

MICHAEL TALBOT
University of Liverpool

SOME REMARKS ON THE PASTICCIO SONATA AND CONCERTO IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

IZVLEČEK: Medtem ko so operni *pasticcii* dobro poznani sestavni deli glasbenega življenja prve polovice 18. stoletja, so instrumentalni *pasticcii* iz istega obdobja v obliki sonat ali koncertov veliko manj znani in raziskani. Članek obravnava nekaj presenetljivih primerov drugega tipa iz dveh precej različnih virov in okvirov: (1) rokopisne antologije sonat in drugih skladb za flavto, ohranjene v Bonnu; (2) repertoarja dresdenske dvorne kapele pod vodstvom Johanna Georga Pisendla. Kaže, da je bilo ustvarjanje *pasticcio* včasih presenetljivo spretno in glasbeno občutljivo delo.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: Antonio Vivaldi, Johann Georg Pisendel, Tomaso Albinoni, simfonija, Dresden

ABSTRACT: Whereas operatic *pasticcios* are familiar constituents of the musical life of the first half of the eighteenth century, instrumental *pasticcios* of the same period in the form of sonatas or concertos are much less well known and studied. The article examines some striking instances of the second type taken from two quite different sources and contexts: (1) a manuscript anthology of sonatas and other compositions for flute preserved in Bonn; (2) the repertory of the Dresden Hofkapelle under the leadership of Johann Georg Pisendel. The creation of *pasticcios* turns out to have been at times a surprisingly skilful and musically sensitive operation.

KEYWORDS: Antonio Vivaldi, Johann Georg Pisendel, Tomaso Albinoni, *sinfonia*, Dresden

APASTICCIO certainly has a bad odour. As English synonyms for this word as it is employed in everyday Italian, the second edition of the *New Grove* proposes “jumble”, “hotch-potch” and “pudding”,¹ and there are some other, more strongly pejorative uses, such as the “mess” that one can get oneself into. In the history of the word’s usage as a more or less precise musical (later, also musicological) term, which, as that dictionary tells us, dates back

¹ Price, “Pasticcio”, 213. This article reappears unmodified in *Grove Music Online*.

to the 1730s, the term has been applied by contemporaries and later commentators almost exclusively to operas, mainly of the eighteenth century. Indeed, Curtis Price's *New Grove* article on the subject offers as its primary definition: "an opera made up of various pieces from different composers or sources and adapted to a new or existing libretto" and confines its discussion to the operatic domain. True, opera is, and will remain, the principal area within which the concept of a musical pasticcio is applied, but I would like to draw attention in this contribution to a second type of eighteenth-century pasticcio, wholly instrumental in nature, for which the same label is appropriate, though not yet so firmly established in common perception or usage.

THE CHARACTER OF PASTICCIOS

It is helpful to start by defining boundaries. First, a musical pasticcio is a single work — not, for example, an anthology of similar works — containing discrete contributions (generally taking the form of separate movements) by upwards of two composers. This excludes instances of self-borrowing by individual composers (although by employing the term "self-pastiche" Price rightly recognizes that there are some parallels between this practice and that of genuine pasticcios) as well as non-disclosed plagiarism.² Second, a pasticcio is not, in careful usage, a voluntary or contingent (through *force majeure*) harnessing of separate compositional talents. The term would not apply to the opera *Muzio Scevola* (London, 1721), for which Handel, Bononcini and Amadei, by decision of the Royal Academy of Music, each set one act, or to the serenata *Andromeda liberata* (Venice, 1726), a tribute to the visiting Cardinal Ottoboni to which numerous locally based composers including Vivaldi, Albinoni, Porta and Porpora contributed arias — or (skipping a century) to the triple-authored "F.A.E." violin sonata of Brahms, Schumann and Dietrich. Nor would it be appropriate for the opera *Antigono, tutore di Filippo, re di Macedonia* (Venice, 1724), where Giovanni Porta took over the work of completing the score after the contracted composer, Albinoni, fell ill.

In fact, the most satisfactory way to view a pasticcio is to regard it as a compilation usually made, or at least approved, by a single, controlling person in which the constituent units (differently from the case of an ordinary anthology) are not complete, free-standing pieces but themselves constitute the exactly equivalent separate units taken over from an existing multi-movement composition and made to function in a similar way within their new context. Sometimes, this controlling person makes personal contributions to the pasticcio (this would apply, for instance, to the recitatives composed by Handel from scratch for his numerous operatic pasticcios), sometimes not. In this type of appropriation the skill demonstrated by the *pasticheur* is not the equivalent of personal musical creativity; but at its best it becomes a skill of selection, perhaps enhanced by some marginally creative retouching. One could without exaggeration liken the operation of a *pasticheur*, using a modern analogy, to that of a professional photographer as opposed to a professional painter. The photographer's talent lies principally in selection — the choice of a particular moment or view to take the shot in such a way as to produce a good combination of subject and visual composition that after a little processing can produce a result

² Ibid., 215.

closely comparable in appearance and aesthetic effect to what a good artist working in the tradition of naturalism might paint. In parenthesis, one might add that certain highly regarded visual artists (painters or sculptors) have themselves sometimes made use of already existing *objets trouvés* that they form into a collage, which is as much a pasticcio as anything in music. Such a skill is not to be disparaged. However, within the musical domain its eighteenth-century counterpart opens up, to the modern way of thinking, a can of worms describable as an infringement of the “single-authorship imperative” combined with a violation of “intellectual property rights”.³ Such descriptions are of course anachronistic, although one must also acknowledge, as Price relates, that quite a few contemporary connoisseurs of music argued against pasticcios along broadly similar lines, albeit generally with good humour and at any rate with little effect on public opinion.⁴

Whether in vocal or instrumental music, pasticcios were rarely, if ever, regarded as intrinsically preferable artistically to single-authored compositions. There were always very mundane practical factors encouraging their creation. For operas, these included: (1) a reduction in newly composed material, leading to lower costs and perhaps a saving in preparation time; (2) the admission to the score of *arie di baule* brought to the production by the singers themselves, thereby gratifying them and the public as well as reducing the former’s need to learn new material; (3) the opportunity for the compiler to hand-pick arias to suit cast members; (4) the flexibility to quickly introduce replacement or additional arias taken from any suitable source during the course of the production. For instrumental pasticcios — generally in the form of sonatas or concertos — the practical inducements to abandon single authorship were quite different but no less attractive.

