4-1973

The Significance of Characterization in the Preparation and Composition of "The Marriage of Figaro"

Philip Wayne Hardin
Ouachita Baptist University

The Significance of Characterization in the Preparation and Composition of *The Marriage of Figaro*

Honors Special Study
prepared by

Philip W. Hardin

April 23, 1973

The Significance of Characterization in the Preparation and Composition of The Marriage of Figaro

In the 1770's and 1780's two plays written by a Frenchman named Beaumarchais were creating quite a stir in Europe. They challenged and ridiculed the inherent "superiority" of the aristocrats of French society. Later called "the prelude to the French Revolution," these plays were quite controversial and therefore immensely popular. The Barber of Seville and its sequel, The Marriage of Figaro, became instantly well known and both were adapted for opera, the former by Giovanni Paisiello, the latter by Wolfgang A. Mozart.[1]

Mozart's rendering of the second play did not concern itself with the controversial issue of class conflict but was, even so, a successful and popular opera. The success of The Marriage of Figaro lay in the skill of the composer in presenting well-defined and believable characters. In reading the play Mozart saw through the political and social satire to the characters that he wanted as subjects. It is therefore interesting to consider the selection of the play, its adaption by Mozart's librettist and the realization of the plot and characterizations by the composer himself.

> For it was high time for him to tackle another work for the stage, and the German opera having come to grief, he was naturally looking out, without success at first...for an Italian book. Beaumarchais, we know attracted him, and about the middle of 1786 he found the opportunity to embark on an operatic version of the second

> comedy in the French author's trilogy--
> Le Mariage de Figaro.[2]

But Mozart's interest was not spurred by this play alone. He was familiar with the original play of Beaumarchais' trilogy, The Barber of Seville, and was encouraged by the success of the story as an opera set by Giovanni Paisiello. Paisiello was living in St. Petersburg and, on a stop-over in Vienna, visited with Mozart.

> What interested Mozart was Paisiello's comic opera Il Barbiere di Siviglio which had been produced at the court of Catherine II of Russia in 1780 and was brought out in Vienna during the composer's visit. There can be little doubt that it was this work which first gave him (Mozart) the idea of an operatic setting of another comedy by Beaumarchais, the sequel to Le Barbier de Séville.[3]

The sequel was not at all like the original Barber. Beaumarchais' first version of The Barber of Seville was a mild spoof of the titled aristocracy of France. When later his dealings with aristocrats had produced bitter feelings, he revised the Barber and made it into a biting satire. This revision, of course, was squashed when it reached the rehearsal stages and the original restored.

By 1780, however, revolutionary rumblings had increased and Beaumarchais no longer felt that he had to bridle his pen. Using most of the same characters from The Barber of Seville and a few additions, he began a new play which gave vent to his bitterness toward aristocrats.

> The central theme of the play, the struggle between Figaro and his master, was for Beaumarchais' contemporaries a symbol of the struggle going on between commoners and aristocrats....He incorporated into it most of the sarcasm about aristocracy and attacks on the social order of his time that he had been compelled to cut out of the second version of Le Barbier de Séville.[4]

The Marriage of Figaro, the sequel to The Barber of Seville was, therefore, a political play. It appeared at a time when the dissatis-

faction of the French people with their "God-given upper class" was only nine years away from a very bloody revolution. The play echoed this dissatisfaction and took a direct slap at the aristocracy and autocratic rule. An obvious example occurs when the conflict between Figaro and the Count comes to a head and the barber blasts the premise of title by birth.

> Because you are a great lord, you believe you are a great genius! Nobility, fortune, rank, position, all that makes you so proud! What have you done to enjoy so many advantages? You have taken the trouble of being born and nothing more. Your birth apart, you are a very ordinary man. While I...by Jove! Lost in obscurity, I needed more science and skill just to subsist than were needed to govern all Spain for a hundred years.[5]

Georges LeMaitre, Beaumarchais' biographer, comments that "This thundering challenge was one day to awaken a tremendous echo in the hearts of millions of Frenchmen."[6]

A considerable stir grew up even in 1782 when the King of France would not allow the play's public production. Beaumarchais, who had acquired a good deal of influence among the royal family, had showed The Marriage of Figaro privately to Marie-Antoinette. The Queen enjoyed the reading and encouraged Louis to allow Beaumarchais to present it in the Royal Theatre at Versailles. The King would agree only to listen to the play and make a decision afterward. He, of course, sensed the satire and derisive nature of the play and forbade its playing.

