Tim Carter

Mozart in a "*Land without Music*". Henry Bishop's *The Marriage of Figaro*

Continental judgements on the English and music have always been clear. According to Heinrich Heine, "*These people have no ear, either for rhythm or music, and their unnatural passion for piano playing and singing is thus all the more repulsive. Nothing on earth is more terrible than English music, save English painting.*"[1] The American Ralph Waldo Emerson, too, knew precisely where English priorities lay as far as music was concerned: "*England has no music. It has never produced a first-rate composer, and accepts only such music as has already been decided to be good in Italy and Germany. They seem to have great delight in these things, but not original appreciation; and value them as showy commodities, which they buy at great price for pride.*"[2] For all the *bons mots*, the notion that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the English made a commerce of music without involving themselves too much in its finer points has a ring of truth: music scarcely embedded itself in English philosophical discourse, and the English scarcely developed an aesthetic of art for art's sake, preferring a more pragmatic view of culture serving social or political expediency. The arts were certainly useful, but they bore no comparison with graver matters of empire and dominion. It was political and moral superiority, not artistic achievement, that defined the English sense of self.

English notions of superiority did not preclude cultural cosmopolitanism; indeed, they positively encouraged it as a sign of wealth, good breeding and the general health of the State. The arts may not have mattered in the sense of serving the cause of national identity, but they had their place. Even if England was considered a land without significant musical traditions of its own, it still offered safe haven to Continental musicians who, for all their sniffing at English poor taste, still filled their purses with English coin. Yet the notion of culture as commerce required the music and musicians that regularly migrated to England to adapt to local market forces: the English may have welcomed Continental composers, but they would not be preached to by them. Accordingly, music was not merely exchanged as a commodity; it was also changed to meet English needs.

Opera always provides useful examples through which to explore such issues given its sensitivity to context, function and means of production, and for the nineteenth century, Mozart's operas are a particularly intriguing case in point given their complex status within the canon. The music of Mozart's operas was first transmitted

[1] Heinrich Heine: *Lutèce*, article XV, ed. by Jacques Voisine, Berlin, 1977, p. 71.

[2] Ralph Waldo Emerson: *English Traits*, Boston, 1856, p. 251 in: Stephen Banfield: The Artist and Society in: Music in Britain: the Romantic Age, 1800-1914, ed. by Nicholas Temperley (= The Blackwell History of Music in Britain), Oxford, 1988, pp. 11-28, at p. 11.

to England by the performers involved with them in Vienna, Nancy Storace, Francesco Benucci and Michael Kelly, who variously inserted arias in London productions of operas by other composers. Around 1810, there was also a trend in London, as in Paris, for amateur performances of the three da Ponte operas. *Le nozze di Figaro*, however, received its first professional performance in London only on 18 June 1812 at the main Italian opera house, the Theatre Royal Haymarket;[3] it was revived in 1813, 1816, 1817 and 1819. It was this last revival that encouraged Henry Rowley Bishop (1786-1855) to produce at the competing Covent Garden theatre his own version of *Figaro*, which opened on Saturday 6 March 1819.

Bishop was a prodigious composer and arranger of music for London theatres, and particularly Covent Garden (where he was Musical Director from 1810-24).[4] Before adapting *Le nozze di Figaro*, he had produced versions of *Don Giovanni* (20 May 1817, called *The Libertine*, after Shadwell) and of Rossini's *Il barbiere di Siviglia* (13 October 1818). *Figaro* was an obvious candidate to succeed the Rossini adaptation: after all, Beaumarchais's *La folle journée ou Le mariage de Figaro* (first performed April 1784 but written by 1781) had been designed as a sequel to his *Le barbier de Séville ou La précaution inutile* (first performed February 1775). It seems clear that all three of Bishop's adaptations aimed to compete with the Italian versions of these operas currently being staged at the Haymarket theatre:[5] indeed, on 13, 16, 20 and 23 March 1819, Bishop's and Mozart's *Figaro*s were even staged on the same evenings. Bishop's aim was apparently to lure audiences by offering performances in English rather than Italian, by replacing recitative with spoken dialogue, by cutting out the more difficult musical numbers in the operas, and by adding popular songs.