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY INSTRUMENTAL PASTICCIOS: THE GENERAL BACKGROUND

There are many reasons why instrumental pasticcios are much less well known to the scholarly community and the wider public than their vocal counterparts, but being less common is not one of them. Rather, the reasons lie in the smaller scale of the compositions, the higher incidence (once their multiple composers are identified) of minor and unfamiliar names and, most important, the sheer lack of clues to authorship beyond the evidence of the notes themselves. Not all anonymously preserved instrumental works are pasticcios, but the great majority of instrumental pasticcios fail to advertise themselves as such by naming any of the composers (where they do, this is likely to be only one composer). The correct impression given is that the compilation of instrumental pasticcios was usually a furtive affair undertaken at a domestic or institutional level for private purposes, without much thought of giving these pieces a wider circulation.

³ “Single-authorship imperative” is my own coinage. It draws on ideas advanced in Talbot, “Genuine and the Spurious”; and Talbot, “Work-Concept and Composer-Centredness”; regarding the relatively low priority accorded by eighteenth-century music-lovers and concert-goers to composer recognition (as opposed to genre and especially performer recognition). The claim on audience attention of an eighteenth-century composer was often at a level roughly comparable with that of the choreographer for a ballet performance today.

⁴ See Price, “Pasticcio”, 214–215.

In that respect, the instrumental pasticcio distinguishes itself fundamentally from the very public-facing operatic pasticcio.

What were these private purposes? There were two in particular: the teaching of amateurs (where the emphasis was on keeping technical demands and length within chosen boundaries) and the supply of new repertoire to individual instrumentalists and ensembles in a heavily customized form that in some way exploited their capabilities more completely than the available unmodified works did. Occasionally, its inclusion in a pasticcio could become a convenient means of extending the exposure of a favourite movement. Equally, the importation of a “foreign” movement could serve to normalize the movement structure in accordance with contemporary expectations. To give one example: eighteenth-century Italian and Italianate *sinfonias* intended for the opera house almost invariably possessed three movements configured Fast–Slow–Fast, whereas multi-movement “church” *sinfonias* used as solemn introductions — Haydn’s symphonies nos. 22 and 49 are late examples of this type — were often cast in four movements configured Slow–Fast–Slow–Fast. Selecting a suitable slow movement from an external source to serve as an introductory movement could be enough to convert the first type into the second. It goes without saying that the movements that had achieved a degree of popularity within their original work were always likely to become the prime candidates for export. Similarly, works rescored for a medium different from the original one provided fertile ground for the *pasticheur*, since it was often easier, and sometimes musically more convincing, to import a new movement (even by a different composer) than to adapt an existing one satisfactorily. For example, a violin sonata movement containing multiple stopping, notes at the extremes of the instrument’s compass and passage-work involving rapid and wide arpeggiation might well prove impossible to adapt for a treble-register woodwind instrument without unacceptable disfigurement, leading the arranger to seek a substitute from elsewhere. In the next two sections I will continue the discussion of instrumental pasticcios by revisiting an individual manuscript and an institutional repertory, about both of which I have written on earlier occasions.

THE PASTICCIO SONATAS FOR FLUTE IN BONN, D-BNU, HS. S 2981

The manuscript and rare books department of the University Library in Bonn (D-BNu) possesses an untitled anthology containing fourteen items, principally solo sonatas for transverse flute (two items are for a pair of flutes), apparently dating from the second half of the 1720s.⁵ Only one of the items was originally written for, or included, that instrument (item 8, which is an arrangement for two unaccompanied flutes of a trio sonata by Pepusch for flute, violin and bass), and it seems that the album was prepared for the end-user, who was probably an amateur player, by a music teacher or similarly qualified person.⁶ All the items are in one way or another arrangements, reflecting the fact that until the late 1720s the transverse flute was — except in

⁵ This manuscript is examined in detail in Talbot, “Bonn Manuscript S 2981”.

⁶ This unknown arranger liked to add flute-friendly ornamentation to the upper lines and — but less happily — to make brutal cuts in the music, either because of an idiosyncratic aversion to repetition *per se* or to protect the end-user from excessive physical exertion.

France — a “newcomer” to amateur music-making that lacked an extensive purpose-written repertoire of the kind that had long been available to violinists and recorder-players. For a while, therefore, privately undertaken arrangements of violin and recorder music supplied the necessary stop-gap.⁷

The Bonn manuscript is remarkable for its cosmopolitan character. There are hints that it was prepared in England, for the latest work in it is a duet (in which the singers become flutes) from Handel’s opera *Ottone*, premiered in London in 1723, while the sonatas it contains include music by composers active in Britain (Barsanti, Pepusch and Festing), whose publications from John Walsh and his confrères did not circulate widely in continental Europe. But in other respects it embraces an admirably wide cross-section of European composers. From Italy we have Albinoni, Vivaldi and the inescapable Corelli; from France, Senaillé and the Italian émigrés Mascitti and Besseghi; from Belgium, Jean Baptiste Loeillet “de Gand” and from Germany, Telemann and Johann Jakob Kress. Much, but far from all, of the material was available in published sources. The arranger may well have been a native of France or Wallonia, for the titling of the pieces contains certain gallicisms.⁸ However, one must be cautious in drawing that inference, seeing that French was at that time a *lingua franca* throughout cultivated Europe.

The content of the album’s six pasticcio sonatas (items 1, 2, 6, 10, 11 and 12), so far as I have been able to ascertain it, is set out in Table 1. There is great consistency among the members of this group. Every single sonata is in four movements configured Slow–Fast–Slow–Fast. Between around 1700 and 1730 the vast majority of solo sonatas in every country adhered to this structural design, which I like to describe as the “post-Corellian consensus”.⁹ The tonal relationship of the interior slow movement to the home key is also absolutely typical: half of the sonatas opt for the relative major or minor key; the other half remain in the tonic. Another progressive feature, one brought out into the open by the sourcing of the borrowed movements, is the complete interchangeability of characteristics between the two slow movements (first and third) and the two fast movements (second and fourth), respectively. In the sonatas of Corelli and his closest contemporaries, the opening pair of movements tends to be more formal (stately rather than emotion-laden, spacious rather than concentrated) than the closing pair. All this changes in the next generation (with Vivaldi as the prime mover), where a first movement can perfectly well be recycled as a third movement in a new composition, or vice-versa. For the *pasticheur*, this new freedom is a godsend. Looking down the sixth and second columns of Table 1, one notices how many borrowed interior slow movements (III) have been brought forward to the front of the composition (I). For slow movements, this flexibility has another advantage: that if the interior slow movement in the parent work departs from the home key, its new key can be treated in exactly

⁷ This is equally true for the Cheney Flute Sonatas Manuscript, a slightly earlier (c. 1715) manuscript album of English provenance containing twenty-four anonymous flute sonatas, which has a small overlap of content with the Bonn manuscript. On this fascinating source in private ownership, see Talbot, “Cheney Flute Sonatas Manuscript”. There also exist eighteenth-century pasticcios created by the addition of supplementary movements from external sources to otherwise complete, single-authored sonatas, as discussed in Talbot, “Silva Box 17–1”.

