go a long way toward being worthy of its extremely high price. As it stands, we can consult the original sources, make up our own minds about the "debates," and forage for our own bibliographies, but we must also admit that these 500 pages of documents have enriched our understanding of the issues involved in this period of extraordinary change. And we can wait for Volume II.

ELAINE R. SISMAN
Columbia University

Julian Budden. *The Operas of Verdi*, Vol. III: *From* Don Carlos *to* Falstaff. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981. x, 546 pp.

NOW COMPLETE, Julian Budden's three-volume, 1,600-page *magnum opus* seems destined, for better or worse, to become the monumental handbook for present-day Verdi enthusiasts and scholars. *The Operas of Verdi* is this generation's more comprehensive addition to the several previously available English-language walks through the Verdian *œuvre*—those, for instance, by Francis Toye, Dyneley Hussey, Spike Hughes, and Charles Osborne. Budden's discussions make a stronger bid for permanence than do those of his predecessors. In the first place, he has widened the range of Verdian discourse by treating historical context as central. His special contribution has been to call attention to the European operatic traditions within which Verdi's works were introduced and to remind us that the operatic repertory of that time was substantially different from that which is marketed throughout the world today. Moreover, by writing in the midst of a renaissance of Verdi research, Budden is able—and eager—to pass on the fruits and concerns of recent scholarship to the general reader. Thus we now have available this synoptic (but by no means inerrant) compilation of details, and its completion here attests to the degree of sophistication that Verdi research has attained.

The third volume, dealing with the last four operas in four massive chapters, is in part an explicit continuation of the second. Budden clearly intends the two introductory chapters of Vol. II (1978), "The Collapse of a Tradition (Italian Opera 1840–70)" and "Formation of the Mature Style," to serve as a general backdrop for the first two operas of Vol. III as well, *Don Carlos* and *Aida*. The final two works, *Otello* and *Falstaff*, are preceded by a separate, and highly successful, introduction, Chapter 3, "A Problem of Identity (Italian Opera 1870–90)." Here Budden documents the effects of European politics and economics, the 1871 reform of the conservatories and theaters, the economic wars of the publishers, the introduction of potent foreign influences (Wagner and Massenet) to the Italian stage, the rise of *verismo* (detailed here without mention of the strong realistic literary currents of the time, particularly the work of Émile Zola and Giovanni Verga), and the impact of Verdi's contemporaries in Italy, notably Ponchielli, Gomes, and Catalani.

The discussion of each of the four operas divides into two portions of roughly equal length: a generally well-informed compositional/theatrical history and a set of quasi-analytical observations about the music itself. As in the preceding volumes Budden brings to his task a formidable knowledge of the operatic and concert repertory. This is, of course,

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

his trump suit, and he generally plays it extremely well. Few readers will fail to be impressed by such casual observations as, "the only instance I have been able to find of a duet cabaletta of the [*Aida*] period with a triple statement of the main idea is 'Ed ora, Contessa' in Cagnoni's *Un Capriccio di Donna* (1870)" (p. 243n). Occasionally, however, Budden overplays this suit, and in these instances the repository of knowledge threatens to degenerate into exhibitionism. When he writes (p. 234) that the flute solo at the beginning of *Aida*, Act III "recalls" [sic] that in Holst's *Beni Mora*, we may suspect that his motives are other than explanatory. So also his assertion that the beginning of *Falstaff*, Act I, Part ii (1893) foreshadows Rezniček's *Donna Diana* Overture (1894), perhaps because, as Budden would have it, "the Leipzig-trained Rezniček, like our own Sullivan, represented the Mendelssohnian aspect of the German academic tradition that Verdi admired in Ferdinand Hiller" (p. 457).