On the face of it, *Le nozze di Figaro* would seem to be the most straightforward of Mozart's operas for the nineteenth century: it had none of the proto-Romantic overtones of *Don Giovanni*, none of the moral difficulties of *Così fan tutte*, and none of the generic problems of *Die Zauberflöte* (or rather, *Il flauto magico*). However, despite, or perhaps because of, this it succumbed to modifications in striking ways. We have three sources for "*The Marriage of Figaro, a comic opera in three acts* [...] *the music chiefly selected from Mozart's operas, the overture and new music composed, and the whole adapted to the English stage, by Mr. Bishop*" (so styled on the title-page of the libretto): a printed libretto issued just after the first performance (London, John Miller, 1819; the *Advertisement* is dated 20 March), a printed vocal score of the bulk of the music (London, Goulding, D'Almaine, Potter & Co., 1819), and Bishop's autograph manuscript (London, British Library, Add. MS 27712).

[3] It was anticipated by a one-act burletta based on the opera first staged at London's Pantheon on 2 May 1812. I have given a brief overview of performances of *Figaro* since its première in Vienna on 1 May 1786, commenting on some trends apparent therein, in my *W. A. Mozart: "Le nozze di Figaro"*, Cambridge, 1987, pp. 122-47.

[4] See the article and work-list in: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. by S. Sadie, London, 1980, ii, pp. 741-5. Useful biographical and other information is also provided in R. Northcott: *The Life of Sir Henry R. Bishop*, London, 1920.

[5] *Don Giovanni* was first staged at the Theatre Royal, Haymarket, on 12 April 1817, and *Il barbiere di Siviglia* on 10 March 1818.

In the *Advertisement* to the libretto, Bishop claimed honourable intentions for his work: "*one of the motives which induced me to hope for the ultimate success of the attempt, was, the desire I had to improve our National taste for Music, by, at every opportunity, establishing the works of the immortal MOZART on the English Stage.*" Moreover, "*The obstacles, also, that arose in adapting the* Music *were innumerable! The reception, however, the Opera has met with, was at once gratifying and encouraging, has repaid every exertion, and forms a most important era in the Musical History of this country.*" Bishop goes on to acknowledge the producer (Mr Fawcett) and the choreographer (Mr Noble), and recognizes that "*the poetry*" (i.e., for the sung parts) of the opera was provided by "*a friend*" and by "*a* juvenile *Author*" (respectively Isaac Pocock, who collaborated with Bishop on many other occasions, and Louise Costello).[6] He also lists the cast.[7] However, Bishop does not admit his source for the bulk of the spoken dialogue, Thomas Holcroft's translation of Beaumarchais's play first published in 1785, which he may have known in the shortened version altered by John Philip Kemble and published in 1811.[8] Large parts of Bishop's dialogue are taken more or less *verbatim* from Holcroft, although there are additions from the play, which Bishop seems to have known in the French, and from da Ponte's libretto.

The Appendix gives an outline of Bishop's adaptation with details of the musical items.[9] Mozart's four acts are compressed to three, largely by conflating the original Acts III and IV and by omitting the Figaro-Marcellina subplot (and hence the trial scene). However, the number of scene-changes is increased, perhaps to give more opportunity for stage spectacle. Bishop's Act I begins like Mozart's, although the duet "*Se a caso madama*" (Mozart's No. 2) is omitted and carried out in dialogue, while Susanna stays onstage for Figaro's "*Se vuol ballare*" and then has her own exit song. Mozart's duet "*Via resti servita*," where Marcellina bickers with Susanna, is replaced by a jealousy-duet between Barbarina and Susanna (Barbarina fears that Cherubino is attracted more to Susanna than to her). Cherubino enters to sing "*Non so più cosa son, cosa faccio*," although we lose the following trio "*Cosa sento! tosto andate*" (which is

---

6 Northcott, *The Life of Sir Henry R. Bishop*, p. 49. According to Bishop (libretto, p. 17), a "friend", probably Pocock again, also provided the prose text of a scene between Antonio and Barbarina in Act II, scene 1.