⁸ Examples are the spelling “Traversse” (for “Traverse”, meaning the transverse flute) and the insistence everywhere on French “Menuet” for the name of the dance-type.

⁹ The appellation is a little ironic in view of the fact that it was in his trio sonatas (Opp. 1–4) rather than in his solo sonatas (Op. 5) that Corelli predominantly adopted this movement plan.

the same way as a home key when it becomes recycled as the opening movement of a pasticcio sonata — a situation that widens the arranger’s choice and can sometimes avoid the chore of transposition.

Table 1 | The pasticcio sonatas in D-BNu, Abt. Hss. u. Rara, S 2918

NO.	MOV ^T *	KEY [†]	COMPOSER	WORK [‡]	MOV ^T *	KEY [†]	OTHER COMMENTS
1	I	D	unidentified				
	II	D	A. M. Besseghi	Op. 1, no. 7 (VI)	IV	D	
	III	D	A. Vivaldi	RV 810 (VI)	III	D	
	IV	D	unidentified				= Menuet (C) in B-Ac, HS 177761, p. 57
2	I	g	J. B. Senaillé	3 ^{me} Livre, no. 2 (VI)	III	a	Key of Senaillé sonata: A
	II	g	J. B. Senaillé	1 ^{re} Livre, no. 6 (VI)	II	g	
	III	Bb	F. Barsanti	Op. 1, no. 3 (Rec)	III	Bb	Key of Barsanti sonata: g
	IV	g	F. Barsanti	Op. 1, no. 4 (Rec)	IV	c	
6	I	G	J. C. Pepusch	Op. 1, no. 3 (Rec)	I	G	
	II	G	M. Mascitti	Op. 2, no. 4 (VI)	I	Bb	
	III	G	J. J. Kress	Sonata 5 (VI)	I	Bb	= D-Bsa, SA 4646(5)
	IV	G	unidentified				
10	I	g	T. Albinoni	<i>Sonate a violino solo</i> (1718), no. 1 (VI)	III	d	Key of Albinoni sonata: d
	II	g	J. B. Loeillet	Op. 3, no. 12 (Rec)	II	e	
	III	Bb	T. Albinoni	<i>Sonate a violino solo</i> (1718), no. 2	III	Bb	Key of Albinoni sonata: g
	IV	g	J. B. Loeillet	Op. 3, no. 5 (Rec)	III	c	
11	I	e	G. P. Telemann	<i>Six sonates à violon seul</i> , no. 4	III	e	Key of Telemann sonata: G
	II	e	unidentified				
	III	e	A. M. Besseghi	Op. 1, no. 2 (VI)	III	d	Key of Besseghi sonata: F
	IV	e	unidentified				
12	I	Bb	J. B. Senaillé	3 ^{me} Livre, no. 6 (VI)	III	A	Key of Senaillé sonata: A. Notated there in $\frac{3}{2}$, not $\frac{3}{4}$
	II	Bb	J. B. Senaillé	1 ^{re} Livre, no. 10 (VI)	I	A	
	III	g	unidentified				

NO.	MOVT*	KEY†	COMPOSER	WORK‡	MOVT*	KEY†	OTHER COMMENTS
	IV	Bb	J. B. Senaillé	3 ^{me} Livre, no. 6 (VI)	IV	A	

* Roman numerals denote movements.

† Major keys are in upper case, minor keys in lower case.

‡ The violin is abbreviated 'Vl', the recorder 'Rec'.

One might easily believe that it would be easy to spot pasticcios through disparities in the musical style of their movements or a disunity in their thematic material. In fact, this is far from being the case. Part of the reason is the general convergence and internationalization of style in the genres of both sonata and concerto during the early decades of the eighteenth century, but a much stronger factor is the power of rational — perhaps sometimes also intuitive — selection on the arranger's part. Particularly in items 1 and 6, and to a lesser but nevertheless perceptible extent in the other four sonatas, the incipits of the four movements show commonalities in thematic profile that through the normal repetition and development processes successfully knit the work together. These are no different in effect from the same features found in single-authored compositions, which often lead commentators to speak of quasi-cyclic inter-movement relationships (with the baroque variation suite as the ancient prototype).

Music example 1 presents a full set of incipits for items 1 and 6, respectively. In item 1 the dominant melodic shape is a rise from D via E to F# (with an optional continuation of the rise via G to A) before falling back to low A. In item 6 there is both a principal arched melodic shape, D–E–D, and a subsidiary rising one, D–G. One must have at least a sneaking regard for the *pasticheur* responsible for these choices.

Music example 1 | Incipits for items 1 and 6 in D-BNu, Hs. S 2918

The image displays musical notation for two items, labeled 'ITEM 1' and 'ITEM 6'. Each item has three staves of music. Item 1's first staff is labeled 'Adagio' and 'Allegro', with a treble clef, a key signature of one sharp (F#), and a common time signature. The second staff is labeled 'Sicilliana Largo' and 'Minuet', with a treble clef, a key signature of one sharp, and a 12/8 time signature. Item 6's first staff is labeled 'Adagio' and 'Andante', with a treble clef, a key signature of one sharp, and a common time signature. The second staff is labeled 'Sicilliana Adagio' and 'Allegro', with a treble clef, a key signature of one sharp, and a 12/8 time signature. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and trills.

It will not have escaped notice that the anonymity of all six sonatas is — and was doubtless intended to be — a convenient mask for their status as pasticcio compositions.¹⁰ One can at least give the arranger credit for not claiming mendaciously that any of them was by a named single composer. When pasticcios rub shoulders with single-authored works within the same collection, it can happen that the latter, too, become deprived of a composer’s name, perhaps for the very purpose of normalizing anonymity.¹¹ In this perspective it becomes clear that a comprehensive trawl of anonymous sources for sonatas and concertos of this period in RISM’s database (making maximum use of the Virtual Keyboard to flush out concordances), and particularly those in manuscript albums, would certainly uncover many more pasticcio compositions than are currently identified.

THE DRESDEN *HOFKAPELLE* AND PISENDEL’S PASTICCIOS

There is a vast literature on the Dresden court orchestra under Friedrich August I “der Starke” (r. 1694–1733) and his homonymous son (r. 1733–1763) — both men electors of Saxony and concurrently kings of Poland — and also on Johann Georg Pisendel (1687–1755), the highly talented violinist-composer who joined the *Hofkapelle* as a permanent member in 1712 and rose to become its official concertmaster in 1730 (perhaps starting to serve in this role on an “acting-up” basis a little earlier). The monograph on Pisendel by Kai Köpp remains the most useful comprehensive study of this musician and his importance for orchestral practice in Dresden.¹²

Right from his time as a choirboy in Ansbach in the first years of the eighteenth century, when he was given the task of copying out music for the choirmaster, Pisendel was a fluent and assiduous musical scribe who soon put this activity to good use as an equally diligent collector of music, composer, musical director and arranger. Even before his position as *Konzertmeister* gave him the authority to call on those fellow members of the *Hofkapelle* who officially served as copyists to make pasticcios under his instructions, Pisendel had prepared himself for more radical musical interventions by cultivating the habit of tinkering in small ways with the works of others, generally in the course of copying them or scoring them up from separate parts. These interventions could result in changes to instrumentation, the lengthening or shortening of movements, modifications to inner parts or the elaboration of melodies and figurations.¹³

¹⁰ Their only heading is in fact “Solo”.