Yet, at his best Budden can summarize the spirit of an opera in a few incisive sentences. His comparison of *Don Carlos* with *Aida* is a paragon of common sense:

> Both works are played against the background of a closed society: both take as their starting-point the same tragic conflict—that of private emotion versus public duty—but propound it very differently. . . . [In *Don Carlos*] the claims of individual feeling threaten the disruption of society. . . . In *Aida*, on the other hand, the two opposing forces are held in equilibrium, and the conflict arises only through special circumstances. At no point is society or government put at risk through the deliberate actions of the principals. . . . In contrast to *Don Carlos*, *Aida* is the stuff of classical tragedy. . . . The balance of [the latter's] plot finds a corresponding balance in the musical structure which for the Verdi of 1870 is surprisingly symmetrical . . . (pp. 197–98).

Budden's greatest strengths lie in the sheer breadth of his repertory knowledge and his ability to synthesize over a century of published material, ranging from Abramo Basevi's *Studio sulle opere di Giuseppe Verdi* and the Ricordi *disposizioni sceniche* (available for many of the later Verdi operas) to most of the latest research. Nor may one discount his splendid sense of the theater, which pervades every page; the reader never forgets that these operas trade in vivid, concrete action. Clearly, Budden is a practical man writing for practical readers. So attractive are these strengths that one regrets having to point out that for the scholar they are frequently counterbalanced, and sometimes overbalanced, by a corresponding pair of weaknesses: an evasion of the problems posed by available primary-source material, and the quality of the musical analysis.

Budden's tendency to restrict his gaze to secondary sources (perhaps with the exception of his reporting on the *disposizioni sceniche*) is less problematic where the published research on a given work has already been strong. Thus, the discussions of *Don Carlos* and *Aida* are valuable indeed: here Budden is able to draw on the recent work of Ursula Günther, Andrew Porter, David Rosen, Marc Clémeur, and Hans Busch. The *Otello* summary, however, is fundamentally traditional, based largely on long-available materials by Alessandro Luzio, Piero Nardi,

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and Frank Walker (although sprinkled with extracts from Medici's and Conati's recent *Carteggio Verdi-Boito*). Yet Luzio's important "Il libretto di *Otello*" in *Carteggi verdiani*, Vol. II, needs correcting and amplifying, some of the Verdi-Ricordi *Otello* correspondence has never been published, and no study of the autograph score has yet appeared. A more closely constructed *Otello* history remains a project to be fulfilled.

Similary, with *Falstaff*, for which little of the new research was publicly available in the late 1970s, Budden transmits the traditional, unreconstructed history. This he does with great thoroughness, to be sure, but his secondary-source approach neglects the most compelling source documents, notably Boito's autograph libretto (which is treated only by reference to Luzio's flawed discussion of it in *Carteggi verdiani*, Vol. II), Verdi's autograph score (which G. Ricordi & C. published in facsimile in 1951), and the early published scores. The result is an account with significant lacunae and, in a few instances, errors.

No specific mention, for example, is made of the translations of Shakespeare that guided Boito's word-choice for the *Falstaff* libretto: those of Carlo Rusconi (1838) and Giulio Carcano (1875–82), although Budden does make the more esoteric point that "the Italian translation [*sic*] consulted by Boito must have been based on the now discredited quarto text" (p. 487n).[1] With regard to the authorship of the libretto, Budden points out that Boito brought a draft of Acts I and II to Sant'Agata in November 1889, but does not go on to suppose that Boito and Verdi must also have worked on much of the entire text together in winter 1889 and spring 1890, when they were neighbors, Verdi in Genoa and Boito in Nervi. Yet their collaboration seems probable, particularly since Verdi quoted from the text before 8 March 1890, the date on which Boito gave the completed libretto to him.[2] The composer, that is, could have begun the sketching process before 8 March.