7 The Count, Mr Jones; Fiorello, Mr Durusett; Figaro, Mr Liston; Basil, Mr I. Isaacs; Antonio, Mr Fawcett; Sebastian, Mr Comer; Cherubino, Miss Beaumont; the Countess, Mrs Dickons; Susanna, Miss Stephens; Barbarina, Mrs Liston; Marcellina, Mrs Sterling. The Count and Sebastian were speaking roles. Mrs Dickons had played the Countess in the 1812 performances at the Haymarket – according to Lord Mount-Edgcumbe, "*she produced little effect on the Italian stage*," although he notes that the Countess in *Figaro* was her best part (*Musical Reminiscences of an Old Amateur for Fifty Years from 1773 to 1823*, London, 1824, p. 112) – while Miss (Kitty) Stephens had played Susanna in the rival burletta version of *Figaro* that same year at the Pantheon.

8 T. Holcroft: *The Follies of a Day, or The Marriage of Figaro*, London, 1785; the preface is dated 21 February; ibid: *The Follies of a Day*, London, 1811. Kemble's contribution to the 1811 version is noted in a MS addition on the title-page of the copy in the British Library.

9 In the Appendix and in the following examples, I have modified Bishop's orthography and punctuation. Similarly, I have standardized his musical notation. In the vocal score, the text of No. [9] reads "*In early life, I took a wife*".

played out in dialogue). Figaro then enters with the chorus as in Mozart,[10] but the end of Mozart's Act I is turned into a concerted finale (see below).

Act II opens with Fiorello (a character appropriated from Rossini's *Il barbiere*) pleading with Susanna on the Count's behalf in the duet "*Crudel, perchè finora*" from Mozart's Act III (Bishop's Count is a speaking role). Antonio is then given a scene with Barbarina before the action proceeds with Mozart's Act II, scene 1, the Countess's "*Porgi amor qualche ristoro*" (but Bishop instead has the Countess sing an adaptation of "*Voi che sapete*"). The Countess and Susanna then write their letter to the Count (to "*Che soave zeffiretto*," from Mozart's Act III; i.e., we lose the first letter to the Count written by Figaro). Cherubino enters, but he is too nervous to sing his song (Mozart's "*Voi che sapete*"). Bishop has Susanna sing instead (the newly-composed "*Ne'er can the rose*" with harp accompaniment), with the Countess playing the guitar. Susanna dresses Cherubino, and the subsequent action is played out in dialogue (i.e., we lose "*Susanna, or via sortite*," "*Aprite, presto aprite*," and the first section of Mozart's Act II finale). When Susanna appears on the threshold of the dressing room instead of Cherubino, the Countess has a newly composed song ("*All these jealous doubts removing*"). Fiorello then enters to announce the arrival of the Notary to formalize the marriage between Figaro and Susanna; Figaro appears as in Mozart's Act II finale; and the rest of Bishop's finale is a shortened version of Mozart's (Antonio enters with the broken flowerpot and Figaro admits that he jumped from the window, but the episode of the page's commission is cut).