> It is detestable! It will never be played! Why, if this play were to be performed, the Bastille would have to be pulled down!....That man mocks everything that ought to be respected in government....[7]

Beaumarchais, ever the activist and manipulator, tried to reverse this ruling by using public opinion. His play contained a scene in which

Cherubine sings a short love song. He quickly composed the words for the song to fit a very popular tune and promoted the singing of this new song all over France. Soon the public picked it up and delighted itself in supporting Beaumarchais' cause since it was in so doing indirectly creating a mass affront to the King.[8]

This mockery frightened the King. He feared the influence that the play might have and he feared Beaumarchais' influence. For, even though the play was banned from public production, the author succeeded in having it read to private audiences in the homes of some aristocratic friends. And finally, after two years, with Marie-Antoinette's approval The Marriage of Figaro was prepared for public presentation.

The King did not interfere at first, but immediately before the opening performance sent an emissary to stop the play. A small-scale riot ensued. To make matters even worse for Louis, the Comte de Vandreuil agreed to finance a private staging of the play at his chateau and Beaumarchais, who was present, was highly praised. After two more months of delay King Louis gave in and the first public performance took place in April, 1784. This capitulation was later hailed as the first victory of the people over the King.[9]

The victory, at least for Beaumarchais, was short-lived, however. His aristocratic enemies engaged him in a battle of words and, when he allegedly insulted the King's brother, who actively wrote against Beaumarchais, he was arrested and taken to a prison for juvenile delinquents. For the fifty-three-year-old author this was the supreme humiliation--one that broke his spirit and killed his will to fight. Thereafter he was a regular "milk-toast" seeking to avoid everyone's anger and disapproval.[10]

His play did not avoid anger and disapproval--at least not among the more perceptive aristocrats. The Marriage of Figaro was banned in several European capitals, but where it was produced it was enthusiastically received by the middle classes who enjoyed this vicarious ridiculing of the upper class.

But even without the socio-political sensationalism in the play, The Marriage of Figaro was a good comedy. For this reason even some of the aristocrats enjoyed it. One person who appreciated the quality of Beaumarchais' comedy and recognized in it the possible subject for an opera was Lorenzo da Ponte. Da Ponte, (1749-1838), was a competent librettist and had collaborated with several of the leading composers in Vienna.

He had begun his career in Venice but, after being exiled, wandered northward. He was attracted to Vienna by the reputations of some of the opera composers living there and soon acquired a reputation of his own.

> At the command of the Emperor da Ponte adapted for him the Opera, Il Burbero di Buon Core, after Goldini's comedy, ...with complete success; but his next operas, Il Finto Cieco, composed by Gazzaniga, and Il Demogorgone, composed by Righini, were not particularly successful. Not satisfied with these composers, he cast his eyes on Mozart, to whom he had promised a libretto as early as 1783.[11]

Both Mozart and da Ponte recognized the possibilities that The Marriage of Figaro offered and, after one refusal, Mozart succeeded in persuading da Ponte to adapt the play for an Italian opera. Eric Blom, in his biography, Mozart, describes the situation.

> He had met the right librettist in Lorenzo da Ponte--the right one for him, at any

> rate, for da Ponte had worked with other composers like Salieri, Gazzaniga, Righini, and the Italianized Spaniard Martin y Soler with varied success. He was a Venetian Jew by birth, Emanuele Conegliano, but he had been christened in his fourteenth year by the Bishop of Ceneda, whose name he adopted....He was no great literary genius, but an adroit craftsman and neat versifier. At any rate, the Beaumarchais subject suited him, and he turned it skillfully into what, but for a weakness in the fourth act, has remained one of the world's best operatic librettos, excising the numerous allusions in the revolutionary, which did not suit the purposes of the musical stage, but leaving the polished intrigue of the original unimpaired. Moreover, he was shrewd enough to recognize a great composer and saw his advantage in being associated with a genius like Mozart, whose suggestions he knew to be sound and accepted without demur.[12]

Mozart's major suggestion, of course, was for the removal of the political and social satire that perhaps would hinder the opera's production. He was interested in producing a successful opera, his primary concerns being the joining of the music to the libretto and the mechanics of opera staging. He could not be bothered by too controversial a subject. Two Mozart scholars express well the composer's attitude toward the political comment in Beaumarchais' play.