¹¹ This is the case with the arrangements of the second concerto from Albinoni’s Op. 2 (1700) and of the Pusch trio sonata (Cook 2:025), respectively items 8 and 13 in the Bonn manuscript, although the four sonatas by Corelli and the single sonata by Festing are credited to their authors. The arranger may of course also have been shy about leaving clues to the extent of his arrangement in the first two instances, seeing that it entailed the omission of instrumental parts.

¹² Köpp, *Johann Georg Pisendel*.

¹³ A not untypical case is an Albinoni violin concerto in C major (labelled *Co 2* in the catalogue in Talbot, *Tommaso Albinoni*). An early reworking by Pisendel (in D-DI, Mus.2199-O-2) features the second, third and fourth kinds of modification described, while a later version (housed under the same shelfmark) chooses instead to inflate the original form of the concerto into a concerto grosso with two solo and two ripieno violin parts, as well as two oboes. The operations are described in Talbot, “Question of Authorship”, 19–20.

His sojourn in Venice and visits to many other Italian musical centres in 1716–1717 — during which he added to his official task of being part of the *Kammermusik* (an elite group of Dresden musicians providing entertainment for the future Friedrich August II) the private mission of making contact with prominent local musicians and acquiring their compositions through donation, purchase or his own copying — famously brought him into contact with Antonio Vivaldi, who became his teacher and friend. Vivaldi inscribed at least six concertos and five sonatas to him, but Pisendel made his own copies of many times that number of his mentor’s works. One copy was of a highly interesting, but also rather mystifying, “Sinfonia à 4 Del. Sig.^r Ant.^o Vivaldi” preserved among that large part of the composer’s private archive (mostly of his own works) today held by the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria in Turin.¹⁴ That work was written out by the copyist known to Vivaldians as “Scribe 4”, who since the 1990s has been generally accepted to be Vivaldi’s father Giovanni Battista on apparently cogent contextual evidence,¹⁵ but who turns out, after recent research, to be the composer’s brother-in-law Giovanni Antonio Mauro, now revealed to be a professional music copyist.¹⁶ Mauro was the person Vivaldi most readily turned to, as if to an amanuensis, for the production of authoritative and calligraphic copies of his music. The main paper type used for this manuscript is B16 in Paul Everett’s classification, datable approximately to 1715–1716.¹⁷

The first three movements of this apparently four-movement sinfonia, numbered RV 192 in the Vivaldi catalogue, are in an improbably antiquated style recalling the primitive concertos written before and around 1700 by Bolognese composers (Torelli et al.) and quickly imitated by Venetian ones such as Albinoni.¹⁸ A clue to their possible authorship comes from two linked but originally separately stored fragments preserved in the so-called “Schrank II” collection (named after the original cupboard housing the bulk of the *Hofkapelle*’s instrumental music) in the Dresden Library.¹⁹ These comprise, respectively, a copy of the Violino Concertino (principal violin) part for the same three movements and a Basso part for them headed by a title page reading “Concerto a 6[:] 3 Violini Viola et Cembalo di Sig: Androvandini [*sic*]” and followed by some indecipherable musical annotations written out by Pisendel. The main copyist, whose hand appears in some other Schrank II manuscripts, is obviously not Italian (otherwise, he would have written “del Sig:”, not “di Sig:”), and it is most likely that he was active in Germany together with Pisendel prior to the latter’s move to Dresden.

¹⁴ Shelfmark: I-Tn, Foà 31, fols. 148r–153v.

¹⁵ The suggestion that “Scribe 4” was G. B. Vivaldi was originally mooted in 1990 in Everett, “Vivaldi’s Italian Copyists”, 29–37. Over the years, opinion among Vivaldians less cautious than Everett himself in accepting this identification hardened to the extent of becoming an orthodoxy.

¹⁶ Ambrosiano, “I Mauro e Antonio Vivaldi”, 3–18.

¹⁷ Everett, “Towards a Vivaldi Chronology”, 740.

¹⁸ Representative publications including concertos of this early type are Torelli’s *Sinfonie a tre e concerti a quattro*, Op. 5 (Bologna, 1692); Torelli’s *Concerti musicali*, Op. 6 (Augsburg, 1698); and Albinoni’s *Sinfonie e concerti a cinque* (Venice, 1700).

¹⁹ This is the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden (D-Dl), also referred to by the acronym SLUB. The fragments are today united under the shelfmark Mus.2389–N–7a. Note that the Schrank II collection came after Pisendel’s death to include also his personal collection, which until then had been separate.

Unlike Vivaldi, the Bolognese amateur composer Giuseppe Aldrovandini (1671–1707) is in stylistic terms a fairly plausible candidate for the authorship of the three movements. Moreover, a visit to Venice by him for carnival 1704, when his opera *Pirro* was given at the S. Angelo theatre (the same theatre that in autumn 1705 hosted Vivaldi's overture and arias for a pasticcio, *Creso tolto a le fiamme*, performed under the sole name of Girolamo Polani)²⁰ would have been a very possible route to Vivaldi's acquisition of the music, especially if he was playing in that theatre's orchestra.²¹ On the other hand, it is not unknown for composers of a vocal work to have innocently been given credit in contemporary sources also for its entirely instrumental *sinfonia* in cases where the latter was entrusted to a different composer (Torelli performed this service for Giacomo Antonio Perti on multiple occasions). So there is a small but genuine possibility that Vivaldi undertook this task for Aldrovandini, which, given the necessarily early date (1704), might explain the *sinfonia*'s uncharacteristically "primitive" structural and stylistic features.