Act III starts with dances (including a *pas de deux*) that introduce the wedding (Mozart's Act III finale). These dances are perhaps in lieu of the ballets that customarily accompanied operas at the Theatre Royal, Haymarket.[11] The Countess and Susanna have a duet as the former presents her maid with a dowry, and in the midst of the subsequent action, Susanna passes the letter to the Count. He drops it, Figaro picks it up, reads it, and rails against Susanna's supposed infidelity (but we lose "*Aprite un po' quegl'occhi*"). Cherubino (dressed as a girl) and the villagers then enter to the sound of a march; the page is then discovered as in Mozart's Act III. The scene then changes first to Antonio's cottage (to give Fiorello a solo scene) and then to the Countess's apartment, where the Countess has an accompanied recitative and coloratura aria (a replacement for "*Dove sono i bei momenti*," which was perhaps deemed too restrained for the leading-lady) and then discusses with Marcellina the proposed assignation in the garden. The garden scene (Mozart's Act IV finale) is

[10] The text of the chorus in the libretto is "*Receive, noble master, / The wreath we have wove, / Presented by beauty / And profer'd by love!*" (plus a second stanza). Add. MS 27712 here has trumpet and clarinet parts only for Mozart's "*Giovani liete*" (No. 8), although the metric structure of the text would seem better suited to "*Amanti costanti*," the duet and chorus in Mozart's Act III finale.

[11] For example, at the first performance of *Figaro* in London on 18 June 1812, there was "*the favourite popular Scotch ballet*" *Peggy's Love*, and a new ballet, *La reine de Golconde*; see the notice in *The Times*, Thursday 18 June 1812. The presence of ballets was used as an excuse for cuts in the opera in the preface to the libretto of *Le nozze di Figaro* printed "*As performed at The King's Theatre, Opera House*" in 1824 (London, n.d.): "*It has been found unavoidably necessary to shorten it, as the Opera was originally composed for the theatre of Vienna, where, as the ballet is not admitted, it constituted the whole evening's entertainment*".

played mostly in dialogue – we also lose Susanna's "*Deh vieni, non tardar, oh gioia bella*" – although there is a trio for Figaro, Susanna and Antonio (taking the place of the Count). The opera ends with a *vaudeville*-type chorus (with prominent castanets), based, according to Bishop's manuscript, on a theme by Rossini.

Much of the original plot disappears (although Antonio and Barbarina are given more to do), but what remains does work after a fashion. Most striking, however, is the fact that in general Bishop plays out Mozart's ensembles in spoken dialogue, turning the opera much more into a succession of solo songs. It seems likely that this reflects popular taste in London at the time. Although we nowadays value *Figaro* for such masterly ensembles as the Act I trio, the Act II trio and finale, and the Act III sextet, many contemporary Londoners may have found such ensembles too complicated: in 1824, Lord Mount-Edgcumbe deplored the current trend in Italian operas, where "*songs have disappeared, and interminable quartettos, quintettos, sestettos, &c. usurp their place*."[12]

In the sections of Bishop's adaptation that use Mozart's music, the texts are generally loose translations. The renderings are scarcely felicitous. One amusing example for "*Pace, pace, mio dolce tesoro*" in Mozart's Act IV finale is: "*Silence, silence, he may overhear us. / Dearest, hush, there is somebody near us! / O what a night for a man to make love!*" Another is "*Count Almaviva's a compound of evil!*" for "*Se vuol ballare, signor Contino,*" which also demonstrates Bishop's tendency to water down the revolutionary overtones of the original (an evil Count is one thing; Figaro threatening the Count quite another). The handling of the music, however, is even more drastic, ranging from extensive cuts to outright recomposition. The Countess's version of "*Voi che sapete*" is strung together from Mozart's settings of the first, third, fourth and fifth stanzas of da Ponte's text, leading to the repeat of the first (as in Mozart). Cherubino's "*Non so più cosa son, cosa faccio*" is turned into a straightforward ABACA rondo (Bishop replaces "*Parlo d'amor vegliando*" with a new section and has a reprise of the opening); Figaro's "*Se vuol ballare*" undergoes similar treatment. "*Venite, inginocchiatevi,*" with its delicately unbalanced phrases, is totally recomposed and Mozart's cadential idea becomes the main theme of the aria. In general, the orchestrations are thickened (for example, in the arrangement of "*Non so più cosa son, cosa faccio*" two flutes and an oboe are added to Mozart's scoring of two clarinets, two bassoons, two horns and strings), and dynamic markings are lavishly applied. Bishop also tends to expand orchestral ritornellos and to provide orchestral introductions in cases where Mozart begins an aria immediately with the voice.