> Beaumarchais' original French play Le Mariage de Figaro...was a social and political satire, but in constructing the Italian libretto the political sections were entirely omitted by da Ponte....It was...done at the express wish of Mozart, who had no interest in politics.... He was indifferent to political principles and had only an interest in the men who represented them.[13]

> Mozart was not interested in Beaumarchais' revolutionary message, and no political satire of any kind was allowed to appear in the opera. The general idea of a struggle between cunning and force was kept, but completely stripped of all social significance. The outline of Le Mariage de Figaro's plot was retained, though reduced to mere anecdote.[14]

It is apparent that cutting the political allusions out of a satire such as The Marriage of Figaro is removing the primary thrust and bite of the play. "Mere anecdote" is hardly a basis for a successful opera even when the anecdotes concern such a popular subject as problems of love. This is especially true in the case of The Marriage of Figaro since its dependence on satire for interest had made it unnecessary to develop the love conflict beyond its basic details.[15]

> The omission of political satire is the more serious because it leaves as the central point of the plot an immorality which is not exactly justified, but not by any means seriously punished; only treated with a certain frivolity. The noble libertine is opposed by true and upright love, hones devotion to duty and honourable conduct; but these moral qualities are not made in themselves effective; the true levers of the plot are cunning and intrigue employed as weapons of defence....The dialogue is undoubtedly in many respects purer than in the comedy; but the plot and its motives, the chief situations, the whole point of view, become all the more decidedly frivolous.[16]

The frivolity of the subject without political satire didn't bother Mozart. He sensed in this play something that kept it a cut above other comedies and, in an operatic version, a cut above the average buffa.

> His chief concern was doubtless the gradual unfolding and continued interest of the plot, and the graphic delineation of character, qualities which were entirely overlooked by the ordinary opera buffa. Any approach to probability or analogy with actual life was not thought of... attempts to give consistency to the caricatures of individuals and situations only served to bring their irreconcilable contrasts into stronger relief. In Figaro, on the contrary, the interest depends upon the truth of the representation of actual life. The motives of the actors are serious, they are carried out with energy and intellect, and from them the situations are naturally developed....[17]

"Delineation of character," an attempt at depicting "actual life," is an important step up in the world of comedy. Beaumarchais' The Marriage of Figaro is different even from its predecessor The Barber of Seville in this respect. The Barber of Seville is, like most comedy of this era, influenced greatly by the commedia dell'arte all'improvviso--literally, professional improvised comedy. This form of theater consisted of a fixed group of characters who acted out a fixed group of plots with improvised dialogue. The stories never changed and the personalities never changed--only the lines. The characters were caricatures parodies from everyday life but possessing no actual life as such, only an expected, standard reaction to each situation. "...each one tended to assume a stereotyped habit and name, more significant, really than anything he might do."[18]

The Barber of Seville follows this pattern pretty closely, both in the play and in the operatic version by Paisiello.

> Le Barbier de Séville was a predestined opera buffa, and had indeed been conceived by Beaumarchais as an opera-comique. The cheated old man who wishes to marry his ward, the noble lover in disguise, the wily servant, this time in the guise of a barber--these are typical figures of the commedia dell'arte....[19]

In Figaro Beaumarchais went a step further and gave his characters some life. The influence of the commedia dell'arte stops when he makes his players into people of the French aristocracy, "particular individuals, twisted and tormented behind a deceptive facade of high breeding and gaiety."[20] He sought to depict them as they were, creatures playing a perverted role in an unjust social and political system. The seriousness of their characterization, even in a comedy, made them more than just caricatures.