It appears that at the point when Mauro copied out the *sinfonia* Vivaldi was satisfied with its third movement, since it concludes, apparently confidently, with the emphatic kind of terminal flourish used to mark the end of works. However, the weakness of this movement must have been all too evident to him. It is modelled not on a typical dance-like *sinfonia* finale but on the *perfidia*-like sections featuring continuous passage-work for a solo violin over a simple chordal accompaniment that frame many slow central movements in concertos by Torelli and Albinoni. Particularly as a conclusion to the whole work, it is disappointingly vapid. Without any evident interruption in the notation Mauro then added — surely, at Vivaldi's behest — a replacement for it: an amiable *giga*-like movement entirely in the Red Priest's manner, where orchestral sections alternate with solo passages for the principal violin.²² Did Vivaldi (assuming that Aldrovandini rather than he wrote the three original movements) hope to ease his conscience by having composed at least part of the work he had claimed entirely for himself? Perhaps. In that case, by adding the new movement as a replacement finale, he also became the first *pasticheur* to lay hands on the work.²³

The second and more certain *pasticheur* was Pisendel. We possess no autograph manuscript of this *sinfonia* that transmits his own version, and perhaps there never was one. What we

²⁰ On Vivaldi's legal spat with Polani, in the course of which the former's contribution to the score of *Creso* emerged, see Glixon and White, "*Creso tolto a le fiamme*".

²¹ Could the work, in its original three-movement form, have in fact been used as the overture to *Pirro*? The presence in operatic *sinfonias* of concerto-like solo passages for principal violin (sometimes in partnership with a solo second violin) was not unusual at this early time, as evidenced by Vivaldi's first single-authored opera, *Ottone in villa* (Vicenza, 1713). Two *sinfonias* by Aldrovandini himself (for *Mitridate in Sebastia* (Genoa, 1701) and *L'incoronazione di Dario* (Naples, 1705)), which are transcribed, respectively, on pp. 103–105 and 111–112 of the *sinfonia* anthology comprising the second volume of Geertinger, "Die italienische Opersinfonia", show a similar use of paired violin soloists.

²² One cannot entirely rule out the possibility that Vivaldi intended to retain the original third movement while also following it with the new movement; but in that case one would have expected him to erase or delete the terminal flourish after the former, which did not happen.

²³ To my knowledge, the authenticity of the *sinfonia*, listed in Ryom, *Antonio Vivaldi*, 84, as RV 292 (with its original finale) and RV 292a (with its first substitute finale), has not been brought into question before.

do have is a very neat copy made by one of the court music copyists, Johann Gottlieb Morgenstern, probably during Pisendel's period as *Konzertmeister*.²⁴ For two movements, the work is exactly as before, except for the addition of two oboes as *strumenti di rinforzo* (doubling instruments in a reinforcing role) for the first and second violin parts, a modification very often made in the *Hofkapelle* to Italian works originally for strings alone. But then we encounter neither of the third movements proposed previously: what we find is a fleet-footed sinfonia finale of classic type in $\frac{3}{4}$ metre. This turns out to be an import, transposed from B-flat major to C major, from a work that Pisendel had evidently copied while in Venice: a sinfonia by Albinoni that is a close relative of a violin concerto by the same composer published in Amsterdam in 1715 as Op. 7, no. 10.²⁵

To remain for a moment with Albinoni, there is one interesting instance in the Schrank II collection where he is the recipient rather than the donor of an added or substituted movement that creates a pasticcio. A set of parts shelfmarked Mus.2199-N-3 contains a four-movement sinfonia in G major in the hand of Johann Gottlieb Morgenstern closely related to the fourth concerto, for violin, in this composer's Op. 7; Morgenstern must have taken its second, third and fourth movements from a source of the sinfonia, today lost, that Pisendel had acquired or copied in Venice, and in the process added doubling parts for two oboes and bassoon in the customary Dresden fashion. The work in this three-movement form is a typical operatic sinfonia, in which a lively fugue replaces (as quite often in Albinoni) the more common dance-like movement in "short" metre ($\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{3}{8}$) favoured for finales in this genre. However, Morgenstern adds, as opening movement, a solemnly contrapuntal Grave (in fact, a miniature "stretto" fugue) in $\frac{4}{4}$ where the pair of oboes achieve obbligato status for the only time in the work.²⁶ This turns out to be the opening movement of an early concerto for two violins (TWV 52:G 2) by Telemann, likewise preserved in the Schrank II collection in a set of parts originally copied by J. S. Bach and subsequently added to by Pisendel and others.²⁷ Supplying the extra movement was perhaps prompted by an intention to use the sinfonia for a non-operatic — for example, a sacred — occasion. As in the Bonn Manuscript pasticcios, one must admire the skill with which the *pasticheur*, here presumably Pisendel, has matched the thematic material of the imported movement to that of a relevant part of the original.²⁸ As Music example 2 shows, both (a) the fugue

²⁴ Shelfmark: Mus.2389-N-7b. The manuscript uses music paper manufactured in the Veneto and features the abnormally closely packed musical notation, designed to maximize the number of bars on each page, characteristic of Pisendel's so-called *Reisepartituren* (travel scores).

²⁵ See Talbot, *Tomaso Albinoni*, 169 and 172. The sinfonia is identified as *Si 6* in the catalogue of Albinoni's works contained in the same book. Pisendel's score of it is shelfmarked Mus.2199-O-5. The German visitor seems to have had privileged access to Albinoni's music, since his collection contained three autograph sonatas (one inscribed to him) by this master.

²⁶ Confusingly, the Grave is tacked on to the end of the work, but this is a typical expedient of Dresden (and other) copyists of the time used simply in order to avoid page turns in the longer movements.

²⁷ Shelfmark: Mus.2372-O-35a/b.

²⁸ Honesty demands from me an admission that in my discussion of the sinfonia in my doctoral thesis of 1968 (Talbot, "Instrumental Music of Tomaso Albinoni") I innocently accepted the added opening movement as an authentic (and especially commendable) product of the Venetian master's pen, since it appeared to be so well integrated into its musical context.

subject of the finale and (b) that of the borrowed introductory movement give prominence to the thematic shape G–B–A–D.

Music example 2 | (a) Albinoni, *Sinfonia* in G (7.4a), incipit of last movement; (b) Telemann, *Concerto* for Two Violins in G (TWV 52:G 2), incipit of first movement



Good thematic matching is displayed again in a pasticcio that Pisendel made of RV 172, one of the violin concertos inscribed to him by Vivaldi, from whom he had received it in autograph score.²⁹ This concerto, in C major, is, frankly, not one of Vivaldi's best, and especially in its long third movement has a distinctly scrappy, improvisational feel about it. At some point Pisendel evidently decided to have it performed in an adaptation as a four-movement work, possibly one functioning as a *sinfonia*. The original third movement was replaced by one taken from a violin concerto by Carlo Tessarini in the *Hofkapelle's* collection,³⁰ and a slow first movement, a mere nine bars long, was either borrowed from a source still to be discovered or composed *ex novo* by him. The Dresden source of this pasticcio version, RV 172a, survives only as an orchestral first violin part in the hand of the copyist Johann Gottfried Grundig,³¹ and it is uncertain whether a full set of parts was ever copied out, although that must be the default assumption. In both outer movements of RV 172 the opening gesture contains a prominent rising tonic triad (C–E–G); this occurs in bar 2 of the first movement and bar 3 (with intervening linking notes) of the third. Both the borrowed Tessarini movement (at its very start) and the added *Largo* movement (on the second beat of the first bar) give prominence to exactly the same shape.