On a smaller scale, Bishop seems to have felt it necessary to round-off Mozart's phrases, turning piquant irregularities and swift transitions into four-square patterns. For example, in his adaptation of "*Non so più cosa son, cosa faccio*" (marked "*Allegro moderato*" rather than Mozart's "*Allegro vivace*"), Bishop adds a two-bar instrumental cadence at the end of the first stanza (apparently to delay Mozart's modulation to the dominant and to give the singer more time to breathe; see Ex. a), and in the second stanza he omits the seven-bar passage where Mozart uses flattened seventh

12 *Musical Reminiscences*, p. 120.

appoggiaturas and irregular phrases to mirror "*un desio ch'io non posso spiegar*" (Ex. b). Once again, Bishop seems concerned to avoid undue complication, whether for his performers or his audience, but the result does fall rather flat.

This process of simplification is also apparent in Bishop's treatment of the finales. The Act IV finale is reduced to a shortened version of a single episode of Mozart's setting and a new final chorus. As far as we can tell, the Act II finale also abbreviates Mozart (only some fragments and a trombone part survive), although something of the sectional structure of the original remains.[13] It is striking, therefore, that Bishop felt it necessary to add a new finale to Act I. Presumably, he thought it somewhat odd to end an act with an aria, even so rousing a one as "*Non più andrai farfallone amoroso.*" Instead, he produces a sectional finale, with the first for Susanna and Barbarina (addressing the Count with "*Ah! my lord, to fearful dangers, / Must he* [Cherubino] *wander then afar?*"), then (after the Count exits) a part of Figaro's "*Non più andrai farfallone amoroso,*" and finally a tutti section ("*All entreaties unavailing, / Cruel fate each heart assailing*"). Again, only fragments of the music and a trombone part survive, but it is clear that the last section adapted the final Allegro-Presto sections of the Act I finale of *Così fan tutte*.[14]

Bishop's own music is much as one would expect from the composer of "*Home, sweet home,*" and it is rather surprising to find the Countess singing an English ballad, or Antonio a Scottish folk tune. The most impressive piece is the Countess's new coloratura aria in Act III, "*My soul with sorrow laden,*" where the singer who played the role, Mrs Dickons, must have been stretched by the florid ornamentation. Such embellishment, if not so extreme, also appears elsewhere in Bishop's score (for example, in the cadenza at the end of Susanna's "*The youth in his blooming array*"). Similarly, he repeatedly adds appoggiaturas to Mozart's vocal lines (especially at feminine endings), and in "*the Celebrated Letter Duett*" (so called in the vocal score), Susanna and the Countess echo each other's florid roulades.[15]

[13] Add. MS 27712, fols. 74-80 (fragments), 81 (trombone part). From the trombone part, it seems that Bishop followed the broad outline of Mozart's finale, although he shortened individual sections (to about half-length), transposed some material and omitted much of the final three sections. The text is also modified to suit the re-worked plot.

[14] Ibid., fols. 41-55. The first section was some 34 bars in length, and the second some 30. It seems that another two episodes were planned between the second and third sections (Susanna, Barbarina, Marcellina: "*No more with fruitless terrors / Alarm his youthful mind!*", apparently to be played "*Più allegro,*" and then 28 bars in D minor, a "*sestetto*" (changed to "*quintetto*") marked (fol. 45^{v}) to be adapted from *Così fan tutte*).