> It has been observed with truth that in Sussane there is a bit of Columbina left, in Figaro of Arlecchino; that Don Bartolo and Marcellina are pure buffo figures. But the Countess? The Count? Cherubino? The tiny roles of Barbarina and her father, the gardener Antonio? Basilio the schemer? It took courage to see the opera buffa possibilities in this work and to realize them....[22]

To compound the problem, the elimination of social and political struggles removed some of the motivations behind the actions of Beaumarchais' complex characters. Hence, da Ponte and Mozart needed to reduce the characters to a level consistent to the remaining plot.[23] The task fell first to da Ponte in the preparation of the libretto. His responsibility was to take everything that remained in The Marriage of Figaro after political editing, weed out further dead weight and still have a coherent and attractive story for opera. He was equal to the task.

> ...he achieved a masterful libretto construction. The requirements of a comic opera, with its constant succession of solos, duos, terzets and other concerted numbers, the necessity for shortening as much as possible the stretches of recitative by which the action is carried, the radical changes to be made in timing and business, were all grasped by him with wonderful clarity. Figaro as an opera does not, of course, cut as reasonable a path through the mazes of parents, fiances, spouses, amoureux, and the law as does Figaro the play; but the very tightening necessary to the opera increases its pace and accent.[24]

Since characterization is so important in the edited story, da Ponte had to be doubly careful in his cutting that he did not remove any of a character's actions or lines that were essential to the definition of his personality. The success of Mozart's setting of the libretto attests to

the skill with which da Ponte achieved the verbal part of characterization, about which it has been said "(he) observed not only the social vagaries of his time but the psychological verities of all time."[25]

Another evidence of da Ponte's skill is the fact that Mozart chose to collaborate with him on two more libretti, Don Giovanni and Cosi Fan Tutte, which along with Figaro are Mozart's best efforts at opera buffa. In speaking of da Ponte's success with opera libretti, Marcia Davenport stated:

> Indeed, Da Ponte was a first-rate theatre poet, how only his protecting God could tell, for he had had little enough experience. His lines had both brilliance and flare, which struck themes from Wolfgang's imagination like hammers upon flint. Thus the characters of Figaro--and later of Don Giovanni--came alive in music, and were perhaps the first characters ever to spring forth from this medium. This composer and this librettist were a combination whose equal has never since been produced.[26]

One reason for the success of this team was da Ponte's understanding of what Mozart was about. He evidently knew of Mozart's interest and talent in characterization and provided situations and dialogues which were suitable for effective depiction of personalities.[27]

Da Ponte's efforts were not wasted on Mozart. He made full use of each situation in the libretto, developing each character as much as possible, taking care to keep the characterizations consistent throughout while avoiding the redundancy of caricature.[28] Consistency is important to dramatic characterization, for though being too consistent yields stiff players or the exaggerated types of commedia dell'arte, neither

should the characters be too changeable and capricious, rendering their actions unreasonable and unbelievable.

Mozart produced characters instead of caricatures, individuals instead of images. The characters of The Marriage of Figaro become realistic and believable human beings, comprehensible in twentieth-century as well as eighteenth-century terms.[29] Their reality stems not so much from the words they speak or the antics they perform but from the way they are pictures as they move through the plot. Mozart understood the characters in da Ponte's rendering of the play and their motives and emotions as well. Therefore, the situations in Figaro proceed logically from the reactions and interactions of these characters. No unreasonable plot twists are to be found; no deus ex machina to tie everything off in a proper denoument. His excellence in characterization results, of course, from his wise manipulation of the verses provided him in the libretto; but beyond a faithful and imaginative rendering of the words per se, Mozart polished up his characters and made them vibrant through the use of his most effective tool, the music. Donald Grout put it this way:

> This secret is...in the nature of the music itself, in the form created by the extension of a melodic line in time, and in the simultaneous harmonic combinations, rhythms, and colors of the supporting instruments--all of which somehow (given a composer like Mozart) convey to us just those things inexpressible in words yet infinitely important which make the difference between a lifeless figure and a living being....how little the words alone tell us about the person, and how much the music.[30]

