

3 From Metastasio to Mazzolà: Clemency and Pity in *La clemenza di Tito*

Magnus Tessing Schneider

Of all Mozart's mature operas, *La clemenza di Tito* has attracted most conflicting critiques, frequently referring to the circumstances of its genesis. Mozart did not himself choose to set an opera to an old libretto by Pietro Metastasio. Commissioned for the coronation of Emperor Leopold II as king of Bohemia, this was stipulated in the contract drawn up barely two months earlier between the Bohemian Estates and Domenico Guardasoni, the manager of Prague's Italian opera company, and before the composer had even been chosen (see Chapter 1, II Document 2). The facts that Metastasio's drama of princely virtue was stipulated, and that Mozart was obliged to write the music in a short time, have been used repeatedly to demonstrate how artistically compromised Mozart's work is. Whether due to the deficiencies of the text or to work pressure, it has been said that Mozart was not inspired to give his best. Daniel E. Freeman, for example, argues that the coronation—and hence probably the choice of libretto—reflected an effort by the Bohemian nobility to resist the progressive reforms introduced by the Habsburg emperors. He concludes that the composer was just a tool in the reactionary political propaganda machine, and he uses this to dismiss the notion that Mozart was an enlightened artist. However, Freeman seems to be basing his arguments on the assumption that the meaning of a work of art is determined entirely by its context, barely discussing the contents of the opera itself beyond repeating the timeworn opinion

How to cite this book chapter:

Tessing Schneider, M. 2018. From Metastasio to Mazzolà: Clemency and Pity in *La clemenza di Tito*. In: Tessing Schneider, M. and Tatlow, R. (eds.) *Mozart's La clemenza di Tito: A Reappraisal*. Pp. 56–96. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16993/ban.c>. License: CC-BY NC-ND 4.0

that the composition shows signs of being written in great haste.¹ The latter verdict was first aired on 12 December 1791, just three months after the premiere, in the Berlin musical publication, *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, in a report comparing Mozart's opera unfavourably with the coronation cantata by Leopold Koželuch (libretto by August Gottlieb Meissner) (see Chapter 1, II Document 17). It states that Mozart's 'grand, or rather, semi-serious' opera, which had failed to please the audience in Prague, was 'yet another' setting of Metastasio's *La clemenza di Tito*, and that Mozart had failed to 'make haste slowly' when composing it. However, Sergio Durante suggests that this critique is likely to reflect a cabal against Mozart;² Koželuch may have been favoured by Bohemian nationalists, whereas Metastasio (and to a lesser extent, Mozart) was associated with the Viennese court and its depraved Italianate taste. The accusations against the coronation opera were repeated in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* in 1798, again with a cultural political subtext. This time, though, the views were coloured by a desire to promote Mozart as a champion of German music, the author of the article being the influential Leipzig music critic Friedrich Rochlitz (see Chapter 1, II Document 22). Resenting the fact that Mozart's penultimate opera was a Metastasian *opera seria* for a Habsburg coronation, Rochlitz was keen to emphasise that the composer accepted the commission only because his wife and friends insisted upon it, and because it 'flattered his sense of honour'. Due to time pressure, Mozart allegedly decided to write the most important numbers 'very well', while he wrote the remaining numbers merely according to 'the fashionable taste of the big crowd'. Furthermore, while Rochlitz praised the libretto revisions introduced by the Saxon court poet Caterino Mazzolà, albeit attributing them to Mozart, he depicted them merely as a means of tightening the action, to make the drama 'more concentrated' and 'far more interesting'; and to break the 'perpetual monotonous alternation of arias and recitatives' through the introduction of ensembles.

The impact of Rochlitz's nationalistic narrative on the later reception of the opera can hardly be exaggerated. Though modern scholars may feel less of a need to make excuses for Mozart's acceptance of the commission, the accusations against the work for its hastiness and conventionality linger, as does the implication that the reduction of the textual revisions were solely a question of dramatic expediency, of enhanced 'naturalness', and of offering more opportunities for musical expression. Even commentators who admire *La clemenza di Tito* have tended to underestimate the profound extent to which Mazzolà's revisions transform the drama, although Mozart himself credited the poet for turning the libretto into 'a true opera' (see Chapter 1, II Document 6).³

Some early commentators were more willing than Rochlitz to acknowledge the extent of Mazzolà's contribution. As anonymous text revisions were standard procedure in eighteenth-century opera productions, it is remarkable that the *Krönungsjournal für Prag* felt obliged to mention that 'Herr Mazzola [sic], theatrical poet in Dresden', had 'changed' Metastasio's libretto (see Chapter 1, II Document 12). Even more significant is the 1821 testimony of the tenor Giuseppe Siboni. As the lead tenor of Guardasoni's opera company in Prague from 1800 until 1805,⁴ Siboni had performed the title role in *La clemenza di Tito* 'for four or five years' according to the 'original composition', i.e. without the extra numbers included in most other nineteenth-century productions (see Chapter 1, II Document 24).⁵ Siboni recounted the following story, which he probably heard from Guardasoni:

[...] when the Prague theatre management decided to let the great Mozart set one of the most beautiful dramas by the immortal Metastasio to music for the coronation festivities of Emperor Leopold, they felt obliged to make a lot of changes in the piece to make it more appropriate to the circumstances. Fifty years ago, it was inconceivable for anyone to have the courage to lay their hands on the most beautiful works by one of the greatest dramatic poets in order to modify them.

However, it happened on Mozart's own demand, and otherwise we would perhaps not possess this wonderful work by the great composer.

The anecdote lends support to suggestions made by John A. Rice, that some of the revisions reflect the political circumstances in the years after the French Revolution,⁶ and by Sergio Durante that Mazzolà's employment was effected by Guardasoni rather than by the imperial court.⁷ Perhaps most importantly, though, the anecdote indicates that the changes demanded by Mozart were so radical that even thirty years after the event, an Italian singer was sensitive to their controversial implications. The story prompts us to question the lingering view that Mozart and Metastasio held an identical underlying political vision for the work. Indeed, I would argue that Mazzolà's revision is more radical than many scholars seem willing to allow, even to the extent that *La clemenza di Tito* by Mozart and Mazzolà, is no longer really an opera about clemency, despite its title, but rather an opera about compassion (*pietà*). And the differences between these two concepts are the differences that separate 1791 from 1734 politically, theatrically and musically, even though fundamental principles of enlightened thinking and critique were current earlier in the century.⁸

Jessica Waldoff has already discussed the use of the concept of *pietà* in this opera, though without delving into the differences between Metastasio's and Mazzolà's versions, which leads her to a definition that seems to me less appropriate to the late Enlightenment. She takes a far more favourable view of the opera than Freeman, to be sure, yet when she describes *pietà* as 'an enlightened conviction that embodies Christian teachings',⁹ she nevertheless seems to agree with him that the moral perspective of the opera is ultimately Catholic.¹⁰ In this essay, I will argue that the moral perspective of the Mozart-Mazzolà opera is defined rather by an enlightened humanism that is entirely secular and entirely egalitarian, an interpretation that is incompatible with the view of the opera as a work of propaganda.

From Metastasio to Mozart

The word *clemenza* (and its adjectival forms *clemente* and *clementissimo*) occurs nine times in Metastasio's original libretto, and all occurrences were retained by Mazzolà. The concept is used either by Sesto and Vitellia to describe Tito's character or conduct, or by the emperor himself when he ponders which strategy to adopt after their betrayal, always speaking of clemency as a path he can choose to follow or not. This use of the word concurs with the definition given in Louis de Jaucourt's 1753 article on *clémence* in the Diderot-d'Alembert *Encyclopédie*, where clemency is defined as 'an act by which the sovereign relaxes the rigour of the law', and 'a virtue that makes the prince inclined towards gentleness, and towards restraining and relaxing, with judgment and discretion, the rigour of justice'.¹¹ In other words, whether clemency is seen as an act or as a virtue, it is reserved for a sovereign. Jaucourt also quotes the definition of clemency given by Montesquieu in *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748) as 'the distinctive quality of monarchs' less necessary in a republic than in a monarchy 'where one is governed by honour, which often requires what the law forbids'.¹²

The word *pietà* or *pietade* (and its adjectival form *pietoso*), which is much more common in Italian than *clemenza*, occurs twenty-one times in Metastasio's original libretto, although used without the conceptual precision and significance it would acquire later in the century. Metastasio sometimes used the concept of 'pity' in the sense of 'mercy', referring to a clement sovereign's act of pardoning a guilty subject, and sometimes in the sense of 'compassion', referring to a sentiment that all human beings can feel. In his revision of the drama, Mazzolà exploits Metastasio's imprecise use of the word, and introduces a new degree of analytical precision, emphasising the sense of 'compassion', partly by allowing the concept of pity to figure prominently in five of the opera's closed numbers for which he wrote new texts, and partly by omitting eight of the original occurrences of the word. While most of these were cut because the libretto had to be shortened, a few seem

to have been cut because their usage clashed with the definition of pity that Mazzolà (and probably Mozart) wished to promote.

One example is the aria in which Annio begs Tito to pardon Sesto. Metastasio's original aria text reads:

Pietà Signor di lui.
 So che il rigore è giusto:
 Ma norma i falli altrui
 Non son del tuo rigor.
 Se a prieghi miei non vuoi;
 Se all'error suo non puoi;
 Donalo al cor d'Augusto,
 Donalo a te Signor. (Act III, scene 3)¹³

(Take pity on him, my lord! I know that rigour would be justified, but the faults of others are not the norm of your rigour. If you will not have pity in answer to my prayers, if you cannot pity his error, then feel pity in the emperor's heart; have pity on yourself, my lord.)