Budden furnishes little precise information about the stages of composition as revealed by the autograph score. Thus, he does not report that three portions of the manuscript are insertions, interpolated folios with passages added only during the relatively late orchestration stage of composition (September 1891–October 1892): a seventeen-measure introduction to the Act I, scene 2 women's quartet, "Quell'otre! quel tino!" (fols. 65^r–66^v); Quickly's entire narrative in Act II, scene 2, "Giunta all'Albergo," along with a

[1] See Carlo Rusconi, *Prima parte del Re Enrico IV*, *Seconda parte del Re Enrico IV*, and *Le allegre femmine di Windsor*, Teatro completo di Shakspeare [*sic*] voltato in prosa italiana, IV and VI, 3rd ed. (Turin: Pomba, 1852); and Giulio Carcano, *Re Arrigo IV: parte prima*, *Re Arrigo IV: parte seconda*, and *Le donne allegre di Windsor*, Opere di Shakspeare [*sic*], VII and X (Milan: Hoepli, 1878 and 1881). Compare, e.g., Boito's version of Ford's monologue, "È sogno? o realtà," near the end of II.i, with Carcano's translation, from the relevant portions of *Le donne allegre* (II.ii and III.v): "Oh! oh! è questa una visione? un sogno? Sono io che dormo? Svegliati, Ford! Ser Ford, ti sveglia!" (Carcano, X, 78) and "Qual furfante, dannato epicureo è costui! Il mio cuore scoppia quasi della rabbia. Chi dice che codesta gelosia è insensata? . . . L'ora è fissata, il mercato conchiuso . . ." (Carcano, X, 49), etc.

[2] Verdi letter to Boito, 6 January 1890: "Il mio cameriere è licenziato. Se ne è presentato uno, certo *Vittorio Falsetti* (brutta parola, direbbe Frod [*sic*])"; in *Carteggio Verdi-Boito*, ed. Mario Medici and Marcello Conati (Parma, 1978), I, 157.

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

few introductory and concluding lines (fols. 180^{r}–86^{v}); and an extended orchestral introduction to Act III (fols. 261^{r}–65^{v}).

When Budden does invoke the autograph score, he draws conclusions that a closer study might have prevented. He notices, for example, that at the end of Falstaff's Act III, scene 1 monologue (fol. 277^{v}) "the autograph contains two bars of transition here that do not appear in the printed score; presumably the advantages of suddenness occurred to Verdi after the manuscript had been sent to the publisher" (p. 504n). Here the esssential facts are omitted. The two measures are explicitly crossed out, and their music occurs on one staff only (first violins): they are thus the remains of an earlier draft (or "skeleton score") version. Such situations are scarcely unique: the Ford/Falstaff duet in Act II, scene 1 preserves four earlier, deleted measures (fol. 146^{v}), and the conclusion of Ford's monologue in Act II, scene 1 preserves one (fol. 173^{r}: more would be available were fol. 172 not a replacement folio). In any event, as the proofs confirm, it is clear that Verdi changed the two measures in Falstaff's solo piece before sending them to Ricordi, not after.

The most pronounced shortcoming of the *Falstaff* chapter is its failure to separate out the differences among the three versions of the opera authorized by Verdi: the Milanese (premiering 9 February 1893), the Roman (15 April 1893), and the Parisian (18 April 1894—not May 1894, as in Budden, p. 440). Budden's presentation of the Roman revisions (two major changes: a shortening—sixteen to six measures—of a portion of the laundry-basket ensemble in Act II, scene 2 and a replacement of the final 111 measures of Act III, scene 1 with eighty new measures) touches on the basic information but has little to offer beyond what has already been published by Hans Gál and Guglielmo Barblan. Certain points are therefore lacking. First, following his predecessors, Budden does not mention that Verdi also reharmonized the four measures following the sixteen removed measures in the Act II, scene 2 ensemble; this reharmonization may date from the period of the revision (March–May 1893), although the composer could have independently altered the four measures, perhaps during the rehearsal period before the première, in January 1893. Second, a study of the correspondence in the Ricordi Archives, especially the telegram copies, could have demonstrated that the rewritten Act II, scene 2 ensemble may have been first performed without the Act III, scene 1 revision in Genoa in early April 1893. Third, Budden does not suggest that Verdi might have revised Act III, scene 1 as a result of certain rather cool critical responses to that portion of the opera during the earlier, La Scala performances. And finally, there is no mention of the fact that Verdi does not provide the original music for the conclusion of Act III, scene 1 in its entirety in his Roman revision.