Figaro, for instance, enters the opera as a confident and happy bridegroom. When a threat to his happiness arises almost immediately he belittles its seriousness and assures Sussana that he will devise a clever plan to remedy the situation. Although the words exude confidence in his mastery of the problem, the music does not let us believe that

all is sunny in Figaro's mind. The presto section of his cavatina in Act I suggests the fear inspired by his master's interest in Sussana; and later he plots to embarrass the Count through a masquerade.[31]

Bartolo, despite all the fire and gusto he puts into "La Vendetta," is defeated in his attempt to appear pompous by the score Mozart provided for the orchestra. The ascending motive and smooth runs in the strings give the aria a lightness and aura of playfulness that belie any impression of vengeance and dangerous plotting.

Cherubino, though he protests he cannot sing, does so humbly imploring the Countess and Sussana to explain to him the puzzle of the love that is welling up within him. Mozart did not take Cherubino's words at face value, obviously, for he gave him an arietta, "Voi che sapete," that is emotional and portrays a young man not so much interested in an explanation of love as he is in more opportunities to experience it. His passion is made plainer by the orchestration of this song. The strings are muted, imitating a guitar, and keep up a steady flow of sound while here and there solo woodwinds chime in to heighten the touches of emotion.[32]

Woodwinds are used earlier for the sake of emotional shading in the cavatina "Porgi, amor, qualche ristoro." The Countess, who doesn't appear until the second act, is very quickly characterized here as the faithful wife whose heart is being broken by her inconsiderate husband. The openness and clarity of the music in this number easily suggest the purity of her emotion and evoke pity and sympathy from the listener.

While no sympathy is elicited for the roguish Count Almaviva, there is never any doubt as to how he feels about the events of the opera. A particularly graphic example is the aria "Vedro mentr'io sospiro" in

which the Count, sensing betrayal and embarrassment, works himself into an indignant rage. Mozart gives him appropriately contemplative music for the first half of the aria, music which hovers around the dominant key and reflects the Count's debate with himself as to whether his servants should be happy while his own desires are being denied. Firmly resolved that such an injustice should not occur, he launches into an impassioned tirade against Figaro and Sussana for even presuming to attempt to injure his pride or spite him. Mozart showed the Count's indignation and embarrassment in several effective ways. He makes use of dynamic contrasts with sudden forte accents on key words like "audace" and "ridere;" there are brief suggestions of the minor key which enhance the Count's bitterness; and there is a generous use of rapidly moving strings with trills that give an effect of agitation and unrest to the vengeful Almaviva. Although not particularly important to the plot, this ego-crisis provided Mozart with one of the best opportunities in the entire opera for meaningful character development.

> One of the most remarkable things about the character delineation in Figaro is the fact that more of it is done in ensembles than in solo arias.[33]

One half of the numbers in The Marriage of Figaro are ensembles. In them some of the choicest humor in the opera is presented and some of the most effective music. Yet even with his concern for the comical and for the harmonious joining of several voices and orchestra, Mozart never lets his characterizations alter or slip into stereotyped or functional roles.[34]

Characterization in the small ensembles is not so difficult as in the large ones. Otto Jahn refers to it as"nothing more than a detailed and fuller exposition of some definite situation or mood."[35] The larger ensembles are better examples of consistent characterizations in a compli-

cated situation, the prime examples being the trio (terzet) in Act I, the finale of Act II, the sestet in Act III and the finale of Act IV.

The terzet demonstrates a sudden change in the attitudes of three characters when they are suddenly put on the spot. The Count, who has been trying to arrange a meeting with Sussana, discovers that he has been overheard by Cherubino and becomes hostile to the page, causing his embarrassment and injured pride to show through. Sussana, who until now had been calmly plotting to permanently discourage the Count's advances, shows her weakness and fear when Basilio's blunder and the discovery of Cherubino threaten to upset her wedding day. Basilio, the haughty busybody, suddenly cowers and tries to retract his malicious story when confronted by the Count.