But the most interesting and illuminating instance of a pasticcio created by Pisendel is his insertion of the second movement of Vivaldi's violin concerto in B-flat major RV 366 "detto il Carbonelli", displacing the original movement, into the seventh work (in E minor) belonging to a collection of concertos and *sinfonias* by the Bolognese violinist-composer Giuseppe Antonio Brescianello (c. 1690–1758) published by Michel-Charles Le Cène in Amsterdam in 1727. The Livornese violinist and composer Giovanni Stefano Carbonelli (1694–1773) commemorated in the title of Vivaldi's concerto may well have come into personal contact with Vivaldi around 1716–1717 through playing in one or more Venetian opera orchestras at carnival time, and by a similar route could conceivably also have met Pisendel.³² Brescianello will almost certainly have been known personally to Vivaldi, since in the years leading up to 1715 he was in Venice serving the exiled electress of Bavaria, Theresa Kunigunde Sobieska, who rejoined her husband in Munich in that year, taking the same composer with her.

²⁹ Shelfmark: Mus.2389-O-42.

³⁰ Shelfmark: Mus.2451-O-7.

³¹ Shelfmark: Mus.2389-O-42a.

³² On Carbonelli's life and music, see Talbot, "From Giovanni Stefano Carbonelli to John Stephen Carbonelli"; supplemented by Talbot, "Miscellany", 147–150.

No Vivaldian autograph manuscript of RV 366 is preserved, but a semi-calligraphic set of parts for it copied by Pisendel back in Germany and very probably based on a score copied or acquired in Venice survives in the Schrank II collection.³³ It does not appear that either Pisendel or the *Hofkapelle* ever possessed the published Brescianello collection, but Schrank II holds a copy of German provenance transmitting its seventh and ninth works, both violin concertos.³⁴

The pasticcio is contained in the manuscript Mus.2364-O-7, which is in Morgenstern's hand. Brescianello's slow movement, a cantilena for the principal violin against a full orchestral texture of chugging quavers, is not particularly inspiring, and Pisendel may have preferred to display his talents in a richly ornamented "solo-sonata-style" movement for soloist and continuo alone. Originally in the mediant key, D minor, Vivaldi's movement is transposed up a tone so that in its new context it is in the tonic key, no longer offering tonal contrast to the outer movements. Morgenstern's copy already contains slight elaborations (presumably made by Pisendel), such as the expansion of a pair of quavers into a four-semiquaver group in bar 10, but after the initial writing-out was completed Pisendel, who was addicted to ornamentation and rarely refrained from adding it to music he composed or curated,³⁵ added profuse new indications for quasi-extempore ornamentation in his favourite form of stemless grace notes — barely visible, but quick to write and taking up a minimum of horizontal space. Music example 3 compares Vivaldi's original notation of the final four bars, transposed from D minor to E minor for ease of reading, with the pasticcio version.

Music example 3 | (a) Principal violin part of Vivaldi, Concerto RV 366, movement 2, bars 12–15 (transposed up a tone); (b) Principal violin part of the pasticcio concerto D-DI, Mus. 2364-O-7, movement 2 (inserted by Pisendel), bars 12–15

³³ Shelfmark: Mus.2389-O-121b.

³⁴ Shelfmark: Mus.2364-O-9.

³⁵ On Pisendel's practice of annotating manuscripts with sketches, additions and, most especially, ornamental elaboration, see Lupiáñez Ruiz, "Las anotaciones".

(Adagio)

(a) Vivaldi, copied by Pisendel

(b) Vivaldi, inserted and elaborated by Pisendel

The musical score consists of two systems. The first system has two staves, (a) and (b), both in G major and common time. Staff (a) is a copy of the original, while staff (b) includes an inserted and elaborated section. The second system has four staves, with the top two staves continuing the main melody and the bottom two staves providing a more complex accompaniment with trills and other ornaments.

Moving on from the pasticcio concertos in Dresden,³⁶ it is time to look very briefly at their counterparts in the solo sonata genre. Here, the parallels — structural, functional and aesthetic — with the pasticcio sonatas in the Bonn Manuscripts are very evident. Of particular note are two anonymous four-movement sonatas of this type that for their first movements respectively borrow the first and third movement of Vivaldi’s sonata RV 22 in G major.³⁷ The fast second and fourth movements in the two sonatas are identical: clumsy efforts that lack known concordances. In Mus.2-R-8,73 only the first movement, by Vivaldi (using the opening movement of RV 22), is of known authorship. Pisendel must have brought back from Venice a manuscript of RV 22, today lost, that provided the copy text. His reason for choosing this particular movement, which has no obvious thematic affinities to the other movements, may have been simply that he liked it.

The other sonata, better known in Vivaldian literature, is Mus.2456-R-21. It derives the composer-related prefix “2456” from the fact that it was listed as a sonata by Giuseppe Tartini in Paul Brainard’s catalogue of that composer’s solo sonatas, published in 1975.³⁸ Brainard’s entry acknowledged that the work was of uncertain authorship and had been assigned to Tartini by an

³⁶ Two further Dresden pasticcio concertos, both anonymous, borrow a movement by, or attributed to, Vivaldi — Mus.2-O-1,1 (containing the second movement of RV 326) and Mus. 2389-O-158 (containing the first movement of RV Anh. 18). Doubtless, many further pasticcio concertos remain still to discover in the Schrank II collection.

³⁷ This sonata exists in two versions: an earlier one preserved in a manuscript anthology in Brussels and a later one, with a greatly altered bass part, appearing in the set of twelve “Manchester” sonatas once owned by Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni. It is the earlier version that is used for the Dresden pasticcios.

³⁸ Brainard, *Le sonate per violino*, 85 (with catalogue reference G 27).

unidentified “mano posteriore” (later hand). The fact that at least one movement (the repositioned third movement from RV 22) is unarguably by Vivaldi led Peter Ryom initially to accept the whole work as genuine and catalogue it as RV 776 — not entirely unreasonably, since, Vivaldi is known for his habit of circulating individual movements between works.³⁹ However, a powerful clue to the fact that the sonata was a pasticcio lay in the fact that whereas Grundig copied the first, second and fourth movements, Pisendel himself wrote out the third movement. Eventually, it emerged that this was the untransposed first movement of the violin sonata Op. 2, no. 5 by Giovanni Battista Somis, taken from a well-known collection published privately by that composer in Turin in 1723 that Pisendel himself had copied calligraphically in its entirety.⁴⁰ Once again, the selection seems to owe more to a personal liking for the individual movement (and a desire to avoid transposition) than to a desire for overall coherence. What remains strange is that the two fast movements, despite their obvious musical weakness, remain a fixed element in both pasticcios.