Mazzolà replaced this with an entirely new text:

Tu fosti tradito:
 Ei degno è di morte:
 Ma il core di Tito
 Pur lascia sperar.
 Deh prendi consiglio,
 Signor, dal tuo core:
 Il nostro dolore
 Ti degna mirar. (Act II, scene 7)¹⁴

(You were betrayed: he deserves to die, but the heart of Titus still lets us hope. Oh take advice, my lord, from your heart: deign to behold our pain.)

Apart from the fact that Mazzolà's aria text is syntactically simpler and emotionally more direct, his Annio urges Tito to listen to his compassionate heart, whereas Metastasio's Annio reminds Tito of merciful principles.¹⁵

Another example is Servilia's speech to Vitellia at the end of the opera. Annio leaves to search for Tito, expecting the future Empress Vitellia to follow him and beg him to be merciful to Sesto. Vitellia, however, hesitates. At this point in Metastasio's libretto Servilia says to Vitellia:

Deh non lasciarlo
 Nel più bel fior degli anni
 Perir così. Sai che finor di Roma
 Fu la speme, e l'amore. Al fiero eccesso
 Chi sa chi l'ha sedotto. In te sarebbe
 Obbligo la pietà: quell'infelice
 T'amò più di se stesso: avea fra' labbri
 Sempre il tuo nome: impallidia qualora
 Si parlava di te. Tu piangi! (Act III, scene 10)

(Oh, do not let [Sextus] perish thus in the fairest flower of youth. You know that he was the hope and love of Rome till now. Who knows who enticed him to this cruel excess? To you, pity should be an obligation. That unhappy man loved you more than he loved himself; your name was always on his lips; he turned pale if someone spoke of you. You are weeping!)

This is followed a little later by Servilia's aria, in which she reproaches Vitellia for letting self-interest curb her pity:

S'altro che lagrime
 Per lui non tenti;
 Tutto il tuo piangere
 Non gioverà[.]
 A questa inutile
 Pietà, che senti,
 Oh quanto è simile
 La crudeltà. (Act III, scene 9)

(If you attempt nothing but weeping for him, all your tears will be in vain. Oh how similar to cruelty is that futile pity that you feel.)

In his revision, Mazzolà cuts the first lines of Servilia's speech, down to and including the lines 'In te sarebbe / Obbligo la pietà'. Thereby, he

not only made Servilia's plea less pointed (i.e. she no longer hints that Vitellia might be responsible for Sesto's misfortune); it also omits the implication that the sentiment of pity can be an obligation, making it clearer that Vitellia is moved to tears not because she *should* take pity on Sesto, but because Servilia reminds her of Sesto's love for her.

In such cases, Mazzolà's revisions support the dramatic function of Mozart's music: the arias of both Annio and Servilia become emotional appeals to the compassion of the onstage audience, which also gives the music a different dramaturgical function, rather than eloquent calls for virtuous conduct.

This change of perspective reflects the fact that the meaning of 'pity' had undergone significant changes since 1734, not least due to the influence of the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Both original Metastasian passages imply that pity is a Christian moral principle or duty, whereas Rousseau, in his *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* [*Discourse on the origin of inequality*] of 1755, rejects Christian morality as the source of pity. He defined compassion or pity (*pitié*) as 'an innate aversion to the sight of a fellow creature's suffering':¹⁶ i.e. it is the sole natural virtue from which flow all the social virtues. Rousseau asks what are generosity, clemency or humanity, if not compassion applied to the weak, to the guilty, or to mankind in general, writing: 'Kindliness, and even friendship, correctly understood, is only the outcome of an enduring pity for a particular object, for, is wishing a person not to suffer anything other than wishing him to be happy?'¹⁷ The feeling of compassion puts us in the place of those who suffer, and the more the beholder identifies with the pain of the sufferer, the stronger the compassion. Importantly, Rousseau emphasises that compassion comes before any kind of reflection, and although 'it may be the business of Socrates and others of that stamp to acquire virtue through reason, the human race would long ago have ceased to exist if its preservation had depended strictly on the reasoning power of the individuals who make it up'.¹⁸ On the contrary, it is reason 'that

breeds vanity and reflection that strengthens it; reason that turns man inward; reason that separates man from everything that troubles or afflicts him'.¹⁹

Some aspects of Metastasio's moralistic concept of pity must therefore have struck Mozart and Mazzolà as somewhat old-fashioned. Metastasio does not make clear whether Tito's pardoning of Sesto and Vitellia is due to compassion or to moral and political reflection, while Mazzolà's revisions suggest that it is due to compassion. The fact that princely clemency describes a vertical relation between sovereign and subject, in contrast to pity in Rousseau's definition as compassion, which describes a horizontal relation between fellow creatures, helps to explain why the revisions draw out the horizontal relations in the drama: not only the emperor's sympathy for the traitors, but also the sympathy in other characters, and the audience, for the traitors and even for the emperor himself. These revisions touch the very foundations of Metastasio's dramaturgy and imply both a changed theatrical and operatic aesthetic, and a changed view of sovereignty.

Rousseau's ideas greatly influenced the aesthetic thinking of the period, including the theories of the German critic and playwright Gotthold Ephraim Lessing who in 1766 published his own major contribution to Enlightenment aesthetics, the essay *Laocoön, or, On the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. Here he discusses the relationship between the good, the true and the beautiful in the arts, specifically promoting the concept of the beholders' feeling of pity or compassion (*Mitleid*) as a central aim. Lessing mainly uses the Vatican Greek sculpture group *Laocoön and His Sons* to define his concept of compassion in art. Quoting Pliny the Elder, he points out that it originally happened to stand in the palace of the Emperor Titus:

The master was striving to attain the greatest beauty under the given conditions of bodily pain. Pain, in its disfiguring extreme, was not compatible with beauty, and must therefore be softened. Screams must be reduced to sighs, not because screams would betray weakness, but

because they would deform the countenance to a repulsive degree. Imagine Laocoön's mouth open, and judge. Let him scream, and see. It was, before, a figure to inspire compassion in its beauty and suffering. Now it is ugly, abhorrent, and we gladly avert our eyes from a painful spectacle, destitute of the beauty which alone could turn our pain into the sweet feeling of pity for the suffering object.²⁰

These aesthetic ideals—even down to the wording—are echoed in Mozart's famous letter to his father of 26 September 1781, in which he discusses Osmin's aria 3. 'Solche hergelaufne Laffen' in *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*. Mozart writes:

[...] as Osmin's rage gradually increases, there comes (just when the aria seems to be at an end) the allegro assai, which is in a totally different measure and in a different key; this is bound to be very effective. For just as a man in such a towering rage oversteps all the bounds of order, moderation and propriety and completely forgets himself, so must the music too forget itself. But as passions, whether violent or not, must never be expressed in such a way as to excite disgust, and as music, even in the most terrible situations, must never offend the ear, but must please the hearer, or in other words must never cease to be *music*, I have gone from F (the key in which the aria is written), not into a remote key, but into a related one, not, however, into the nearest relative D minor, but into the more remote A minor.²¹

Although Mozart does not refer to 'pity' here, his aim is clearly to prevent the audience from turning away from Osmin in disgust, just as the ancient Greek artist prevented the spectators from turning away from Laocoön, and just as Mazzolà and Mozart later strove to prevent us from turning away from Sesto and Vitellia. The feeling of disgust (Mozart uses Lessing's term *Ekel*) aroused by an exaggerated expression of pain or rage is both an aesthetic and a moral reaction, in other words, just as its opposite, the beautiful, is an ideal inextricably linked to the good.

In 1767–69, immediately after publishing his *Laocoön*, Lessing wrote the reviews that were later collected under the title *Hamburg*

Dramaturgy in which he reinterpreted Aristotle's ideal of tragic catharsis, the spectators' 'purification' of the passions of pity and terror, along the lines of Enlightenment aesthetics. For Lessing, the purpose of catharsis is to transform the sentiment of pity into virtuous habits. He considers drama the most edifying art form since it is the most cathartic, theatrical pity being closely related to a sense of fear for ourselves, writing:

[Aristotle] speaks of pity and *fear*, not of pity and *terror*, and his fear is by no means the fear excited in us by misfortune threatening another person. It is the fear which arises for ourselves from the similarity of our position with that of the sufferer; it is the fear that the calamities impending over the sufferer might also befall ourselves; it is the fear that we ourselves might thus become objects of pity. In a word, this fear is compassion referred back to ourselves.²²

Such thoughts exerted a major influence on Mozart's cultural environment. In Prague, for example, the National Theatre itself had been inaugurated in 1783 with Lessing's tragedy *Emilia Galotti*, and its proscenium arch was adorned with Lessing's medallion portrait.²³

The Concept of Pity in Mazzolà's Revision

Nearly all the revisions Mazzolà made to the libretto for *La clemenza di Tito* reflect a turning away from Metastasio's absolutist political vision, and a turning towards the egalitarian humanism of Rousseau and Lessing. The concept of pity plays a crucial role in this change of direction. The first reference to pity occurs in duet 1. 'Come ti piace imponi' between Sesto and Vitellia, Mazzolà replacing a recitative dialogue and adding the following concluding lines that have no equivalent in Metastasio's text:

Fan mille affetti insieme
Battaglia in me spietata.

Un'alma lacerata
Più della mia non v'è. (Act I, scene 1)

(A thousand emotions are engaged in a pitiless battle against each other. There is no soul more torn than mine.)