The most interesting character study in the finale of Act II is that of the Count. He progresses from a jealous rage to embarrassment and penitence when he really does find Sussana behind his wife's door; then to apprehension when Marcellina fails to come in time to further his plan. The Count grasps at the opportunity provided him by Antonio's entrance and successfully delays until Marcellina arrives to present her claim on Figaro. He then re-assumes his dominant attitude, content that he once more has the upper hand.

Important in the recognition scene of Act III (the sestet) are the characterizational developments of Bartolo and Marcellina. These two, who had been plotting Figaro's undoing and a forced marriage to Marcellina, suddenly become doting parents to their long-lost illegitimate boy. Equally interesting is the comparison of the Count, who had considered Marcellina's plot his masterstroke to prevent Figaro from marrying Sus-

sana, and Sussana, who comes in after the recognition and thinks that Figaro does love Marcellina; both sing the same words of fury and disgust but for quite different reasons.

The complicated finale to Act IV offers a wealth of situations for characterizational developments and reactions, the final such developments to occur in the opera. They center around the ladies' masquerade and the resulting mistaken identity. The most amusing cases are when Figaro woos the "Countess," knowing it is Sussana, thus arousing her temporary hurt and anger (which he quickly soothes), and the following episode in which Figaro and the "Countess" continue the wooing to arouse the jealousy of the Count. The devilish Count becomes the wronged and innocent husband, calling out the servants to avenge his injured pride. He soon finds that the Sussana that he had been wooing is actually his wife. He can hide nothing (at last) so he begs for forgiveness, which the Countess quickly grants. When the opera ends here, nothing is thoroughly resolved, but everyone seems content for the moment.

Particularly important to these ensembles is the necessity of representing all the character changes and reactions mentioned above while working simultaneously for a group sound and sensible progression of the music itself. Even in the complex finale of Act IV each character is logically and effectively presented, aided by Mozart's masterly descriptive orchestral techniques. Though the orchestra is busy helping the singers get their emotions across, it still possesses the freedom to develop these helps into a sensible and uninterrupted piece of its own.

> Whereas the Italian composers as a rule were concerned only with suggesting bustle and activity and exploiting in every way the often crude

> farcical elements of the finale, Mozart never loses sight of the individuality of his persons; humor is there in abundance, but it is a finer, more penetrating humor than that of the Italians, a humor of character more than of situations, with that intermingling of seriousness which is the mark of great comedy....He over-topped his predecessors not by a changed approach to the problem of opera but by a superior beauty, originality, and significance of his musical ideas...and by his ability to write music which not only perfectly portrayed a dramatic situation but at the same time could develop freely in a musical sense, without appearing to be in the least hampered by the presence of a text.... his life-long interest in and mastery of the larger instrumental forms are reflected on every page of his operas--in the way in which voices and instruments are adjusted to one another, in the texture and treatment of the orchestral parts (particularly the independence of the wood winds)...and in the unerring sense of musical continuity extended over long and complex sections of the score.[36]

In other words, the music makes the opera. The story is good and the libretto constructed with the composer's purposes in mind, but it is the beauty and coherence of the music that make Mozart's The Marriage of Figaro a superior opera buffa.

> Taking that buffa tradition much as he found it, and doing almost nothing to change it, he composed operas that are living today, while his models have survived only as museum pieces. [37]

The music cinched Mozart's efforts for realistic characterization and the reason for the survival of his operas, The Marriage of Figaro in particular, is his excellence in characterization. He took da Ponte's characters, as adapted from Beaumarchais, and maintained their individuality throughout the opera. In the stressing of individuality Mozart was echoing the growing attitude of the importance of the individual that grew up in the late eighteenth century.

> In Mozart's operas the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries meet. He brought into the inherited traditions, forms, and musical language a new conception, that of the individual as the proper subject for operatic treatment.[38]

Maintaining the individuality of the characters gives the listener a chance to identify with them and to perceive them as real personalities. Mozart provides this opportunity without sacrificing the interest of the plot or the beauty of the music. Although such emphasis on full characterization is a trait of the Romantic era in the arts, it is present in this work written when Mozart was at his peak. Mozart, in The Marriage of Figaro, one of the oldest operas still performed, is considered by some to have achieved character delineation better than that found in the works of later operatic composers whose ideal was such detailed and masterful representation.