THE POSITION OF THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY INSTRUMENTAL PASTICCIO: THEN AND NOW

I am all too aware that in this article I have merely scratched the surface of a vast subject that seems never to have been the subject of a dedicated study. Whether this avoidance has been out of distaste or because of the practical difficulty of running to earth the complete set of authors for the movements making up a pasticcio is hard to say. Because the making of instrumental pasticcios tended to be covert or semi-covert, whereas that of operatic pasticcios was much more out in the open (particularly when singers repeatedly trotted out their favourite “war-horses”), it attracted little contemporary commentary. It is also rare to find a musician of distinction such as Pisendel engaging in the art of pasticcio-making: its practitioners were much more likely to be at the lower end of the professional scale — people almost as anonymous as the products they fashioned.

If nothing else, investigations into instrumental pasticcios can throw up useful information about their parent works or the performing context. From the two Dresden pasticcios including individual movements from RV 22 we learn that Pisendel possessed a copy, now lost, of this excellent sonata. From RV 192 we glean more about Vivaldi’s unsavoury habit of claiming works partly by others as his own and gain access to the complete musical text of a historically interesting *sinfonia* (or was it in reality an independent concerto?) by Aldrovandini. From the slow introductory movements added to three-movement *sinfonias* in Dresden we appreciate better how the latter type, with its characteristic “noise-killer” opening signalling the start of a performance, was not the only kind for orchestra. Above all, the musically sensitive matching of movements culled from here and there that was so often achieved by calculation, instinct or a combination of both deserves from us a measure of admiration.

The “composer-centredness” (to use my own term) that has first gathered strength and then established itself permanently in Western art music since the later part of the eighteenth

³⁹ Ryom, *Verzeichnis der Werke Antonio Vivaldis*, 142 and 170.

⁴⁰ Shelfmark: Mus.2353-R-1.

century is not to be undone or suspended. “Historically informed” performance can realistically induce “historically inflected” audience reactions only in limited areas.⁴¹ For eighteenth-century instrumental pasticcios I see little future in mainstream concert life. For operatic pasticcios, however, the picture is more positive. A recent recording of Handel’s pasticcio *Caio Fabbricio* (HWV A9) has justifiably garnered considerable praise.⁴² Admittedly, there are special factors in play. All the recitatives are by Handel, and the great majority of the arias from a single setting by Hasse. The arias by other composers are stylistically very compatible and not so very much more numerous than the typical quotient of “guest” arias in nominally single-authored Italian operas of the same period. It nevertheless seems that in number-based operas there is a degree of natural “compositeness” that up to a certain point tolerates plural authorship of the music. One out of perhaps a dozen or more arias well separated from one another by recitative within an operatic act is, after all, not the exact equivalent of a sonata or concerto movement immediately adjoining similarly scored movements with which it makes up a supposedly organic whole. It will be interesting, at any rate, to see if there are any sequels to this recording.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Musical Publications

- Albinoni, Tomaso. *Concerti a cinque*, Op. 7. Amsterdam: E. Roger, [1715].
- Albinoni, Tomaso. *Sinfonie e concerti a cinque*, Op. 2. Venice: Sala, 1700.
- Albinoni, Tomaso. *Sonate a violino solo*. Amsterdam: J. Roger, [1718].
- Barsanti, Francesco. *Sonate a flauto o violino solo con basso per violone o cembalo*. London: author, 1724.
- Beseghi, Angelo Michele. *Sonate da camera a violino solo col violone o cembalo*, Op. 1. Amsterdam: E. Roger, [1710].
- Brescianello, Giuseppe Antonio. *XII Concerti et Sinfonie*, Op. 1. Amsterdam: Le Cène, [1727].
- Corelli, Arcangelo. *Sonate a violino e violone o cimbalo*, Op. 5. Rome: Santa, 1700.
- Loeillet, Jean Baptiste. *XII Sonates à une flûte et basse continue*, Op. 3. Amsterdam: E. Roger, [1715].
- Mascitti, Michele. *Sonate da camera a violino solo col violone o cembalo*, Op. 2. Paris: Foucaut, 1706.
- Pepusch, Johann Christoph. *VI Sonate à flauto solo con cimbalo o vero fagotto*, Op. 1. Amsterdam: E. Roger, [1705].
- Senailé, Jean Baptiste. *Premier livre de sonates à violon seul avec la basse continue*, Paris: author, 1710.

⁴¹ In *Text and Act* Richard Taruskin trenchantly but in my view accurately exposes how reception of early music by performers and audiences alike passes first through the prism of modern, and sometimes modernist, sensibilities and assumptions. As well as being inevitable, this situation can in fact often be viewed as beneficial to the aesthetic experience.

⁴² George Frideric Handel, *Caio Fabbricio*, HWV A9, London Early Opera under the direction of Bridget Cunningham, Signum Classics SIGCD713, 2022, compact disc.

- Senailé, Jean Baptiste. *Sonates à violon seul avec la basse*, Op. 3. Paris: author, 1716.
- Somis, Giovanni Battista. *Sonate da camera*, Op. 2. Turin: author, 1723.
- Telemann, Georg Philipp. *Six sonates à violon seul accompagné par le clavessin*. Frankfurt: author, 1715.
- Torelli, Giuseppe. *Concerti musicali*, Op. 6. Augsburg: Wagner, 1698.
- Torelli, Giuseppe. *Sinfonie a tre e concerti a quattro*, Op. 5. Bologna: Micheletti, 1692.