[15] Charles Mackerras suggested that Bishop's ornaments for the letter-duet might provide evidence of contemporary performance practice that would merit imitation; see his *What Mozart Really Meant*, in: Opera 16 (1965), pp. 240-46. However, in his 1820 lecture (see below), William Crotch was less impressed by such treatment (Norfolk Record Office, MS 11063 (Lecture VIII, fol. 8^{v})): "*I cannot forbear noticing the manner in which this duet is frequently sung in public with a profusion of ornaments & embellishments in ye bravura style very proper indeed for Italian compositions & such as most Italian composers would not object to; but the works of Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Spohr, Weber, & indeed all the other German composers were intended by their authors to be sung* exactly as they are written – *the simplicity of this little duet is entirely ruined by such treatment.*"

Critical reaction to Bishop's adaptation appears to have been mixed. *The Times* (Monday 8 March 1819) was not unfavourable and suggested that the adaptation would have "*a long and successful career.*" Similarly, the *Theatrical Inquisitor* reported:

"*The chief object in this piece, and that which doubtless gave birth to the drama in its novel form, was the music of Mozart's* Nozze di Figaro, *adapted to English words, and then introduced for the first time at a national theatre. In praise of this design it is impossible to say too much; because wherever good taste, and perhaps it may be said good sense, prevails, it must be a subject for sincere admiration. Mr Bishop, to whom the credit is due of bringing it before the public, performed his task in a manner much beyond the fairest expectation, considering the difficulties he had to encounter. The piece was given out for repetition amidst the loudest and most unanimous applause.*"[16]

However, other critics were less enthusiastic:

"*We must here take leave to lament, that* Mr. Bishop *should have omitted so much of* Mozart's *music, to make room for his own: which latter, we beg to assure him, contrasts very disadvantageously with the original music of Figaro, though he perhaps may not be disposed to take our word for this salutary truth.*"

Similarly:

"*What are we to say to an adapter of* Mozart, *who for some of his pieces substitutes the airs about the street, and in others alters passages to suit the voice of the performer? Those passages were written to suit particular passions or emotions, not to be at the mercy of this or that incapacity. Their beauty also, and that of the context itself, depends upon preserving the context entire.*"[17]

Yet Bishop's *The Marriage of Figaro* held the stage for some twenty years both in the London theatres and in the provinces (it was premièred in Edinburgh in July 1819, Portsmouth in April 1823, Newcastle in July 1823 and Cambridge on 1 October 1825).[18]

Such manhandling of any opera like *Le nozze di Figaro* was by no means unusual whether for Bishop – who frequently cut scores to shreds and added his own music, most famously in his version of *Der Freischütz* (1824) – or for London theatres. Nor was it a straightforward pandering to an audience of lower class or taste than was wont to attend the opera at the Theatre Royal, Haymarket: even at the Haymarket, Mozart's ensembles were often shortened or removed. This manner of treatment was also widespread in Europe.[19] Yet while this suggests a common practice determined

---

[16] Given in Northcott: *The Life of Sir Henry R. Bishop*, p. 49.

[17] Both extracts given (with no reference to the original source) in H. Beard: *Figaro in England: Productions of Mozart's Opera, and the Early Adaptations of it in England Before 1850*, in: Maske und Kothurn 10 (1964), pp. 498-513, see p. 506.

[18] "*Non più andrai farfallone amoroso*" seems to have been restored in its entirety, but "*Voi che sapete*" remained with the Countess, and Susanna was regularly given such "*airs about the street*" as "*Home, sweet home*" and "*I've been roaming.*"

[19] For two French examples involving Castil-Blaze, see M. Everist: *Lindoro in Lyon: Rossini's* Le Barbier de Séville, in: Acta Musicologica 64 (1992), pp. 50-85; K. Ellis: *Rewriting* Don Giovanni, *or* "*The Thieving Magpies*", in: Journal of the Royal Musical Association 119 (1994), pp. 212-50.

by the nature and operation of the early nineteenth-century opera industry, the precise context-specific constraints upon that practice as yet remain unclear. For example, it is unlikely that London theatres were under quite the same pressures as those in, say, Paris in terms of the influence of officially sanctioned house-styles for given theatres or of a politicized fear of foreign encroachment upon national idioms. The issue in London may have been much more one of free-market taste.