> ...he created a gallery of characters comparable to the creations of a great novelist--characters whose being is built solidly out of situation, music, and words. In this respect, in the creation of operatic characters in the round, Mozart has never been excelled.[39]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Georges LeMaitre, Beaumarchais (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), p. 275.

[2]Eric Blom, Mozart (New York: Collier Books, 1966), p. 122.

[3]Ibid., p.119.

[4]LeMaitre, op. cit., pp. 215-218.

[5]Ibid., p. 217.

[6]Ibid.,

[7]Ibid., p. 274.

[8]Ibid., pp. 276-278.

[9]Ibid., p. 279.

[10]Ibid., pp. 281-284.

[11]Otto Jahn, Life of Mozart, Vol. III (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc. 1970), p.65.

[12]Blom, op. cit., p. 122.

[13]W.J. Turner, Mozart, The Man and His Works (New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1938), pp. 336-338.

[14]LeMaitre, op. cit., p. 348.

[15]Jahn, op. cit., p. 79.

[16]Ibid., pp. 79-81.

[17]Ibid., pp. 81-82.

[18]Winifred Smith, The Commedia Dell'arte (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1912), p. 6.

[19]Albert Einstein, Mozart, His Character, His Work (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), p. 429.

[20]LeMaitre, op. cit., pp. 349-350.

[21]Ibid., p. 347.

[22]Einstein, loc. cit.

[23]LeMaitre, op. cit., p. 348.

[24]Marcia Davenport, Mozart (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), pp. 240-241.

[25]Frank Merkling, "This Week," Opera News, XXXII (December 9, 1967), 2.

[26]Davenport, op. cit., p. 241.

[27]Wallace Brockway and Herbert Weinstock, The Opera: A History of Its Creation and Performance: 1600-1941 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1941), p. 94.

[28]Donald Jay Grout, A Short History of Opera (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), p. 285.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Jahn, op. cit., p. 87.

[32]Ibid., pp. 97-98.

[33]Grout, op. cit., p. 285.

[34]Grout, op. cit., p. 286.

[35]Jahn, op. cit., p. 100.

[36]Grout, op. cit., pp. 275-278.

[37]Brockway, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

[38]Grout, op. cit., p. 297.

[39]Brockway, op. cit., p. 85.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berges, Ruth. Opera Origins and Side Lights. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1961.

Blom, Eric. Mozart. New York: Collier Books, 1966.

Breuer, Robert. "The Court Jester," Opera News, XXIV (January 23, 1960), 8.

Brockway, Wallace and Herbert Weinstock. The Opera: A History of its Creation and Performance: 1600-1941. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1941.

Davenport, Marcia. Mozart. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

Downes, Edward. "A Tender Irony," Opera News, XXIX (January 2, 1965), 24-25.

Einstein, Albert. Mozart, His Character, His Work. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Goldovsky, Boris. Bringing Opera to Life. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Grout, Donald Jay. A Short History of Opera. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Hastings, Baird. "The Road to Figaro," Opera News, XXV (January 28, 1961), 21-23.

Jahn, Otto. Life of Mozart. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Kerman, Joseph. "Marriages in Figaro," Opera News, XVIII (December 21, 1953), 26-28.

Kobbé, Gustav. The Complete Opera Book. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1919.

Lang, Paul Henry, ed. The Creative World of Mozart. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963.

LeMaitre, Georges. Beaumarchais. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.

Lingg, Ann M. "Meet Marcellina," Opera News, XXV (January 28, 1961), 14-15.

Merkling, Frank. "This Week," Opera News, XXXII (December 9, 1967), 2.

Mozart, Wolfgang A. Le Nozze di Figaro. Vocal score ed. 2021. New York: G. Schirmer, Inc., 1951.

Robinson, Michael F. Opera Before Mozart. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1966.

Smith, Winifred. The Commedia Dell'arte. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1912.

Turner, W.J. Mozart, The Man and His Works. New York: Tudor Publishing co., 1938.

Warnke, Frank J. "The Happy Ending," Opera News, XXIV (January 23, 1960), 4-5.