The word *spietata* (which occurs only here) is the antonym of *pietosa*, suggesting that the action of the opera is sparked by Vitellia's and Sesto's unresolved and aggressive emotions, which form a contrast in the drama's symmetrical structure to Tito's pitying absolution in the final scene. Furthermore, Mazzolà uses the concept *furore* (rage) as the antithesis of *pietà* throughout Act I, suggesting that Vitellia is driven to attempted murder by an irrational urge for destruction. *Furore* is linked in Mazzolà's libretto metaphorically to the element of fire, establishing a connection between Vitellia's 'burning' rage and the fire that eventually 'rages' at the Capitol. In duet 1. Sesto sings 'Già il tuo furor m'accende' (I am already kindled by your rage), Mazzolà anticipating a hint given by Metastasio in Sesto's next encounter with Vitellia, which contrasts burning rage with chilling horror:

Basta, basta non più, già m'inspirasti,
Vitellia, il tuo furore. Arder vedrai
Fra poco il Campidoglio, e quest'acciaro
Nel sen di Tito - - - (Ah, sommi Dei! qual gelo
Mi ricerca le vene - - -). (Act I, scene 9)

(Enough, enough; no more! Your rage already inspired me. Soon you will see the Capitol burn, and in Titus' breast this dagger... (Ah, gods on high, what chill runs through my veins...)

The third and last mention of *furore* follows in the trio 10. 'Vengo - - - aspettate - - Sesto' of the very next scene, again in contrast to the chill of horror, when Vitellia reacts with consternation to the news that Tito has chosen her as his bride. In Metastasio, the message is communicated to Vitellia only by Publio, after which she expresses her regret in an aria soliloquy, whereas Mazzolà adds Annio to the

scene and focusses instead on Vitellia's confusion in an 'action trio', in which her disjointed speech contrasts starkly with her commanding and manipulative presence in the previous scene:

Oh sdegno mio funesto!
 Oh insano mio furor!
 (Che angustia! che tormento!
 Io gelo oh Dio! d'orror.) (Act I, scene 10)

(Oh my fatal anger! Oh my insane rage! (What anxiety, what torment! Oh God, my blood runs cold with horror!))

As in the first duet, there is no equivalent of the *furore* reference in the Metastasio libretto; it is an image Mazzolà has introduced to suggest the dramatic build-up in Act I.

Although the emotional source of the destructive flames is now cold, Vitellia realises that the fire of her rage threatens to spread to the Capitol. Mazzolà emphasises this pivotal function of the trio by compressing the succeeding seven scenes from Metastasio's Act II into the four breathless scenes acted out at the Capitol, which conclude the new Act I. Mozart linked the last three numbers of the Act musically, in effect turning them into a through-composed Act finale characterised by confusion, desperation and abrupt changes: a musical representation of an emotional and social conflagration, sparked originally in the first duet, rekindled in Sesto's aria 9. 'Parto, ma tu ben mio', running wild into the following trio and into Sesto's accompanied recitative 11. 'Oh Dei, che smania è questa', until it finally reaches its terrifying climax in the closing quintet with chorus 12. 'Deh conservate, o Dei'.

The metaphorical complex that Mazzolà constructs around the word *furore* implicates the motivation of Vitellia's assassination plot. In fact, Metastasio's libretto had already implied that she may be driven less by filial loyalty—or even lust for power—than by a jealous rage caused by thwarted love. In her first two encounters with Sesto

in Act I Vitellia suggests, in asides to the audience, that Tito made her fall in love with him. In the opening scene she says:

[...] e più non pensi
 Che questo eroe clemente un soglio usurpa
 Dal suo tolto al mio padre?
 Che mi ingannò, che mi sedusse, (e questo
 È il suo fallo maggior) quasi ad amarlo. (Act I, scene 1)

(Do you no longer keep in mind that this clement hero usurps the throne that his father stole from my father? That he betrayed me, seduced me (and this is his greatest fault) almost to the point of making me love him?)

And in scene 9 she tells Sesto:

Sappi, che Tito amai,
 Che del mio cor l'acquisto
 Ei t'impedì: che se rimane in vita,
 Si può pentir: ch'io ritornar potrei
 (Non mi fido di me) forse ad amarlo. (Act I, scene 9)

(Know this, that I loved Titus, that he made it impossible for you to take possession of my heart; that if his life is saved, he may repent; that I may then perhaps (I don't trust myself) start loving him again.)

In the final scene Vitellia then tells Tito that this love originated when she misinterpreted his kindness:

Credei
 Che questa fosse amor. La destra e'l trono
 Da te sperava in dono, e poi negletta
 Restai più volte, e procurai vendetta. (Act II, scene 17)

(I thought this was love. I hoped to obtain your hand and the throne in return, and when I had been passed by more times, I planned my revenge.)

It hence seems that her two calls for his murder are spawned by her envious jealousy of Berenice and Servilia, Tito's preferred brides.²⁴

Sesto perceives this motive in both scenes, but Vitellia manages to persuade him, and even herself, through various diversions, to believe that she is driven by the more honourable motive of avenging her father's dethronement and murder. That the blood vengeance is only a pretext is made apparent by the fact that she would much prefer to marry Tito than to have him murdered. By giving Vitellia the exclamation 'Oh insano mio furor!' Mazzolà shows her horror when she realises that her scheming is backfiring. The adjective *insano*, used only twice in the libretto, occurs first in the opening scene when Vitellia described Tito's love for Berenice as an 'amore insano', but her exclamation in the quintet suggests that it was her own raging madness that was 'insane'.

A relatively inconspicuous feature in Metastasio's text is the complete absence of the word *pietà* from the first half of the drama. Mazzolà takes this and turns it into a key principle of the dramaturgical structure, giving its absence symbolic significance, partly by making the pity-less rage of jealousy and envy the dramatic motor in the first half of the opera, and partly by giving greater prominence to the first occurrence of the word *pietà*. It is uttered by Vitellia in the quintet when she enters the Capitol, realising that she is unable to stop the murderous conflagration she has sparked: 'Chi per pietade oh Dio! / M'addita dov'è Sesto?' (Oh God! For pity's sake, who can show me where Sextus is?) (Act I, scene 13). This seemingly casual reference to the concept of pity, rescued from Metastasio's recitative dialogue,²⁵ and inserted into the closed form of the quintet, demands attention, not least because Mazzolà retains very little text from the many scenes he compressed into these tersely worded final scenes. It implies that the pitiless Vitellia is now herself in need of pity, and that the spectators—not just passers-by on the Capitol—are invited to take pity on her. The almost programmatic significance of her appeal is brought out by the fact that the use of the word *pietade* is followed immediately by the opera's only two occurrences of the word *terror*,

this time with no equivalent in Metastasio's text. Vitellia continues with the aside: 'In odio a me son'io / Ed ho di me terror' (I hate myself and I fill myself with terror). And when Sesto enters a few moments later, immediately after stabbing who he thinks is Tito, he says: 'Mi fa terror il giorno' (The light of day fills me with terror) (Act I, scene 14). That the concepts of pity and terror make their first appearance in the opera simultaneously is no coincidence, and points to the broader aims, according to the *Poetics* of Aristotle, of tragic drama. The sight of Vitellia and Sesto reduced to a state of misery, terrified at the thought of their wicked actions, ushers in the possibility that the audience may eventually pity them, the 'conflagration' dramaturgy further promoting such a reaction by portraying Vitellia and Sesto in a somewhat redeeming light, as people who act impulsively, and are then terrified by their actions. In accordance with Lessing's interpretation of Aristotle, illustrated by the case of the Laocoön group, tragic events should inspire terror in the characters rather than in the spectators, but their terror should also inspire the fear that the spectators may end up in a similar situation. The final scenes of Act I depict the agonising realisation that one has done something terrible in a fit of insane rage, which could lead to the desperate conclusion that one is forever excluded from the secure embrace of humanity. In the event, however, it is exactly the expression of remorse that shows one's real human dignity, as Tito says to Sesto at the very end of the opera:²⁶

Il vero pentimento,
Di cui tu sei capace,
Val più d'una verace
Costante fedeltà. (Act II, scene 17)

(The true repentance of which you are capable is worth more than a reliable and constant faithfulness.)

Mazzolà's revision of the characters of Annio and Servilia serves to strengthen the effect of Sesto's exclusion from and re-inclusion into

human society. In Metastasio's original, Vitellia, Sesto and Servilia have five arias each, Annio has four arias, and Servilia and Annio, designed to take leading roles, serve as positive contrasts to Vitellia and Sesto: Servilia and Annio represent the sincerity, constancy and self-sacrifice that their erring counterparts lack. Mazzolà, however, drastically reduces the size of their roles, using them more as representatives of the society from which Sesto excludes himself, and less as virtuous contrasts to him and Vitellia. In Metastasio's libretto, the first scene with Sesto and Annio concludes with Annio's exit aria, in which he expresses his anxiety that he may not be able to marry Servilia, and Sesto's aria soliloquy, in which he tells of his moral doubts. Mazzolà, in his revised libretto, replaced these introspective arias with the duettino 3. 'Deh prendi un dolce amplesso' in which the two friends pledge eternal friendship, concluding with a 'sweet embrace' (Act I, scene 3), the natural expression and symbol of equality and fraternity in a society. Similarly, Mazzolà emphasises the direct contact between Annio and Servilia in their first scene at the expense of introvert reflection. In the original Metastasio, Annio bids farewell to Servilia in an anguished exit aria, after which Servilia swears fidelity to him in an aria soliloquy. Mazzolà conflates these two speeches into duet 7. 'Ah perdona al primo affetto' in which Servilia rapidly dispels Annio's pain. This love duet is a parallel to the previous friendship duet (3.), showing how love as well as friendship can exemplify compassionate concord among citizens, without gender discrimination. These two duets serve as a contrast to the rage duet (1.) sung by Sesto and Vitellia, thereby suggesting the socially damaging effects when human relations are defined by a lack of mutual acceptance and compassion. With Sesto singing in both the rage duet and the friendship duet Mazzolà and Mozart portray him as a divided person capable of nurturing healthy human relations, but in whom violently passionate love clouds his emotional and social awareness. It is the recognition by Tito and by the audience of Sesto's moral awareness behind his passion, however, which

eventually justifies his reintegration into society. Annio predicts this in his aria 13., which has no equivalent in Metastasio. Addressing Sesto, he says:

Torna di Tito a lato:
Torna; e l'error passato
Con replicate emenda
Prove di fedeltà.
L'acerbo tuo dolore
È segno manifesto
Che di Virtù nel core
L'immagine ti stà. (Act II, scene 1)

(Return to Titus' side: return and amend your past error with repeated proofs of your fidelity. Your bitter pain is a manifest sign that the image of virtue remains in your heart.)