Budden's treatment of the late 1893–January 1894 Parisian alterations seriously understates their importance (on p. 440 he asserts that "no further revisions of any substance follow [the Roman revisions]"). He specifically identifies (but does not date) only one change for the French score, the 18–21 January 1894 addition of the "Par ici" (or "Inoltriam") dialogue before Nannetta's song in Act III, scene 2. The rest he labels "minute divergences"

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and leaves unspecified. In fact, there are five Parisian changes—three of considerable interest—and Ricordi carried them over into the presumably authoritative September 1897 Italian vocal score (the third and final edition printed in Verdi's lifetime): (1) The final note of Alice's "Che fai?" in Act II, scene 2 (No. 49) was rewritten a sixth lower, from c^2 to e^1. (2) In the Act II, scene 2 ensemble the last two notes of Bardolfo's "Non si trova" (13 mm. after No. 59) were rewritten as *b-b*, changed from the original *g-g*. (3) The "Inoltriam" dialogue was added in Act III, scene 2 (beginning 5 mm. after No. 34). This change is linked to the revision of the stage directions after Nannetta's song: the entrance of all the characters *ca.* 20 mm. after No. 38. (4) In the "Litany" in Act III, scene 2 ("Domine fallo casto!", etc., for 16 mm. after No. 43) the interjections of Cajus, Bardolfo, Ford, Pistola, and the Fairies ("Pancia ritronfia!", etc.) were consistently removed. (5) A new, shortened text ("Già s'avanza il corteggio nuzïale. È dessa," etc.) replaced Ford's original comments above the wedding minuet in Act III, scene 2 ("Già s'avanza la coppia degli sposi," etc., beginning 8 mm. after No. 50).

That Verdi never entered these changes into the autograph score—and that all twentieth-century Ricordi vocal scores retain only the first three of the Parisian revisions—raises disturbing editorial questions that Budden, far from pursuing, fails to mention. Indeed, the whole question of a definitive edition of the opera rests squarely on the issue of the validity of the five Parisian revisions for Italian stages. Budden can only assure us that "it is difficult to be certain" about the binding character of the "minute divergences" for Paris, although "with the Paris performance the opera for all practical purposes [?] attains its final form" (p. 440). Without a precise identification of the variants and a close study of the early editions, however, such judgments are insufficiently founded.

Perhaps more troubling than these matters of historical detail is the uneven quality of the musical analysis. It is without question gratifying that Budden's discussions strive to attain a higher level than those of the earlier Verdian handbooks, and amid the close-packed observations the reader will find numerous individual flashes of insight. Yet, the analyses are often unsatisfying, largely because of their frequent mistaking of chord for key and their singling out of relatively minor harmonic details at the expense of more important considerations.

Budden's discussion of the nine-measure, E-major "Bacio" section from the love duet in *Otello*, Act I (Rehearsal letter YY) is a case in point. Here he accurately perceives the passage as "little more than an expanded cadence," but goes on to refer to its "elliptical progressions" that "at one point . . . [seem] to pull back from the brink of B major" (p. 355). This is puzzling. In the first place, even if his analysis were unimpeachable, such a passage would scarcely be as brinksmanlike as Budden's language suggests; a tonic-dominant relationship, after all, is far from extraordinary. More important, one wonders where this suggestion of B major occurs. Budden may mean either that the V^6_5/V in measure 2 nearly tonicizes B major (I hope not), or, more likely, that the chord in measure 5, a neighboring embellishment (sounding enharmon-

