr.Burney, London, 1948
- Smith, L.: Melodrama, London, 1973
- Smith, W.C.: A catalogue of Music published by J.Walsh and his successors, London, 1953
- _____ : The Italian Opera and Contemporary Ballet in London 1789-1820, London, 1955
- Sonneck, O.G.T.: Library of Congress Catalogue of Opera Librettos printed before 1800, Washington, 1914
- Spinelli, A.: Bibliografia goldoniana, Milano, 1884
- Tuffrau, P.ed.: Lanson, P.: Histoire de la Littérature Française, Paris, 1951
- H.Walpole, H.: Letters, P.Cunningham ed., London, 1891
- Wyndham, H.S.: The Annals of Covent Garden Theatre, London, 1906

NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

- The Advertiser (Burney Collection)
- The Chronical (Burney Collection)
- The Gray's Inn Journal (Burney Collection)

The Public Advertiser (Burney Collection)
The Quarterly Music Magazine and Review
Rivista Musicale Italiana
Studi Goldoniani

ADDENDA

Mangini, N.: Bibliografia Goldoniana, Venezia, 1958

Marzorati (publisher) : I Maggiori, Milano, 1956

_____ : Questioni e Correnti di storia letteraria

Milano, 1949

Molinari, C.: Theatre through the ages, London, 1975

Rousseau, J.J.: Ouvres completes, Paris, 1936-37