The second and third times that Mazzolà introduces the word *pietà* into the libretto follow immediately, in trio 14. 'Se al volto mai ti senti' (Act II, scene 4), in which Publio comes to arrest Sesto for the attempted assassination, the latter taking leave of Vitellia one last time. In Metastasio, Sesto sings an aria to Vitellia before he is carried off by Publio and the guards, after which Vitellia gives vent to her fear and remorse in an aria soliloquy, but once more Mazzolà replaces two successive exit arias with an ensemble. Mazzolà here allows Vitellia to express her torn feelings, in an aside with Sesto still on stage, while Publio—who remains completely silent in Metastasio—expresses his compassion for Sesto in another aside. In this way Vitellia's evasiveness, her unwillingness to take responsibility for the plot and thereby perhaps save the life of the young man who longs for her love, is thrown into relief by Sesto's loving farewell to her and by Publio's sympathetic concern. This contrast is further highlighted by the fact that Sesto's and Publio's quatrains both end with the word 'pietà': Vitellia's does not. Sesto sings:

Rammenta chi t'adora
In questo stato ancora.

Mercede al mio dolore
Sia almen la tua pietà.

(Remember the one who adores you even in this situation. May your pity, at least, be the reward of my pain.)

And Publio sings:

L'acerbo amaro pianto
Che da' suoi lumi piove,
L'anima mi commove,
Ma vana è la pietà.

(The painful and bitter tears that rain from his eyes move my soul, but my pity is useless.)

Vitellia, however, sings to herself:

Mi laceran il core
Rimorso, orror, spavento.
Quel che nell'alma io sento
Di duol morir mi fa.

(My heart is torn between remorse, horror and fear! That which I feel in my soul makes me die of pain.)

Her conflicting emotions, her concluding focus on her own rather than on Sesto's pain and the conspicuous absence of the word *pietà*—which she has only used so far while begging others to take pity on *her*—imply once more that Vitellia's moral awareness is still lacking.

Vitellia's failure to pity Sesto in this trio seems to have been deliberately constructed by Mazzolà and Mozart to contrast Tito's pity for Sesto in the next trio, 18. 'Quello di Tito è il volto', when the young traitor is called to appear before his sovereign, even though Tito has much less reason to pity him than Vitellia does. At the first sight of Sesto, broken down by shame and remorse, Tito remarks in an aside in the following Metastasian recitative: 'Eppur mi fa pietà' (And yet he inspires pity in me) (Act II, scene 10), words which are then echoed

by Sesto in his first address to the emperor: ‘se tu veder potessi / Questo misero cor, spergiuuro, ingrato, / Pur ti farei pietà’ (if you could see my wretched heart, treacherous and ungrateful, I would inspire pity in you even so). The trial scene ends with Sesto’s rondo 19. ‘Deh per questo instante solo’, which contains Mazzolà’s next reference to *pietà*. While the rondo draws partly on original Metastasian lines, its second quatrain has no equivalent in the earlier text:

Di pietade indegno è vero,
Sol spirar io deggio orror.
Pur saresti men severo,
Se vedessi questo cor.

(Unworthy of pity indeed, I must inspire nothing but horror. Even so, you would be less severe if you could see my heart.)

Once more Mazzolà picks up an image in Metastasio’s dialogue and develops it into a kind of verbal leitmotif, in this case Sesto’s preceding implication that if Tito could see his heart, he might pity him even so, which Mazzolà treats as an anticipation of his lines in the rondo. Sesto’s aria in the Metastasio libretto expresses his desperation in the face of death because he has betrayed his friend, whereas in Mazzolà’s libretto Sesto’s rondo contains an indirect appeal to Tito’s compassion.

The spectators, who know that Sesto’s heart is not obdurate, though to this point crazed by passion, may be able to absolve him more easily than Tito. How then does Tito come to absolve him? In Metastasio’s original version, the emperor is torn in his subsequent soliloquy between the desire for revenge and the inclination to exonerate him. The lines that Mazzolà cut include:

Vendetta! Ah! Tito! E tu sarai capace
D’un sì basso desio: Che rende eguale
L’offeso, all’offensor! Merita invero
Gran lode una vendetta, ove non costi

Più che il volerla. Il torre altrui la vita
 È facoltà comune
 Al più vil della terra: Il darla è solo
 De' Numi e de' regnanti. (Act III, scene 7)

(Revenge! Ah Titus, and are you capable of so base a desire that makes the offended equal to the offender? That revenge which costs no more than wanting it indeed deserves great praise. The ability to take the life of another is common to the vilest man on earth, but the ability to give it only to gods and rulers.)

Mazzolà replaces these with the following: 'Vendetta! – – – Il cor di Tito / Tali sensi produce? – – Eh viva – – – in vano / Parlan dunque le leggi?' (Revenge! Can such feelings rise in Titus' heart? ... Oh, let him live ... But do the laws speak in vain, then?) (Act II, scene 11). Mazzolà's Tito does not need abstract reasoning to dismiss revenge as an unworthy option: he represses as repulsive his own tendency to vengeance, and hence his inner conflict is less between clemency and revenge than between pity and respect for the rigour of the law. Here the music acquires a dramatic significance not implied by Metastasio's original text. In Metastasio libretto, Sesto's preceding aria shows the young traitor expressing desperation more to himself than to Tito, which in no way affects the verdict of the emperor who having heard it still feels a desire for revenge. In Mazzolà, however, Sesto's rondo is addressed directly to Tito, and if Tito felt any desire for revenge beforehand, he certainly feels none afterwards. The changed dramatic function of Sesto's solo implies that he is not absolved because of rational or political considerations, but because Tito sympathises with the young traitor whose essentially good character is revealed in the trial scene, through his agonising conflict and broken stage appearance that both Tito and the audience recognise during the trio 18. 'Quello di Tito è il volto', and through the tender expression and inner beauty of Mozart's music in rondo 19. 'Deh per questo instante solo'.

The last occurrence of the word *pietà* that Mazzolà introduced into the libretto is found in Vitellia's rondo 23. 'Non più di fiori', which she sings after finally deciding to confess her crimes to save Sesto's life.²⁷ Mazzolà wrote an entirely new text for this solo replacing the aria text of Metastasio's original. Metastasio's aria reads:

Getta il nocchier talora
 Pur que' tesori all'onde,
 Che da remote sponde
 Per tanto mar portò.
 E giunto al lido amico
 Gli Dei ringrazia ancora,
 Che ritornò mendico,
 Ma salvo ritornò. (Act III, scene 10)

(Sometimes the helmsman throws to the waves the very treasures he carried over so many seas from faraway coasts. Having reached the friendly shore, he thanks the gods that he returned a beggar, but returned safely.)

It seems obvious why Mazzolà and Mozart found this text unsatisfactory: not only does it employ the maritime imagery for which Metastasio's librettos were frequently ridiculed even in the eighteenth century, but the older poet portrays Vitellia as someone who acquires virtue through reason rather than by innate compassion. The keyword 'salvo' hardly suggests that Vitellia will be 'safe' if she confesses her crimes, but rather that her soul or honour will be 'saved'. Mazzolà reimaged the scene, writing instead:

Non più di fiori
 Vaghe catene
 Discenda Imene
 Ad intrecciar.
 Stretta fra barbare
 Aspre ritorte
 Veggo la morte
 Ver me avanzar.

Infelice! qual orrore!
 Ah, di me che si dirà.
 Chi vedesse il mio dolore,
 Pur avria di me pietà. (Act II, scene 15)

(No more shall Hymen come down to weave lovely chains of flowers.
 Clutched in barbarous and harsh ropes, I see my death approach-
 ing. Unhappy woman! What horror! Oh, what will they say of me?
 Those who could see my pain would even yet feel pity for me.)

Unlike the Metastasian Vitellia, Mazzolà's Vitellia does not pride herself on having made the right moral choice, which might arouse belated admiration in the audience. Instead she arouses our compassion because for the first time she acts in an unselfish way: she sets herself aside for Sesto's sake at the expense of her future, her freedom, her honour and, finally, her hope of marrying Tito. This last point is much clearer in Mazzolà's text than in Metastasio's where the 'treasures' thrown to the waves refer to the loss of both her 'imperial and [her] nuptial' hopes mentioned in the preceding recitative ('Speranze addio / D'impero e d'imenei', Act II, scene 15). In the new aria text she makes no reference to the imperial throne, but laments only the loss of her nuptial garlands. The word 'pietà', furthermore, not only concludes the rondo but references previous occurrences of the concept, corresponding symmetrically to the use of *furor* and *spietata*, opposites of *pietà* and *pietosa*, in Sesto's and Vitellia's opening rage duet 1. 'Come ti piace imponi'. At the end of the opera Vitellia's rage has cooled and she is even able to forget herself and run to Tito at the end of her solo in order to prevent him from having Sesto killed, just as she ran to Sesto at the end of the trio 10. 'Vengo - - - aspettate - - Sesto' in Act I in order to prevent him from killing Tito. Mozart emphasises the thematic and structural connection between the two numbers through their orchestral postludes, which both function as scene change music, transitioning to the crowd scenes that conclude the two Acts.²⁸ Apart from referring back to Vitellia's own previous

uses or non-uses of the word *pietà*, its occurrence in her rondo also points back to the trial scene and the verbal leitmotif of Mazzolà's formulation in Sesto's rondo 'if you could see my heart, you would even yet feel pity'. The metaphorical connection between the two rondos implies that they serve similar dramatic functions: rather than appealing directly to the audience, Sesto and Vitellia, unaware of the audience, reveal their human dignity as expressed in the beauty and emotional truthfulness of their music.

Vitellia's rondo sums up a further poetic cross-reference. Although the word 'infelice' (unhappy) is not uncommon in the libretto, it occurs in only three of the musical numbers: in Sesto's soliloquy, the accompanied recitative 11. 'Oh Dei, che smania è questa' where, before his attempted murder of Tito, he exclaims: 'Sesto infelice!' (Unhappy Sextus!) (Act I, scene 11). In Tito's soliloquy, the accompanied recitative preceding the trial scene, the emperor exclaims: 'È pur di chi regna / Infelice il destino!' (The destiny of those who rule is also unhappy!) (Act II, scene 8). And in Vitellia's soliloquy, rondo 23. 'Non più di fiori', preceding her confession in the final scene, she exclaims: 'Infelice!' (Unhappy woman!). Each occurrence of the word 'infelice' forms the emotional climax in the three characters' introspective soliloquies that immediately precede their life-determining interventions. Thus an existential link is established between them, the audience recognising the virtually identical feelings of despair and emotional isolation of the exclamations. The characters are, in a sense, interchangeable here, and by recognising their common humanity the audience may intuitively be inspired with pity.

***La clemenza di Tito*—A Democratic Opera?**

In the opera *La clemenza di Tito* by Mazzolà/Mozart the audience is invited to pity the sovereign, an approach that departs from the political ideology of Metastasian dramaturgy, and demonstrates that the

concept of sovereignty in 1734 was no longer viable in 1791. Regardless of the religious implications of their coronation ceremonies, emperors no longer ruled by divine right: they were no more than human beings. As in the original Metastasio, Mazzolà's Tito is a solitary figure, but his solitude is different. His dismissal at the beginning of the opera of his beloved Berenice, and his decision at the end of the opera never to marry but to regard Rome as his bride, served in Metastasio's libretto to portray Tito as a kind of political martyr who sublimates the need for close human bonds in favour of his concern for the good of the state. In Mazzolà's revision, however, the ideal ruler seems to be someone capable of sharing close ties with any unhappy subjects because he recognises their sense of isolation as similar to his own. 'Mille diversi affetti / In Tito guerra fanno' (A thousand different emotions battle in Titus), says Publio in an aside in the trio 18. ('Quello di Tito è il volto!') when Sesto enters the throne room: 'S'ei prova un tale affanno, / Lo seguita ad amar' (If he is so troubled, he still loves him) (Act III, scene 10). The audience is invited here to pity the emperor, as we are in Sesto's rondo 19. 'Deh per questo instante solo', where Tito is required to remain silent over his conflict between compassion and indignation. Moreover, by altering the role of the chorus, Mazzolà and Mozart portray Tito as a sovereign in contact with his people. In the original Metastasio the chorus had a purely ceremonial and celebratory function, whereas the choral lament in the quintet with chorus that ends Act I communicates a sense of human loss. Similarly, Tito responds to the new thanksgiving chorus 15. 'Ah grazie si rendano' with the words:

Ah nò sventurato
 Non sono cotanto,
 Se in Roma il mio fato
 Si trova compianto,
 Se voti per Tito
 Si formano ancor. (Act II, scene 5)

(Ah no, I am not so unfortunate if my fate finds compassion in Rome, if prayers are still said for Titus.)

One of the subtlest departures from Metastasio's representation of the emperor, however, is found in Mazzolà's treatment, or rather non-treatment, of Tito's arias. Of all the twenty-six arias in the original Metastasio, only half are directly addressed to another character on stage, with nine being soliloquies and a handful of abstract reflections that may, or may not, be addressed to another character. Of the fourteen arias in Mazzolà's revision, on the other hand, ten are directly addressed to another character, just one, Vitellia's rondo, is unambiguously a soliloquy, and Tito's three arias, which all retain the original Metastasian texts, are abstract moral reflections with no precise addressee on stage, even though sung in the presence of other characters. In a staging of Metastasio's original drama, with its abundance of soliloquies addressed to the audience, this is unlikely to strike an audience as departing from the norm. On the other hand, in Mazzolà's revised version, in which Diderot's fourth wall has been raised between the stage and the auditorium, Tito's arias stand out as exceptions that imply an altogether different mode of theatrical communication. The audience, having been detached beholders, and passively admiring subjects of a clement monarch by the grace of God in Metastasio, is invited by the emperor (and Mazzolà) to step into the drama and act as members of his Privy Council, allowed to ponder on whether they would do as Tito and pardon Sesto and Vitellia, or whether they would rather have them thrown to the lions. This representation of the ruler ultimately points beyond monarchy as a form of government, gazing into the modern age.²⁹

Those who describe Mozart's *La clemenza di Tito* as a propaganda work invariably fail to take account of its early reception. Since propaganda is not meant to generate independent emotional and intellectual responses, it eschews aesthetic complexity, yet it is exactly this complexity that explains the opera's initial lack of success. The official accounts of the premiere on 6 September 1791 conspicuously omit any reference to the music or its reception, focusing instead on the gleeful greeting of the imperial family when

they entered the auditorium (see Chapter 1, II Documents 10-12).³⁰ The young Franz Alexander von Kleist, a member of the Prussian delegation, found the opera 'quite worthy' of Mozart whose andante melodies were 'sufficiently beautiful to entice heavenly beings to earth', but since he only heard the opera once, and in a crowded theatre, he did not feel able to offer a more extensive critique (see Chapter 1, II Document 13). Notably, even though poorly attended from the second performance (see Chapter 1, II Document 12), at its last performance on 30 September, the opera was finally received with 'tremendous applause', and 'all the numbers were *applauded*', as Mozart heard from Anton Stadler (see Chapter 1, II Document 15). Three years later, the local critic Franz Xaver Niemetschek observed that *La clemenza di Tito* had failed to please at the premiere despite its 'truly heavenly music' because its serious mood and simple subject matter were unable to interest a crowd occupied with coronation festivities, balls and illuminations; but he wrote that its triumphant revival on 3 December 1794 greatly pleased 'all connoisseurs and cherishers of true beauty' (see Chapter 1, II Document 20). He later repeated some of these observations in his biography of the composer,³¹ noting that the fun-craving crowd at the coronation had been unable to appreciate 'the simple beauties of Mozart's art' (see Chapter 1, II Document 21):

The masterpieces of Rome and Greece are appreciated the more often they are read and the more mature our taste becomes. This applies to the connoisseur as well as non-connoisseurs when listening to Mozart's music, particularly to his dramatic works. Those were our feelings at the first performance of *Don Giovanni* and especially *La clemenza di Tito*!

Indeed, after its revival, *La clemenza di Tito* remained one of the most enduring successes of the Italian opera company in Prague: it seems to have been performed virtually every season, Niemetschek mentioning that it was still heard 'with delight' in 1797 (see Chapter 1, II

Document 21), and the company even chose it for their farewell performance on 24 April 1807.³²

This slow process of appreciation is hardly compatible with the aims of propaganda. Furthermore, members of the imperial court were dissatisfied with the work in 1791, the privy finance minister, Count Karl von Zinzendorf, describing the opera as ‘the most boring spectacle’ (see Chapter 1, II Document 8), and Empress Maria Luisa opining that the ‘grand opera is not so grand, and the music very bad, so that almost all of us went to sleep’ (see Chapter 1, II Document 9). It is difficult to gauge exactly where, in the words of Count Heinrich Franz von Rottenhan (see Chapter 1, II Document 16), the court’s ‘preconceived aversion to Mozart’s composition’ lay, particularly as the frequently cited story about the empress dismissing the opera as a piece of ‘porcheria tedesca’ (German swinishness) is spurious.³³ But it seems likely that the empress and other members of the court reacted against Mozart’s refusal to achieve the ‘grandeur’ usually associated with coronation operas. If the court or the Bohemian Estates had expected a grand propaganda spectacle, they were clearly disappointed.