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

ically like a half-diminished $C\sharp^{4}_{3}$) of the E^6 that it precedes, longs to be heard as an altered supertonic seventh in B; but this, too, is problematic. It is evident, of course, that theoretically one could move to B major by proceeding from the chord in measure 5, but the point is rendered irrelevant by the potent sweep of the existing E-major bass line, the larger, dominating musical context.[3]

Occasionally, Budden's reluctance to acknowledge these broader tonal contexts steers his arguments into odd directions. After noticing, for instance, that the introduction to the F-sharp minor "Willow Song" in *Otello*, Act IV begins with the principal melody played in C-sharp minor by the English horn, he proffers the following:

> But why in C sharp minor when the song itself is rooted in F sharp minor? Because the cor anglais could not play it effectively in Desdemona's key. Tonal consistency is therefore sacrificed to considerations of emotional colour, though without any detriment to the music as a whole. One can only repeat that conventional rules about key weighed little with Verdi (p. 389).

The evidence is insufficient to assert this. Were Budden able to demonstrate that Verdi had altered preexisting (preferably F-sharp minor) music to accommodate the English horn (which, to judge from the autograph score, is not the case), he might well insist on his point.[4] As it stands, one would hate to be obliged to defend the proposition that preparing a tonic by its dominant sacrifices tonal consistency.

On a somewhat larger scale, consider his discussion of Iago's "Credo" in *Otello*, Act II:

> Iago's creed has four articles of belief. . . . The piece is so designed as to fall into two sections: the first, short and expository, is framed by two massive statements of Ex. 193a [the declamatory line doubled in octaves, first heard 7 mm. after letter C]. . . . All this conveys the first article of faith. The second section ("Credo che il giusto è un istrion beffardo") is based mostly on Ex. 193b [first heard *aspramente* after letter D], beginning in C minor and modulating freely so as to culminate in a B major climax at the words "dal germe della culla" that dissolves straightaway into an orchestral guffaw of semiquavers (p. 358).

[3] The passage has received a more telling analysis by David Lawton, "On the 'Bacio' Theme in *Otello*," *19th Century Music*, I (1977–78), 211–20. (Budden, it might be noted, fails to include the Lawton article in his bibliography, although several items with later dates are included.)

[4] Interestingly enough, such a tonal point may be made with autograph evidence in Falstaff's monologue, "Ehi! Taverniere!", *Falstaff*, III.i. Verdi's first draft within the orchestral score (still present in the voice part and in portions of the principal instrumental treble) ended in E-flat major ("e il trillo invade il mondo," fol. 277^r). While filling in the orchestration at a later date, however, he transposed much of the monologue's ending up a semitone, thus closing in E major. The moment of the transposition may be demonstrated to have occurred precisely as Verdi scored the words "un negro grillo che vibra entro l'uom brillo" (fol. 276^r), a passage for which the composer was requesting low trills from three flutes. Had he written the trills in the flat key, the third flute would have been forced to execute the impractical trill, *c-d♭*, above the word "brillo." A *c♯-d* trill, on the other hand, is an easy matter. Thus the passage was probably transposed upward in order to obtain a more convenient trill on the third flute. At least in this passage Verdi seems to have given priority to instrumental color, not key. (But notice that this alteration may be linked to the addition of an orchestral prelude to Act III—now beginning in E major—at a fairly late stage of composition: see p. 579 above.)