Literature

- Ambrosiano, Aurelia. "I Mauro e Antonio Vivaldi: nuove informazioni e spunti di riflessione". *Studi vivaldiani* 18 (2018): 3–39.
- Brainard, Paul. *Le sonate per violino di Giuseppe Tartini: catalogo tematico*. Milan: Carisch, 1975.
- Everett, Paul. "Towards a Vivaldi Chronology". In *Nuovi studi vivaldiani: edizione e cronologia critica delle opere*, edited by Antonio Fanna and Giovanni Morelli, 729–757. Florence: Olschki, 1988.
- Everett, Paul. "Vivaldi's Italian Copyists". *Informazioni e studi vivaldiani* 11 (1990): 27–88.
- Geertinger, Axel Teich. "Die italienische Opersinfonia 1680–1710". 2 vols. PhD diss., Københavns Universitet, 2008.
- Glixon, Beth, and Micky White. "Crescendo tolto a le fiamme: Girolamo Polani, Antonio Vivaldi and Opera Production at the Teatro S. Angelo, 1705–1706". *Studi vivaldiani* 8 (2008): 3–20.
- Köpp, Kai. *Johann Georg Pisendel (1687–1755) und die Anfänge der neuzeitlichen Orchesterleitung*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2005.
- Lupiáñez Ruiz, Francisco Javier. "Las anotaciones para la ornamentación de Johann Georg Pisendel (1687–1755) en los manuscritos vivaldianos de Dresde". PhD diss., Universidad de Guanajuato, 2021.
- Price, Curtis. "Pasticcio". In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., edited by Stanley Sadie, 19:213–216. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- Ryom, Peter. *Antonio Vivaldi: thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis seiner Werke (RV)*. Revised by Federico Maria Sardelli. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2018.
- Ryom, Peter. *Verzeichnis der Werke Antonio Vivaldis*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1979.
- Talbot, Michael. "The Bonn Manuscript S 2981: A Miscellany of European Music for Flute from the Early Eighteenth Century". *The Consort* 77 (2021): 20–46.
- Talbot, Michael. "The Cheney Flute Sonatas Manuscript: An Early Collection for the Traverso, Containing Music by Pepusch and Others". *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 52 (2021): 63–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/rrc.2020.4>.
- Talbot, Michael. "From Giovanni Stefano Carbonelli to John Stephen Carbonell: A Violinist Turned Vintner in Handel's London". *Göttinger Händel-Beiträge* 14 (2012): 265–299. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666278310.265>.
- Talbot, Michael. "The Genuine and the Spurious: Some Thoughts on Problems of Authorship Concerning Baroque Compositions". In *Vivaldi vero e falso: problemi di attribuzione*, edited by Antonio Fanna and Michael Talbot, 13–24. Florence: Olschki, 1992.
- Talbot, Michael. "The Instrumental Music of Tomaso Albinoni (1671–1741)". 3 vols. PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1968.

- Talbot, Michael. "Miscellany". *Studi vivaldiani* 16 (2016): 147–153.
- Talbot, Michael. "A Question of Authorship". *Vivaldi Informations* 2 (1973): 17–26.
- Talbot, Michael. "Silva Box 17–1: An English Eighteenth-Century Compilation of Sonatas and Other Compositions for Cello in Greensboro". *The Consort* 78 (2022): 12–39.
- Talbot, Michael. *Tomaso Albinoni: The Venetian Composer and His World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Talbot, Michael. "The Work-Concept and Composer-Centredness". In *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*, 168–186. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
<https://doi.org/10.5949/liverpool/9780853238256.003.0009>.
- Taruskin, Richard. *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. <https://doi.org/10.1093/os0/9780195094374.001.0001>.

NEKAJ PRIPOMB O *PASTICCIO* SONATI IN KONCERTU
V PRVI POLOVICI 18. STOLETJA

Izraz 'pasticcio' se danes pogosto uporablja za operna in podobna dramska dela z več avtorji, najbolj upravičeno pa za primere, ko so bile posamezne točke, kot so arije, uporabljene brez vednosti njihovih skladateljev, brez predhodnega dogovora. V vsakdanjem jeziku je izraz zaničevalen, kar je obenem tudi splošna sodobna sodba tovrstnih oper, ki so cvetele v večjem delu 18. stoletja, in sicer zaradi tega, kar sam imenujem »imperativ enega avtorja«. V zadnjem času so raziskovalci v veliki meri preučevali baročne in klasicistične operne *pasticcie*, veliko manj pa pojav instrumentalnih *pasticcirov* v obliki solističnih sonat ali solističnih koncertov, v katerih so obstoječim stavkom dodali ali zamenjali stavke iz drugih skladb, navadno različnih skladateljev. Razlogi za nastanek takšnih *pasticcirov* so bili običajno drugačni kot v primeru opernih *pasticcirov*. Pogosti povodi so bili poenostavitev ali skrajšanje del za manj vešče ali izkušene glasbenike, da bi jih po spremembi instrumentacije lažje igrali, da bi jih prilagodili novim funkcijam ali izvedbenim pogojem (kot je predelava operne simfonije za rabo v cerkvi) ali preprosto, da bi omogočili večjo prepoznavnost posebej priljubljenega stavka.

Članek obravnava primere instrumentalnih *pasticcirov* 18. stoletja iz dveh različnih virov. Prvi je rokopisna antologija šestih *pasticcio* sonat za prečno flavto iz Bonna, ki je verjetno nastala v poznih 20-ih letih 18. stoletja. Drugi pa je repertoar instrumentalnih *pasticcirov* – predvsem gre za orkestrski repertoar (simfonije in koncerte), vključuje pa tudi par sonat – iz dresdenske zbirke »Schrank II«, ki izvira iz dvorne kapele volilnih knezov Friderika Avgusta I. in II. Gonilni duh dresdenskih *pasticcirov* je bil ugledni član omenjene kapele J. G. Pisendel (od leta 1730 koncertni mojster), violinist in skladatelj, ki je imel strast do več vrst glasbenih aranžmajev in elaboracij.

Osrednja tema članka je na podlagi omenjenih dveh virov prikazati spretnost glasbenikov, ki so napravljali *pasticcie*. Ti so s premišljenim izborom pogosto dosegli določeno stopnjo tematske in slogovne kohezije, ki je komaj kaj manjša od tiste v izvornem delu. V primeru rokopisa iz Bonna preseneča raznolikost skladateljev (zlasti glede na geografsko lego njihovega delovanja), katerih glasbo so plenili za izdelavo *pasticcia*. Videti je, da je nastajanje *pasticcia* močno olajšala domala splošno uveljavljena štiridelna struktura solističnih sonat v obdobju takoj po Corelliju. V primeru dresdenskih *pasticcirov* je širok razpon virov, iz katerih je bila izposojena glasba, bolj razumljiv, saj se je Pisendel lahko oprl na vire tako lastne skrbno zbrane glasbene zbirke kot tudi zbirke dvorne kapele.

Raziskava je prinesla nekaj dodatnih presenečenj, najpomembnejše pa je, da je simfonija (ali koncert) RV 192, ki je bilo doslej sprejeto kot pristno Vivaldijevo delo, zelo verjetno *pasticcio*, iz katerega je Pisendel nato oblikoval nov *pasticcio*, tako da je Vivaldijev stavek zamenjal z drugim, Albinonijevim. Članek zaključuje z ugotovitvijo, da za uspešno sodobno oživitev izbranih opernih *pasticcirov* obstaja nekaj upanja, medtem ko je uspešen poskus oživitve instrumentalnih *pasticcirov* malo verjeten, zlasti zaradi neomajnega sodobnega vztrajanja pri povečevanju vloge enega samega avtorja v primeru tako kratkih in strnjenih del.