Of those spectators in the gala premiere who were familiar with Metastasio’s drama, most would have known it from reading the text rather than from hearing it performed in the theatre. No setting of *La clemenza di Tito* had been given in Prague or Vienna for thirty years, nor had it been performed in Florence while Leopold ruled as grand duke.³⁴ However, the foreign visitors would probably have been more familiar with the genre of *opera seria*; the Prague audience had more experience with comic opera. Indeed, much of the local opposition to Mozart’s opera seems to reflect a general prejudice against its genre, which perhaps explains the contrasting verdicts on the two guest singers, the *prima donna* Maria Marchetti Fantozzi and the castrato Domenico Bedini, both of whom were ‘regular’ *seria* performers directly imported from Italy. According to Zinzendorf,

Marchetti sang ‘very well’, and the emperor was ‘enthusiastic about her’ (see Chapter 1, II Document 8). Mozart’s letter also implies a positive verdict on both her and Bedini (see Chapter 1, II Document 15). In spite of this, Niemetschek placed the blame of the opera’s initial lack of success with the local audience partly on the insufficiencies of the two guest stars, whom he compared unfavourably to the singers of the 1794 revival. He described Marchetti as a ‘*prima donna* who sang more with her hands than with her throat, and whom one was obliged to take for a madwoman’, and the ‘miserable castrato’ Bedini as a ‘mutilated person whose shapeless mass of flesh frightened us whenever he appeared and was so odd in relation to his bastard voice’ (see Chapter 1, II Document 20). This harsh criticism seems to reflect a more general criticism of the perceived unnaturalness of *opera seria* with its old-fashioned rhetorical acting style and its soprano heroes. Later, in his biography of Mozart, Niemetschek went on to observe that Mozart had been ‘compelled to write brilliant arias’ for the two singers specifically contracted for the coronation festivities, and that the arias he wrote stood ‘far above the usual supply of bravura songs’ (see Chapter 1, II Document 21), which again implies a negative attitude towards *opera seria*. Niemetschek does not name the singer of the role of Vitellia in the 1794 revival, but she was almost certainly the twenty-year-old Polish soprano Antonia Campi who, as Antonina Miklaszewicz, had created the role of Servilia in 1791, and had since risen to become the company’s *prima donna* in serious roles.³⁵ In 1811 and 1813 she sang Vitellia in the first German-language production in Vienna, alongside Siboni as Titus, and she also sang the role in Leipzig in 1818.³⁶ Campi was rarely admired for her acting skills, and was frequently criticised for over-ornamenting Mozart’s music. Nonetheless, she was known as an accomplished vocalist, a quality that Niemetschek picks up by inference. Having lambasted the original Vittelia, he writes without naming the singer, that no aria is ‘so charming, so filled with sweet melancholy, with such a wealth of

musical beauty' as Vitellia's rondo 23. 'Non più di fiori' (see Chapter 1, II Document 21), which must reflect Campi's performance. The interpretation he heard clearly lacked the aggressiveness with which it is frequently coloured by singers today.³⁷ The Sesto of the 1794 revival was the twenty-six-year-old Teresa Strinasacchi who, according to Niemetschek, surpassed Bedini by excelling with 'good singing and genuine acting' (see Chapter 1, II Document 20). A poem written for her benefit performance on 31 March 1797 on the occasion of her departure from the company, indicate the type and degree of emotional involvement on the part of the audience: 'Willst du glühen uns und beben machen: / Tritt als Sesto vor uns hin!' (Will you make us smoulder and shudder, then appear before us as Sesto!)³⁸

Since Campi and Strinasacchi were both young performers who had received most of their training in Guardasoni's company, they were seen as more 'local' than Marchetti and Bedini, and they fitted better into Niemetschek's nationalistic narrative. Cultural politics notwithstanding, the early reception of *La clemenza di Tito* in Prague also suggests that the opera simultaneously broke two sets of operatic conventions. Its dramatic and musical simplicity differed from traditional *opera seria*, and its sublime seriousness differed from the Viennese *drammi giocosi* to which the Prague audience was accustomed. The Mazzolà/Mozart *La clemenza di Tito* belonged to a new intermediate genre, which can indeed be described as 'semi-serious', the hallmark of which is the appeal to the delicate sensibilities and sympathies of the spectators, hinted at in the references to Campi's and Strinasacchi's portrayals of Vitellia and Sesto.

In light of the preceding analyses of Mazzolà's transformation of Metastasio's original, it is further noteworthy that Niemetschek regarded the numbers surrounding the scene changes at the end of both Acts as the highpoints of the opera, perhaps suggesting that the sense of musical-dramatic build-up and the contrast between the conclusions of the two Acts were central to his emotional experience.

In 1794 he described the trio 10. 'Vengo - - - aspettate - - Sesto' and the 'Act I finale' (i.e. the quintet with chorus 12. 'Deh conservate, o Dei') as 'unsurpassable and perhaps a *non plus ultra* of music' (see Chapter 1, II Document 20), in 1798 describing the finale as 'the most perfect among Mozart's compositions' (see Chapter 1, II Document 21):

[...] expression, character, feeling, all compete with one another to produce the greatest effect. The singing, instrumentation, variety of tone and echo of distant choruses—at each performance these created such emotion and illusion as is seldom apparent at operas.

Niemetschek's other favourite moments were Vitellia's rondo 23. 'Non più di fiori' and the 'final chorus of Act II' (i.e. probably the sextet and chorus 26. 'Tu è ver, m'assolvi, Augusto') about which he wrote that no other chorus was 'so flowing, so magnificent and expressive'. (see Chapter 1, II Document 21).

Perhaps the most significant of Niemetschek's observations regarding the opera's musical dramaturgy, however, is his view that Mozart allows Tito's character to pervade the whole opera: 'There is a certain Greek simplicity, a quiet sublimity in the entire music, which affects the sensitive heart gently but so much the deeper, and which suits Tito's character, the period and the entire subject so correctly' (see Chapter 1, II Document 20); and with his 'fine sensitivity,' Mozart comprehended 'the simplicity, the calm grandeur of the character of Tito and the whole plot, and conveyed this throughout his composition' (see Chapter 1, II Document 21). Indeed Niemetschek later felt compelled to defend Mozart's musical-dramatic conception against its critics (see Chapter 1, II Document 23). There is an interesting correspondence between this perception and that of Søren Kierkegaard concerning *Don Giovanni*, which he heard in Copenhagen in the 1830s, in a production where, significantly, the singers had been coached by Siboni who had sung the roles of both Tito and Don Ottavio in Guardasoni's company in Prague as a young man:³⁹

the very secret of this opera is that its hero is also the force animating the other characters. Don Giovanni's own life is the principle of life in them. His passion sets in motion the passions of the others; it resonates everywhere, it resonates in and sustains the Commendatore's earnest, Elvira's anger, Anna's hate, Ottavio's self-importance, Zerlina's anxiety, Masetto's indignation and Leporello's confusion. As the eponymous hero, as a hero in general, he gives the piece its name. But he is more; he is, if I may so put it, the common denominator.⁴⁰

Niemetschek likewise suggests that Tito is the common denominator in *La clemenza di Tito*. If Mozart's music in *Don Giovanni* seduces the audience with the same sensual charm with which the eponymous hero seduces the women on stage, the music of *La clemenza di Tito* touches the audience with the sweetness, emotion and sublimity with which its eponymous hero forgives Vitellia and Sesto. And it is this ethical-aesthetical transformation of the interlocutors-listeners, effected through the emphasis on pity through Mazzolà's text and the liberating force of Mozart's music, that places *La clemenza di Tito* firmly in the vanguard of the late Enlightenment.

Notes

1. Daniel E. Freeman, 'Mozart, *La clemenza di Tito*, and Aristocratic Reaction in Bohemia', *Music in Eighteenth-Century Life: Cities, Courts, Churches*, ed. Mara E. Parker (Ann Arbor: Steglein Publishing, Inc., 2006), 125–41, esp. 136.
2. Sergio Durante, 'Musicological Introduction', in Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *La clemenza di Tito*, K. 621: *Facsimile of the Autograph Score* (Los Altos CA: The Packard Humanities Institute, 2008), 17–34, esp. 26–27.
3. This is the case, for example, with Helga Lühning's meticulous analysis of Mazzolà's revisions. While acknowledging the many formal innovations (which she tends to attribute to Mozart), she implies that the Saxon court poet, with his 'klischeehafte Sprache und seine Unselbständigkeit in der Formulierung der neuen Passagen' (clichéd language and lack of independence in the formulation of the new passages), remains true to Metastasio's dramatic vision; see *Titus-Vertonungen im 18. Jahrhundert*:

Untersuchungen zur Tradition der opera seria von Hasse bis Mozart (Volkach: Arno Volk – Laaber Verlag, 1983), 107.

4. Gerhard Schepelern, *Giuseppe Siboni: Sangeren – Syngemesteren: Et Afsnit af Operaens Historie ude og hjemme hovedsagelig paa Grundlag af hidtil ubenyttede trykte og utrykte Kilder*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen: Amadeus, 1989) I, 31, 37.

5. In 1791 the title role in *La clemenza di Tito* was created by Antonio Baglioni, who probably sang it again for the 1794 revival and until he left the company in 1795 or early 1796. See John A. Rice, 'Antonio Baglioni, Mozart's First Don Ottavio and Tito, in Italy and Prague', *Böhmische Aspekte des Lebens und des Werkes von W. A. Mozart*, ed. Milada Jonášová and Tomislav Volek (Prague, 2012), 295–321.

6. John A. Rice, *W. A. Mozart: La clemenza di Tito* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 40–44.

7. Durante, 'Musicological Introduction' (2008), 18.

8. Felicity Baker adopts a different perspective in her chapter in this book (see Chapter 4, 'Tito's Burden'), arguing that already Metastasio's 1734 libretto could be understood by enlightened spectators as contributing to an undermining of absolutist monarchy as an institution.

9. Jessica Waldoff, *Recognition in Mozart's Operas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 270.

10. Freeman, 'Aristocratic Reaction in Bohemia', (2006), 140–1.

11. 'CLÉMENCE, s. f. (*Droit polit.*) Favorin la définit, *un acte par lequel le souverain se relâche à propos de la rigueur du Droit*; & Charron l'appelle *une vertu* qui fait incliner le prince à la douceur, à remettre, & relâcher la rigueur de la justice avec jugement & discrétion.' *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, III (Paris: Le Breton, Durand, Briasson and Michel-Antoine David, 1753), 521.

12. 'La *clémence* est la qualité distinctive des monarques. Dans la république où l'on a pour principe la vertu, elle est moins nécessaire. [...] Dans les monarchies où l'on est gouverné par l'honneur, qui souvent exige ce que la loi défend, elle est plus nécessaire.' *L'esprit des lois*, quoted from *Encyclopédie* (1753), 521–2. On the association of clemency with

monarchy, see also Sergio Durante's essay in this book (see Chapter 6, 'Staging Problems and Aesthetics in Mozart's *La clemenza di Tito*').

13. Quotations from Pietro Metastasio's 1734 libretto are taken from *La clemenza di Tito, dramma per musica, da rappresentarsi nella cesarea corte* (Vienna: Gio. Pietro Van Ghelen, 1734).

14. Quotations from Mazzolà's revision are made from *La clemenza di Tito, dramma serio per musica in due atti da rappresentarsi nel Teatro Nazionale di Praga nel settembre 1791. In occasione di solennizzare il giorno dell' incoronazione di Sua Maestà l'Imperatore Leopoldo II* (Prague: Schönfeld, 1791).

15. Notably so, according to Lühning, who regards Mazzolà's revisions as strictly formal in nature, there is 'überhaupt kein Grund ersichtlich' (no obvious reason at all) why the original aria text was not used; see *Titus-Vertonungen* (1983), 95.

16. '[...] cet amour tempere l'ardeur qu'il a pour son bien-être par une répugnance innée à voir souffrir son semblable.' Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (1755), *Collection complète des œuvres* (Genève, 1780–88), I, 74; on-line edition: *Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Collection complète des œuvres*. 17 vol. in 4°, Genève, 1780–88. <https://www.rousseauonline.ch/tm.php> (accessed 20 April 2017). Translation from *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, trans. Franklin Philip (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994/2009), 45.

17. Ibid., 76. 'La bienveillance & l'amitié même sont, à le bien prendre, des productions d'une pitié constante, fixée sur un objet particulier: car désirer que quelqu'un ne souffre point, qu'est-ce autre chose que désirer qu'il soit heureux?' Translation Philip (1994/2009), 46.

18. Ibid., 78. 'Quoiqu'il puisse appartenir à Socrate, & aux esprits de sa trempe, d'acquérir de la vertu par raison, il y a long-tems que le genre humain ne seroit plus, si sa conservation n'eût dépendu que des raisonnemens de ceux qui le composent.' Translation Philip, *Discourse* (1994/2009), 48.

19. Ibid., 77. 'C'est la raison qui engendre l'amour-propre, & c'est la réflexion qui le fortifie; c'est elle qui replie l'homme sur lui-même; c'est

elle qui le sépare de tout ce qui le gêne & l'afflige.' Translation Philip, *Discourse* (1994/2009), 47.

20. 'Der Meister arbeitete auf die höchste Schönheit, unter den angenommenen Umständen des körperlichen Schmerzes. Dieser, in aller seiner entstellenden Heftigkeit, war mit jener nicht zu verbinden. Er mußte ihn also herab setzen; er mußte Schreyen in Seufzen mildern; nicht weil das Schreyen eine unedle Seele verräth, sondern weil es das Gesicht auf eine ekelhafte Weise verstellte. Denn man reisse dem Laokoon in Gedanken nur den Mund auf, und urtheile. Man lasse ihn schreyen, und sehe. Es war eine Bildung, die Mitleid einflößte, weil sie Schönheit und Schmerz zugleich zeigte; nun ist es eine häßliche, eine abscheuliche Bildung geworden, von der man gern sein Gesicht verwendet, weil der Anblick des Schmerzes Unlust erregt, ohne daß die Schönheit des leidenden Gegenstandes diese Unlust in das süsse Gefühl des Mitleids verwandeln kann.' Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Laokoon: oder über die Grenzen der Mahlerey und Poesie. Mit beyläufigen Erläuterungen verschiedener Punkte der alten Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin: Christian Friedrich Voß, 1766), I, 20. Translation by Ellen Frothingham, *Laocoon: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry*, (Mineola NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 2005 [1898]), 13–14.

21. '[...] da sein zorn imer wächst, so muß – da man glaubt die *aria* seye schon zu Ende – das *allegro assai* – ganz in einem andern zeitmaas, und in einem andern Ton – eben den besten *Effect* machen; den, ein Mensch der sich in einem so heftigen zorn befindet, überschreitet alle ordnung, Maas und Ziel, er kent sich nicht – so muß sich auch die Musick nicht mehr kenen – weil aber die leidenschaften, heftig oder nicht, niemal bis zum Eckel [sic] ausgedrückt seyn müssen, und die Musick, auch in der schaudervollsten lage, das ohr niemalen beleidigen, sondern doch dabey vergnügen muß, folglich allzeit Musick bleiben muß, so habe ich keinen fremden ton zum *F* zum ton der *aria* sondern einen befreundten dazu, aber nicht den Nächsten, *D minor*, sondern den weitem, *A minor*, gewählt.' Mozart *Briefe und Dokumente – Online-Edition* (Mozarteum Foundation Salzburg and The Packard Humanities Institute Salzburg); www.dme.mozarteum.at/DME/briefe/letter.php?mid=1195&cat= (accessed 8 December 2017). Translation from *The Letters of Mozart & His Family: Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Edited with an*

Introduction, Notes and Indices, trans. Emily Anderson, 3 vols. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1938), II, 769.

22. ‘Er spricht von Mitleid und Furcht, nicht von Mitleid und Schrecken; und seine Furcht ist durchaus nicht die Furcht, welche uns das bevorstehende Uebel eines Andern, für diesen Andern erweckt, sondern es ist die Furcht, welche aus unserer Aehnlichkeit mit der leidenden Person für uns selbst entspringt; es ist die Furcht, daß die Unglücksfalle, die wir über diese verhängt sehen, uns selbst treffen können; es ist die Furcht, daß wir der bemitleidete Gegenstand selbst werden können. Mit Einem Worte: diese Furcht ist das auf uns selbst bezogene Mitleid.’ Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Sämmtliche Werke. Dreyzehnter Band. Zweyter Theil. Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (Vienna: Anton Pichler, 1801), LXXV (19 January 1768), 41. Translation from *Sources of Dramatic Theory*. Vol. 2: *Voltaire to Hugo*, ed. Michael Sidney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 121.

23. Prague’s National Theatre, which saw the world premieres of *Don Giovanni* and *La clemenza di Tito* took its inspiration from Hamburg, where the first national theatre in the German-speaking world was established. The ‘national theatre’ concept (i.e. a theatre devoted to performance in the national language) was closely associated with Lessing’s name.

24. In her chapter in this volume, however, Felicity Baker stresses that Metastasio has left Vitellia’s motives open to interpretation; it may also be Vitellia’s political ambition that blinds her to her own feelings. See Chapter 4 ‘Tito’s Burden’.

25. ‘Chi per pietà m’addita / Sesto dov’è?’ Act II, scene 6.

26. It is along these lines that Slavoj Žižek bases his interpretation of the opera in ‘*La Clemenza di Tito*, or the Ridiculously-Obscene Excess of Mercy’ published in 2004 on <http://www.lacan.com/zizekopera1.htm> (accessed 8 December 2017). According to Žižek, ‘the pardon does not really abolish the debt, it rather makes it infinite—we are FOREVER indebted to the person who pardoned us. No wonder Tito prefers repentance to fidelity: in fidelity to the Master, I follow him out of respect, while in repentance, what attached me to the Master is the infinite indelible guilt. In this, Tito is a thoroughly Christian master.’ In my view,

however, Žižek does not take the difference between clemency/mercy and the Enlightenment concept of pity sufficiently into account. I would argue that by pitying Sesto, Tito restores Sesto's humanity and thereby relieves him of his debt.

27. I am grateful to John A. Rice for pointing out to me that rondo texts often include the word 'pietà'. Examples from Mozart's operas include Donna Anna's second aria in *Don Giovanni*, which concludes with the lines 'Forse un giorno il cielo ancora / sentirà pietà di me'; Donna Elvira's last aria in the Vienna version of the same opera, which includes the lines 'Ma, tradita e abbandonata, / provo ancor per lui pietà'; and Fiordiligi's final aria in *Così fan tutte*, which opens with the lines 'Per pietà, ben mio, perdona / all'error di un'alma amante'. Notably, all these examples represent emotional climaxes in a final Act, and in the rondos for Donna Anna, Fiordiligi and Vitellia the plea for pity would seem to be addressed indirectly to the audience. Rice suggests that the rondo as an aria-type may have been associated by late eighteenth-century composers (and not only Mozart) with the enlightened concept of pity.

28. The parallel between the two crowd scenes would have been further emphasised with the staging strategies outlined in Sergio Durante's article, Chapter Six 'Staging Problems and Aesthetics in Mozart's *La clemenza di Tito*.

29. For an alternative interpretation of the reliance of Tito's arias on traditional *opera seria* forms see Jette Barnholdt Hansen, 'Mozart as Epideictic Rhetorician', Chapter 5 in this volume.

30. Only Johann Debrois (see Chapter 1, II Document 14) maintains that the opera was received with the 'applause' that the poet, the composer and the singers 'fully deserved', and that the imperial couple seemed to leave the theatre 'satisfied'. However, Debrois also claims that the performance began as scheduled at 7pm (in fact, it was delayed until 7.30 or 8.00, due to the late arrival of the imperial family), and that the *prima donna* was the Portuguese mezzosoprano Luísa Todi (in fact, it was the Italian soprano Maria Marchetti Fantozzi), which suggests that he was neither present in the theatre himself nor relied on oral accounts.

31. Scholars are not agreed on the identity of the unnamed author of the critique of Prague's theatrical scene (including a review of the revival

of *La clemenza di Tito*) published in *Allgemeines europäisches Journal* in 1794/5. It is a two-part review, the first part (1794, see Chapter 1, II Documents 20) signed **k, and the second part, published as ‘Fortsetzung der Nachrichten über das Theater zu Prag’, *Allgemeines europäisches Journal*, II/3 (March 1795), 215, signed N.k. The abbreviations suggest that the author’s name begins with ‘N’ and ends with ‘k’. Niemetschek is a good fit. Furthermore, stylistic similarities between Niemetschek’s 1798 Mozart biography (see Chapter 1, II Documents 21) and the formulation, opinion and focus of the 1794/5 review further imply, if not confirm, that Niemetschek is the unnamed author.

32. Our knowledge of the Prague repertoire is incomplete, but the *Allgemeines europäisches Journal* included several years’ worth of theatre calendars, which have been collected and reproduced in Tomislav Volek (ed.), *Miscellanea musicologica* vol. 16: *Repertoire Nosticovského divadla v Praze z let 1794, 1796–98*, (Prague: Charles University, 1961). After the revival of *La clemenza di Tito* on 3 December 1794, it was performed twice more in the same month. We have no calendar for 1795, but in 1796 it was performed thirteen times; in 1797 four times (and on four evenings, one of the Acts was given in a double bill with a non-operatic show); and in 1798 seven times. On 1 April 1796 *La clemenza di Tito* was performed to the benefit of the entire company, which suggests that it was a great success. Giuseppe Siboni claimed to have sung the title role in Prague for four or five years (see Chapter 1, II Document 24) i.e. between the end of 1800 and late spring 1805, furthermore, and according to the *Indice de’ teatrali spettacoli*, it was certainly performed in the 1803–4 season; see Schepeleyn, *Giuseppe Siboni* (1989), I, 39. It was also performed twice in the 1806–7 season; see *Prager Theater-Almanach auf das Jahr 1808* (Prague: Caltreischen Buchhandlung, 1807), 31–32.

33. For the origin of this anecdote, see Joseph Heinz Eible, ‘Una porcheria tedesca?’ Zur Uraufführung von Mozarts *La clemenza di Tito*, *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, 31 (1976), 329–334. Eible points out that the immediate source is Alfred Meissner’s highly unreliable *Rococabilder: Nach den Aufzeichnungen meines Grossvaters* from 1871, although Otto Jahn, in the fourth volume of his *W. A. Mozart* from 1859, had already referred to a Prague tradition, according to which the empress dismissed German music in general as ‘porcheria’. On the other hand,

German music critics in the first three decades of the nineteenth century invariably attributed the phrase ‘Che porcheria tedesca!’ to the elderly Giovanni Paisiello when speaking about a composition by Joseph Haydn. Apparently, Paisiello made this remark when hearing Haydn’s cantata *Arianna a Naxos* in Naples; see ‘Ueber den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Tonkunst in Italien’, *Ephemeriden der italiänischen Litteratur, Gesetzgebung und Kunst für Deutschland*, ed. Joseph Wismayr, IV/6 (1804), 301–9, esp. 307, but Carl Friedrich Cramer changed the story, making him refer to *Die Schöpfung* instead, in *Individualitäten aus und über Paris*, 1 (Amsterdam: Kunst- und Industrie-Comptoir, 1806), 134. Later, the phrase seems to have become a proverbial way of illustrating Italians’ alleged prejudicial attitude towards German music. For example, the singer Signora Stelle-Numi uses the phrase when dismissing arias from Mozart’s *Le nozze di Figaro* and *Don Giovanni* in Julius von Voss’ comedy *Berlin im Jahre 1824*, Act II, scene 1, in *Auswahl neuer Lustspiele für das Königliche Hof-Theater in Berlin* (Berlin: Schüppelschen Buchhandlung, 1824). Since the anti-Italian attitudes of German nationalism flourished in Bohemia in the first half of the nineteenth century, Prague traditions surrounding the reception of *La clemenza di Tito* are likely to have been influenced by the earlier tradition, which attributed the infamous phrase to Paisiello. In any case, the empress is more likely to have commented on the opera in French than in Italian.

34. For a list of the settings of Metastasio’s libretto, see Lühning, *Titus-Vertonungen* (1983), 504–22.

35. Ian Woodfield has recently questioned whether ‘Sig:^{ra} Antonini’, who created the role of Servilia (see Chapter 1, II Document 6) was really Antonina Miklaszewicz, an identification first suggested by Walter Brauneis in ‘Wer war Mozarts “Sig[no]ra Antonini” in der Prager Uraufführung von *La Clemenza di Tito*?’, *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Stiftung Mozaerteum*, XLVII (1999), 32–40. Woodfield points out that the singer’s first name is elsewhere given as ‘Anna’ (see Chapter 1, II Document 18); see *Performing Operas for Mozart: Impresarios, Singers and Troupes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 172–3. It seems more likely to me, however, that ‘Anna Antonini’ was the Italian-sounding stage name used by Miklaszewicz before her marriage to Gaetano Campi shortly after the premiere of *La clemenza di Tito*.

36. Antonia Campi left Prague in the summer of 1801 along with her husband. She probably sang Vitellia with Guardasoni's company until then. Her portrayal of the role in Vienna and Leipzig is described in *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, XIII/8 (20 February 1811), 146; XV/11 (17 March 1813), 193; *Der Sammler, ein Unterhaltungsblatt*, VI/36 (4 March 1813), 144; *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, XVIII/215 (2 November 1818), 1739; *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*, XII/181 (24 November 1818), 1124; Eduard Genast: *Aus dem Tagebuche eines alten Schauspielers*, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Voigt & Günther, 1862), II, 119–20.

37. The aggression is possibly related to the fact that Vitellia tends to be sung by rather heavy voices today, sometimes even by mezzo-sopranos. However, as suggested by Campi's other Mozart roles in Guardasoni's company (Countess Almaviva in *Le nozze di Figaro*, Donna Anna in *Don Giovanni*, Fiordiligi in *Così fan tutte* and Astrifiamante (the Queen of the Night) in *Il flauto magico*), her voice was probably very far from those of today's dramatic sopranos or mezzo-sopranos; see Woodfield, *Performing Operas for Mozart* (2012), 224, 226. The same seems to have been the case with Luigia Caravoglia (later Sandrini), who succeeded Campi as the last *prima donna* of Guardasoni's company, from 1802 to 1807. When Sandrini-Caravoglia sang Vitellia in the 1815 Dresden premiere, one critic complained that she lacked 'necessary power in the lower notes, which are meant to have such great effect in her arias'. 'Was den Gesang anbetrifft, so vermisste man zwar die nöthige Stärke in den, auf so grosse Wirkung berechneten tiefern Tönen ihrer Arien'. *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* XVII/8 (22 February 1815), 132. On Luigia Caravoglia in the Prague production of *La clemenza di Tito*, see Marie Börner-Sandrini, *Erinnerungen einer alten Dresdnerin* (Dresden: Warnatz & Lehmann, 1876), 41–42.

38. The poem is reproduced in 'Strinasacchi, Theresia', in Gottfried Johann Dlabacž (ed.), *Allgemeines historisches Künstler-Lexikon für Böhmen und zum Theil auch für Mähren und Schlesien*, 3 vols. (Prague: Gottlieb Haase, 1815), III. The last time Strinasacchi sang Sesto in Prague was probably on 20 March 1797, when Act II was given in a double bill with another show. The next time *La clemenza di Tito* was given, on 6 and 10 November, the German singer Demoiselle Doliagny was praised for her debut in a male role in the production, suggesting that she had

taken over Sesto. See Volek, *Repertoire Nosticovského divadla* (1961), 116, 135–36.

39. See Tessing Schneider, 'Kierkegaard and the Copenhagen Production of Mozart's *Don Giovanni*', *European Romantic Review*, 29/1 (2018), 43–50.

40. '[...] det er netop Hemmeligheden i denne Opera, at Helten deri tillige er Kraften i de øvrige Personer, *Don Juans* Liv er Livsprincipet i dem. Hans Lidenskab sætter de andres Lidenskab i Bevægelse, hans Lidenskab gjenlyder overalt, den gjenlyder i og bærer *Commandantens* Alvor, *Elvires* Vrede, *Annas* Had, *Ottavios* Vigtighed, *Zerlines* Angst, *Mazettos* Forbittrelse, *Leporellos* Forvirring. Som Helten i Operaen er *Don Juan* Stykkets Nævner, han giver det som Helten i Almindelighed dets Navn, men han er Mere, han er, om jeg saa maa sige, General-Nævner.' Søren Kierkegaard, *Enten–Eller: Et Livs-Fragment*, 2 vols. (1843) I, 121. Quoted from the digital edition of Søren Kierkegaard Forskningscenteret, Copenhagen 2013: www.sks.dk (accessed 20 April 2017). The translation is taken from *Either/Or: A Fragment of Life*, trans. Alastair Hannay (London: Penguin Books, 1992/2004), 121.