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Such a description is more likely to confuse than to clarify. First, even if one agrees that there are two sections, surely the second begins at letter E, "Credo con fermo cuor," which indeed tonicizes C minor, unlike "Credo che il giusto," ten measures later. Presumably we are dealing here with a *lapsus calami*. Second, one might quarrel with Budden's structural division, in which the first "Credo" constitutes a self-contained section and the remaining three—and everything thereafter—are relegated to an amorphous "second section." This overlooks the critical point that Verdi has shaped the music to reflect the textual anaphora; indeed, each "Credo" is more intense than its predecessor, and all four build structurally to the decisive final lines. In brief, the first "Credo," set squarely in F minor, begins and ends with the voice on c^1 and receives free, quasi-recitative treatment. The second, third, and fourth are set more melodically and in parallel fashion (musical anaphora), except that the voice begins each a semitone higher, the second on c^1, the third on $d\flat^1$, the fourth on $d\natural^1$. Tonally, the second ("Credo con fermo cuor") is in C minor throughout, the minor dominant of the prevailing F minor; the third ("Credo che il giusto") suggests a momentary tonicization of (not a modulation to) VI, D♭; the fourth ("E credo l'uom") begins and ends on ominous diminished sevenths, but does burst onto a perverse B^6_4 (with an aftermath "in" B minor) at "dal germe della culla." A final section ("Vien dopo tanta irrision") brings back some of the motives and textures associated with the first "Credo" and restores the original F tonic at the end, after "è vecchia fola il ciel" makes a strong feint towards VI, D♭.

Thus, the structure of the piece suggests more clearly five sections, not two, in a rough arch form, as so often in late Verdi: Credo 1 (F minor)—Credos 2, 3, and 4 as centerpieces (increasing tension via V, VI, and the unstable B^6_4)—Codetta and *parola scenica*, recalling Credo 1 and regaining the original tonic. It is also possible to hear Credos 2, 3, and 4, along with the final "è vecchia fola," as elaborating a linear thrust from dominant to tonic: c^1, $d\flat^1$, $d\natural^1$, $e\flat^1$, f^1. Finally, one might notice that the "modulations" are by no means free—rather, most articulate important scale degrees of the F-minor tonic—nor do they appear to be manipulated primarily to produce B major as a climactic key.

Budden's reluctance to subordinate certain harmonic events to others may well account for his position that tonal plans are virtually nonexistent in Verdi's music. The position, axiomatic for much of his analysis in this volume, was stated in its purest form in the first volume of his study ("in accounting for the unity of a Verdi opera we cannot speak of tonal schemes since these operate when at all only within the compass of a separate number," I, 40) and pursued in the second ("The truth is that such coincidences of tonality as occur within the same piece too often occur at illogical moments or more often do not occur at all. . . . It is much easier to show that Verdi tends to use keys as areas of contrast," II, 53).[5]

[5] Budden's position seems especially provocative in view of the recent lively discussions about Verdian tonality in *19th Century Music*. Besides Lawton's work mentioned in n. 3, above, see Siegmund Levarie, "Key Relations in Verdi's *Un ballo in maschera*," II (1978–79), 143–47; Joseph Kerman, "Viewpoint," *ibid.*, 186–91; Guy A. Marco and

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

If tonality is to be essentially arbitrary, except as a mere contrasting device within the narrowest contexts, as when C momentarily becomes "the key of the prosecution" and E "the key of the defence" in the opening of *Falstaff*, Act I (p. 449), then it must be replaced with something else as a bonding agent, lest the operas be thought capricious and illogical. Budden describes this substitute element most explicitly in the second volume:

> In accounting for the unity of a Verdi opera it is difficult to go beyond Basevi's "tinta," as described in Vol. 1 of the present study [where, incidentally, it is mentioned as " 'colorito' . . . certain details of melodic, harmonic or rhythmic procedure" (I, 40)], except to point out that in the later works this can embrace more than one element (II, 53).