It is striking, for example, that what Bishop did to *Figaro* finds a clear echo in contemporary English academic discourse on Mozart. When William Crotch, Professor of Music at the University of Oxford, gave a lecture to the Royal Society on *Figaro* in 1820 he concentrated almost entirely on the arias, rather than the ensembles, in the opera, which he claimed were "*ye very best movements.*"[20] For sure, Crotch had a clear sense of the worth of Mozart's contribution to the genre: "*He has advanced and improved the Opera materially – he has brought it nearer to ideal perfection than any composer – and frequently seems to bid defiance to all competition.*"[21] Yet for Crotch, as it seems for Bishop, Mozart could be found lacking:

> "*The student however must never forget that beautiful as Mozart's vocal melody frequently is, its general character is surpassed by all ye best Italian composers down to Cimarosa – profound as is his knowledge of counterpoint and his management of a multifarious score (and we admit that a more laboured style should not have suited the Opera) yet the great madrigal, Anthem, and Choral Composers far exceeded him in elaborate and high finished writing. Though his instrumental effects are so forcible, and replete with such an endless variety that on this account I would rather recommend him as a model to the young vocal composer than even his master Haydn, yet in the composition of Pianoforte Sonatas, Quartetts and Sinfonias Haydn is superior to him.*"[22]

Both Crotch and Bishop seem to have taken a similar view of a composer whose reception in England, and indeed in the nineteenth century in general, was always somewhat problematic. For all that Mozart was judged "*immortal*," so Bishop said, the jury was still out on whether his music would stand the test of time; he was not yet fully in the canon, nor in a position to have his works worshipped as fixed texts. Meanwhile, *Le nozze di Figaro* was just another *opera buffa* susceptible to precisely the same treatment as countless other examples of the genre.

It is easy to deride Henry Bishop's efforts to produce a *Figaro* "*adapted to the English Stage*" as misguided and opportunistic. But he undoubtedly made Mozart's *Figaro* available to a far wider audience than would otherwise have been the case, and his reworking of the opera clearly attempts to solve some problems with the work that remain acknowledged even today (witness the addition of a finale to Act I and the compression of the problematic Acts III and IV). And his transposition of *Le nozze di Figaro* to an alien musical landscape provides intriguing evidence both of contempo-

20 Norfolk Record Office, MS 11063 (Lecture VIII, fol. 10^r). I am most grateful to Simon Heighes for drawing my attention to this source.

21 Ibid., fols. 11^v-12^r.

22 Ibid., fol. 12^r.

rary reactions to Mozart's style and of operatic tastes in early nineteenth-century London, while raising significant broader issues concerning migrating musical styles in changing socio-cultural contexts.

APPENDIX

Henry Bishop's *The Marriage of Figaro*

Sources:

Printed libretto: *The Marriage of Figaro, a comic opera in three acts* […] *the music chiefly selected from Mozart's operas, the overture and new music composed, and the whole adapted to the English stage, by Mr. Bishop* (London, John Miller, 1819)

Printed vocal score: London, Goulding, D'Almaine, Potter & Co., 1819; contains Overture, Nos. [1]-[5], [8]-[14], [16] (with [18] at end), [17], [19]-[22]

Autograph manuscript: *GB-Lbl* Add. MS 27712; contains Nos. [1] (fragment and trumpet parts), [2]-[5], [6] (trumpet and clarinet parts only), [7] (part in draft), [9], [12]-[14], [15] (fragments), [16]-[21], [22] ("*the subject by Rossini – the additions and scoring by Henry R. Bishop*")

Ouverture — Four movements adapted from music by Mozart, including the March from *Idomeneo* (No. 8), "*È amore un ladroncello*" (*Così fan tutte*, No. 28; here in A major), and "*Fin ch'han dal vino*" (*Don Giovanni*, No. 12; here in D major).

Act I

Scene 1 [Figaro and Susanna's proposed bedroom in the castle]

[1] Figaro, Susanna: "*Fourteen—sixteen—eighteen—twenty*" — "*Cinque, dieci, venti, trenta*" (No. 1)

[2] Figaro: "*Count Almaviva's a compound of evil!*" — Adapted from "*Se vuol ballare*" (No. 3)

[3] Susanna: "*The youth in his blooming array*"

Scene 2 [An apartment in the castle]

[4] Barbarina, Susanna: "*I've seen all your flirting!*"

[5] Cherubino: "*O this love, 'tis a passion so pleasing*" — Adapted from "*Non so più cosa son, cosa faccio*" (No. 6)

[6] Chorus: "*Receive noble master*" — ?"*Giovani liete*" (No. 8)

[7] Finale: "*Ah! my lord, to fearful dangers*" — Three sections: (1) music now lost; (2) Figaro, "*Now, my spark, 'stead of sighing to charm thee*" to part of "*Non più andrai farfallone amoroso*" (No. 9; here in D major); (3) all, "*All entreaties now availing,*" music adapted from Act I finale to *Così fan tutte* (No. 18, bars 485-697).

Act II

Scene 1 [A lodge near the castle]

[8] Fiorello, Susanna: "*Ah! deign a kind reply now*"	"*Crudel! perchè finora*" (No. 16)
[9] Antonio: "*In early life, I got a wife*"	

Scene 2 [The Countess's bedchamber]

[10] Countess: "*Love ever leave me*"	Adapted from "*Voi che sapete*" (No. 11)
[11] Countess, Susanna: "*How gently when the sun's descending*"	"*Che soave zeffiretto*" (No. 20)
[12] Susanna: "*Ne'er can the rose, when newly 'tis blowing*"	Instead of "*Voi che sapete*" (No. 11); with obbligato harp accompaniment.
[13] Susanna: "*Come hither! kneel down here to me*"	Adapted from "*Venite, inginocchiatevi*" (No. 12)
[14] Countess: "*All these jealous doubts removing*"	
[15] Finale: "*The Notary now requests to enter*"	Abbreviated version of Act II finale (No. 15)

Act III

Scene 1 [The garden]

[16] Dances	Bolero, March, Pas de deux.
	Action of Act III finale in dialogue.
[17] Countess, Susanna: "*Oh take this gift, and ever my regard*"	
[18] March	For entry of Cherubino and villagers.

Scene 2 [Antonio's cottage]

[19] Fiorello: "*When love subdues the youthful heart*"	

Scene 3 [A magnificent apartment in the castle]

[20] Countess: "*Aid me, ye pitying powers! affection here subdue!*"	New accompanied recitative, followed by new coloratura aria, "*My soul with sorrow laden.*"

Scene [4] [The garden, with pavilions]

[21] Figaro, Susanna, Antonio: "*Silence, silence, he may overhear us*"	Adapted from "*Pace, pace, mio dolce tesoro,*" Act IV finale (No. 28). Antonio takes the place of the Count.
[22] Finale: "*Each doubt and fear now ending*"	Concluding chorus, with strophes (or half-strophes) for the Countess, Antonio, Figaro, Fiorello, Susanna, plus a choral refrain.

a)

[Allegro moderato]

Cherubino

with - out love, ah who could e - xist with - out

Vc.

mf *p* *cresc.* *mf* *f*

Vln. I

ff

love?

sf

cresc. *ff* *p*

b)

Cherubino

And her eye so kin - dly in - vites me, O

Vc.

[*p*] *mf* *cresc.*

who could, o who could e - xist with out love? O this love

f *p* *dim.* *pp* *cresc.* *dim.*

Mozart arr. Bishop, "*O this love, 'tis a passion so pleasing*" (after London, British Library, Add. MS 27712, fols. 32-39).