That which he denies to tonality he therefore grants to various *tinta*-producing procedures. Clearly, demonstrating the *tinta* assumes considerable importance. To cite a few examples (and his discussions rarely go beyond what is summarized here, because "it is dangerous to analyse too closely the Verdian tinta" [II, 520]):

1. *Macbeth*: the prevalence of ideas within a minor third (I, 40).
2. *Il trovatore*: a "wide arpeggio reach" in many themes (II, 53–54).
3. *La traviata*: a "wealth of delicate waltz-like ideas . . . centered round small intervals" (II, 53).
4. *Les Vêpres siciliennes*: a "smooth melodic swell combined with an abundance of death-figures" (II, 53).
5. *Simon Boccanegra*: frequent pentatonic contours (II, 41, 291, 293).
6. *Stiffelio* and *Aroldo*: overlapping linear fourths, such as $b\flat^1$-$e\flat^2$-d^2-g^2, perhaps with religious connotations (I, 457 and II, 347n).
7. *La forza del destino*: the rising sixth as a basis for melodies, particularly from tonic to submediant and dominant to mediant; and overlapping and circling fourths for certain themes of Alvaro and Leonora (II, 520–21).
8. *Don Carlos*: a four-note pattern that revolves around a minor sixth—usually an ascending third and fourth followed by a descending second (as $e\flat^1$-$g\flat^1$-$c\flat^2$-$b\flat^1$)—and (as additional factors) "lamenting" acciaccature and half-note chords (III, 41, 55, 109–10, 112).
9. *Aida*: a twisting melodic contour of the basic shape $f\sharp^2$-g^2-b^2-d^3-$c\sharp^3$-$f\sharp^2$ (as in mm. 8–9 of the Prelude), "Ethiopian" themes in minor, beginning with a melodic descent from dominant to tonic, and a simple, rising scalar gesture (as in "Ritorna vincitor") (III, 199, 203, 208, 211, 213, 216, 218, 229, 231, and 251).
10. *Otello*: (curiously) the question of *tinta* does not arise, although some individual scenes develop around differing motives, some primarily melodic (III, 335, 388–89), some primarily rhythmic (III, 342, 356–57).
11. *Falstaff*: likewise, no specific discussion of *tinta* as such, but

---

Siegmund Levarie, "On Key Relations in Opera," III (1979–80), 83–89 [in which Levarie introduced the terms "ontic" and "gignetic" into the Verdian tonal argument]; and Gary Tomlinson, "Verdi after Budden," V (1981–82), 170–82. Budden includes only the first Levarie article in his third-volume bibliography.

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

> much commentary, as in *Otello*, on the development of differing motives; this leaves open the possibility of "jewelled workmanship" (III, 381) as supplying the necessary *tinta*.

One might question whether these devices, most often pitch cells that are hardly omnipresent, suffice to join together an entire composition. It is not clear, for instance, that the cells thus isolated are not common enough to recur in any large work. But Budden is not interested in presenting a sustained theory or demonstration of motivic development; rather, he wishes to flag our attention to an abstract pattern five or six times during the course of an opera and assert, as in his *Forza* discussion, that "this consistency is sufficient to carry the widest variety elsewhere and so preserve a basic unity . . ." (II, 521). Yet if he desires to postulate that the structural integrity of an opera hangs on its generation and development of, e.g., an abstract intervallic set—which he terms variously throughout his volumes a "Schenkerian 'Grundgestalt' " (I, 457), a "Grundgestalt" (II, 53), an "Urgestalt" (III, 41) , or an instance of "schemes of pitch" (III, 385)—one might expect a more substantial demonstration of the principles involved.

Thus, the specialist will find much to challenge in these volumes, and the serious reader will be tempted to pepper the margins with additions, corrections, question marks, and exclamation points. Nevertheless, the book is far too useful to ignore, and, despite its imperfections, it is still an indispensable treasure-house of singular, if somewhat discontinuous, ideas for which modern scholarship can be grateful. Certainly it sets a new standard for closeness of investigation that all subsequent studies will be forced to meet or surpass. *The Operas of Verdi* will doubtless remain a convenient point of departure for more advanced work for many years to come.

JAMES A. HEPOKOSKI
Oberlin College,
Conservatory of Music

This content downloaded from 128.36.7.70 on Sat, 23 Feb 2019 20:39:18 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms