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Abstract

Vivaldi’s Op. 6 concertos first appeared in 1719 under the imprint of Jeanne Roger. Though the engraved parts contain an unusually large number of errors and the structure of the publication deviates in a quite clear-cut manner from that of any other instrumental collection shaped according to the traditional Vivaldian canons, in many respects these works are more ‘typical’ of their composer than any previously published.

The Introduction explores the characteristics of the textual transmission of Op. 6 and the stylistic features of each individual concerto in order to gather a broad range of information on the genesis and intrinsic nature of the collection. The Critical Edition of the six concertos includes a statement of Editorial Methods. All discrepancies between the principal source and the edition are documented in the Critical Commentary, which likewise comprehensively reports on variants in the secondary sources.
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Editorial Conventions and Abbreviations

Each composition by Vivaldi mentioned in the text is specified by its number according to Peter Ryom, *Antonio Vivaldi: Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis seiner Werke (RV)*. Notes of specified pitch are identified by the old German system (often called the ‘Helmholz’ system), were Middle C is c', italicized. Notes of unspecified pitch (as in the description of keys) use capital letters in roman font.

In harmonic analyses, major keys and their function in the overall tonal plan are identified by upper case roman numerals (I, II etc.) and minor by lower case (i, ii etc.); arrows (→) indicate functional modulation, while a double slash (//) is used to indicate an abrupt key change by hiatus.

The following abbreviations are used:

- **AnM** *Analecta Musicologica*
- **CZ-Bm** *Moravské zemské muzeum, Brno*
- **F-Pn** *Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris*
- **F-Ppincherle** *Collection Marc Pincherle, Paris*
- **GB-Lbl** *The British Library, London*
- **GB-Lcm** *Royal College of Music, London*
- **ISV** *Informazioni e studi vivaldiani*
- **ML** *Music & Letters*
- **QV** *Quaderni vivaldiani*
- **RISM** *Répertoire International des Sources Musicales*
- **S-L** *Universitetsbiblioteket, Lund*
- **SLUB** *Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats - und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden*
- **SV** *Studi vivaldiani*
Introduction

1. Vivaldi’s Op. 6: status quæstionis

The VI Concerti à Cinque Stromenti making up the Op. 6 of Antonio Vivaldi were published in Amsterdam by Jeanne Roger in 1719.¹ The publication appeared eight years after the first collection of Vivaldi concertos, Op. 3, L’estro armonico, and about four years after that of its sequel, Op. 4, La stravaganza, which had already been announced in the preface addressed “Alli dilettanti di musica” to the preceding publication but came out only at the end of 1715 or, at latest, during the first months of 1716.² It might be assumed that the slowness in issuing Op. 4 was due primarily to difficulties in finding a patron prepared to assume all or some of the costs of publication. This circumstance, however, would not explain sufficiently why the publisher Estienne Roger, having earlier financed and probably commissioned L’estro armonico directly from Vivaldi at a time when none of his concertos had yet been sent to the presses,³ decided to defer the appearance of his later collections. This choice becomes even more surprising if one considers that in the early 1710s Roger would have had to take advantage of the ever-growing demand for a musical genre that was still taking its first steps by complying with the expectations of a public that was continuing to expand and diversify. One may well imagine that the considerable financial outlay required to publish L’estro armonico was one of the reasons for this delay, since it would have been contrary to Roger’s interests to undertake too quickly a publishing operation that risked coming into competition with that of 1711, which had cost him so much labour. One should note, finally, that during the years 1714-1717 the dissemination of Vivaldi’s music, especially his concertos, via

---

² Ibid., pp. 95-98.
the medium of print occurred mostly through multi-authored anthologies, a phenomenon to which musicology has not yet paid enough attention.\footnote{A significant exception is Michael Talbot, ‘The Concerto Collection \textit{Roger no. 188}: Its Origin, Nature and Context’, \textit{SV}, 12 (2012, in preparation).}

From the time when, in autumn 1716, she began to assist her father Estienne in the management of the family firm, Jeanne Roger brought out a series of anthologies ‘à fortes parties’ (thus scored for an ensemble larger than that of an ordinary trio sonata), which contain one or more works attributed, or attributable, to Vivaldi.\footnote{For a general discussion of the characteristics of each anthology, see especially Rudolf Rasch, ‘La famosa mano’, cit., 120-23.}

Table 1. Jeanne Roger anthologies ‘à fortes parties’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>plate no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>VI Concerts à 5 &amp; 6 Instrumens</td>
<td>Composez par Messieurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Concerti a Cinque Con Violini, Oboè, Violetta Violoncello</td>
<td>e Basso Continuo,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These collections containing music by several authors were evidently particularly prized commodities certain of success, which made it possible to maintain the presence of the composer in the marketplace without saturating it, thereby preparing the ground for further single-author collections later on. As the 1710s drew to their close, the time was again right to publish a new collection of Vivaldi concertos, albeit in a more streamlined and inexpensive form than the two similar earlier publications. However, it seems very
unlikely that this renewed activity coincided with a resumption of direct contact between Vivaldi and the publisher. Significantly, both Op. 6 and the Op. 7 that followed it in c. 1720 are assembled from heterogeneous materials including dated and in some cases inauthentic compositions, probably as a result of having been put together without the composer’s participation (or even his knowledge).\(^6\)

The title page of Op. 6, which opens each partbook, reads:

VI CONCERTI à Cinque Stromenti, tre Violini | Alto Viola e Basso Continuo | DI | D. ANTONIO VIVALDI | Musico di Violino, e Maestro de Concerti | del Pio Ospitale della Pietà di Venetia |

OPERA SESTA | A AMSTERDAM | CHEZ JEANNE ROGER | N.\(^a\) [plate number] 452.

The absence of a dedication and the failure to mention Vivaldi’s title of “maestro di cappella di camera” to the plenipotentiary governor of Mantua, Philip of Hesse-Darmstadt, at whose court the composer had been residing since the spring of 1718,\(^7\) suggest strongly that Op. 6 was published without the composer’s assistance and perhaps even his agreement. Actually, the first official document to mention Vivaldi as “maestro di cappella di corte” is a payment note datable to autumn 1719,\(^8\) while the first libretto in which the composer is styled “maestro di cappella di camera di S. A. S. il Sig. principe Filippo langravio D’Assia Darmstadt” is the one printed for the staged production of *La Candace* (Mantua: A. Pazzoni, 1720). Even though Vivaldi possibly took charge *de facto* of secular music at the court from

\(^6\) Indeed, two concertos whose attribution had long been doubted on stylistic grounds have now been removed from the catalogue of Vivaldi’s works: RV 464 (Op. 7, Libro I, no. 1, now RV Anh. 141) and RV 465 (Op. 7, Libro II, no. 1, now RV Anh. 142); see Federico Maria Sardelli, ‘Aggiornamenti del catalogo vivaldiano’, *SV*, 9 (2009), pp. 105-14: 113. The authenticity of a further concerto, RV 343 (Op. 7, Libro II, no. 3), is considered very improbable on account of its divergence from Vivaldi’s usual style; see Michael Talbot, *Vivaldi and Fugue*, *QV*, 15 (Florence: Olschki, 2009), 187.


the time of his arrival in Mantua, it is likely that at the time when his Op. 6 was published he had not yet been formally invested with this title. But whatever the circumstances, if he had played any active part at all in the preparation of the printer’s copy for Op. 6, we may believe that he would not have hesitated to attach it to himself, even without authorization, for the sake of making a favourable impression on purchasers.\footnote{As he did, for example, in the case of Opp. 2 and 3, whose title pages anticipate the post of “Maestro de’ Concerti” at the Pietà that the governors of the *ospedale* conferred on him only in May 1716, respectively seven and five years after the event.}

On a more general level, the Dutch editions of Vivaldi’s works can be put into four distinct groups, classified on the basis of their respective content and the different degree of involvement by the composer in the preparation of the printer’s copy.\footnote{Cf. Rudolf Rasch, ‘Il cielo batavo. I compositore italiani e le edizioni olandesi delle loro opere strumentali nella prima metà del Settecento’, *AnM*, 32 (2002), 237-66: 246-47.} The prints of the first group, comprising authorized editions accompanied by a dedication, can be further subdivided into two categories: one contains works whose publication was the product of a ‘bilateral’ relationship in which the modalities of the process were jointly agreed by the composer and publisher (Opp. 3 and 8); the other comprises editions that were authentic only in a ‘unilateral’ sense, where the role of the composer was limited to supplying the material to the publisher, he himself exerting no further control over the speed or accuracy of the publication (Opp. 4 and 9). The second group of editions is formed by publications believed to be authentic notwithstanding their lack of a dedication (Opp. 5, 6, 10, 11 and 12), where one may be almost certain that the respective publishers maintained no direct contact with the composer during the successive phases of the engraving process. The collections belonging to the last two groups are: first, those assembled from heterogeneous materials, only partly authentic (Op. 7); second, simple reprints of pre-existing editions (Opp. 1 and 2).

Besides circumstantial evidence, such as the lack of a dedication, the hypothesis that Op. 6 belongs to a group of unauthorized editions is strengthened by the specific characteristics of its musical text. Indeed, this is disfigured by an unusually high number of engraving errors,
and, taken as a whole, its structure deviates in a quite clear-cut manner from that of any publication shaped according to the traditional Vivaldian canons.

Table 2. Content of Vivaldi Op. 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Tempo markings</th>
<th>metro</th>
<th>key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerto I</td>
<td>RV 324</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto II</td>
<td>RV 259</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto III</td>
<td>RV 318</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto IV</td>
<td>RV 216</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>D major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto V</td>
<td>RV 280</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>B minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>E minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto VI</td>
<td>RV 239</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>F major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>D minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discordant features are many, ranging from the criteria governing the distribution of the keys within the volume, to a lack of consistency in the technical demands made by the solo part. In fact, not only does Op. 6 diverge from the principle of alternating major and minor keys, which is one of the criteria adopted in all of Vivaldi’s instrumental collections.
conceived as unitary cycles, but the entire set is also characterized by a writing for violin which, according to Fertonani, can be described as merely “modest” with regard to the concerto RV 318, “richer and more brilliant” in the case of RV 324, 259 and 216, and “decidedly virtuosic” in respect of the two last works, RV 280 and 239.

It is therefore legitimate to ask what sources Roger used as the basis for his edition, and how they came into his possession. Was there a manuscript sent to Amsterdam by the composer himself in the form of a ready-made collection? Or was the collection based on a number of independent sources that the publisher brought together ad hoc? In either case, Vivaldi never publicly disavowed authorship of the concertos (perhaps he was not even informed at the time that a publication had appeared), some of which continued to enjoy a degree of favour with publishers. Indeed, after 1723 Op. 6 was reissued by Estienne Roger’s son-in-law and (indirect) successor Michel-Charles Le Cène, while the first two concertos of the set, RV 324 and 259, were included in a carefully selected anthology of Vivaldi concertos published in London by John Walsh and James Hare in 1730 under the title Select Harmony.

---

2. The sources

The editio princeps of 1719 (RISM V 2221, hereafter identified simply as “R”),¹³ like the reprint by Le Cène (RISM V 2222)¹⁴ and the Walsh anthology (RISM V2234-2235), was produced by the technique of copper-plate engraving, a process capable of assuring a grade of accuracy far superior to that obtainable from the traditional method of printing from movable type. Unlike in Italian music printing, which catered mostly for a local market and therefore tended to follow local notational practice without deviation, the text supplied to an engraver had first of all to undergo editorial revision in order to normalize certain aspects of the various local notational practices in accordance with house style.

In the specific case of Vivaldi, we do not yet possess studies aimed at determining the role played by typographical and editorial factors in the transmission of the text – by which one means not so much the unintentional introduction of errors as the standardization of the editorial product that inevitably occurs as a result of the printing process. This situation is made worse by the fact that the originals are lost and that there is no ‘intermediate text’ between the printer’s copy and the final published version as we have it today. The nature and significance of the changes made by the editors and publishers can therefore be inferred only by indirect means – that is, by comparing the usus scribendi observable in Vivaldi’s autograph manuscripts of the 1710s with the notational features of the prints contemporary with them.

The most pervasive among these changes concern the figuring of the basso continuo part, which in conformity with typical north European practice is often conceived as a simple description of the motion of the upper parts. Some figures were added in places

---

¹³ This edition survives in four examples: CZ-Bm (lacking the Viola part), F-Pn (complete), GB-Lbl (complete), GB-Lcm (lacking the Violino Principale and Violino Primo parts).
¹⁴ This edition survives in three examples: F-Ppincherle (complete), GB-Lcm (lacking the Violino Secondo, Viola and Basso parts), S-L (complete).
where there were originally none, at times producing outcomes that are over-fussy or at variance with the composer’s style, while others were changed into a form closer to the general style adopted by Roger in his publications. The departures from the practice normally followed by Vivaldi in his autograph manuscripts would be of musicological interest, but since it is impossible to establish for certain which figures were added or changed by Roger no attempt has been made in this critical edition to reconstruct a putative original figuring. The most conspicuous errors in Roger’s figures have been corrected and noted in the Critical Commentary, and all changes dictated by the Editorial Methods (for example, the replacement of cross-strokes by the appropriate accidental) have been applied. Performers should in any case rely on their own judgement when interpreting the figures.

The figures added in orchestral unison passages are clearly ‘fictive’ inasmuch as such passages in Vivaldi’s autograph manuscripts always lack them: he obviously intended the continuo player to play such passages in plain octaves, as Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach was to recommend in 1762.\textsuperscript{15} It is not easy to fathom the reasoning behind the introduction of this curious editorial practice: Michael Talbot has ventured the hypothesis that the first person to add them was whoever was responsible for preparing L’estro armonico for the engraver – misled, perhaps, by the similarity of the melodic profile of the unison lines to that of the basses in ritornellos of coeval chamber cantatas.\textsuperscript{16} Whatever the truth of this, in Roger’s publications their treatment was not wholly consistent over the course of the years: in Opp. 3 and 6, for example, unison passages are always figured, whereas in Op. 4 they completely lack figuring.

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, \textit{Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen, zweiter Teil} (Berlin: Winter, 1762), Chapter 22, § 4.

While on this subject, it is pertinent to observe that in Venetian sources of the time orchestral unisons were generally associated with a form of notation that employed the bass clef in all the parts of the ensemble alike. Unison textures, with the parts for upper strings notated in the bass clef, were also one of the distinctive features of the repertory of the Pietà. Roger’s editorial policy, which favoured simplification and easy comprehensibility, tended, in contrast, to avoid employing multiple clefs for a single part, a fact that accounts for the suppression of the tenor clef in the highest passages of the continuo part and of the bass clef in violin and viola parts employing ‘bassetto’ notation. With regard to the custom of writing entire passages entrusted to the upper strings in the bass clef, an octave below the actual sounds produced on the instrument, it is clear that the use of that clef served both to clarify the function of these parts within the score and to warn the performer that he was effectively playing a bass part, albeit on an instrument other than one normally assigned to the realization of the continuo. So the change of clef went hand in hand with a change in function of the part, and as such could imply a differentiation in the specific mode of performance. In Roger’s editions passages originally in ‘bassetto’ notation are always printed at sounding pitch, using the ordinary treble and alto clefs.

We know that Vivaldi began to make regular use of the ‘bassetto’, a practice harshly criticized by C. P. E. Bach in his Versuch, only around the mid-1710s. For example, in the autograph manuscripts of the Gloria, RV 589, and the oratorio Juditha triumphans of 1716 parts employing ‘bassetto’ notation are infrequent, while the autograph score of the

---

18 Ibid.
Serenata a 3, RV 690, datable to around 1715, resorts to this notational expedient with some frequency.\textsuperscript{21}

As far as the mode of scoring is concerned, Roger’s edition follows the convention pioneered, for printed concertos, in Torelli’s *Concerti musicali a quattro*, Op. 6 (Augsburg, 1698), where “Solo” and “Tutti” markings are used. From the start, concertos were written in such a way as to be suited to performance with several instruments to a part (in his instruction for Op. 6, for example, Torelli recommends three or four instruments on each part). This does not mean, of course, that performance with only one instrument to a part is unidiomatic. According to Richard Maunder, the evidence of the surviving performing material suggests, on the contrary, that the one-to-a-part performance was the norm for the period.\textsuperscript{22} In that case, the “Solo” and “Tutti” were intended to be descriptive rather than prescriptive. This hypothesis, however, has been criticized by Michael Talbot, who argued that Baroque composers were concerned about the proportion and balance of the ensemble rather than the total number of performers.\textsuperscript{23} Whatever the case, one has to bear in mind that Vivaldi’s age was thoroughly pragmatic in such a matter, and this flexibility applied with added force to published music, where composers had no influence over the circumstances of performance.

With regard to the treatment of original notational abbreviations, especially those indicating parts to be copied (‘cavato’) from the stave of another instrument, it would appear that the engraver worked from a text containing many errors of interpretation, especially in connection with passages where the second violin has to go in unison with the first violin rather than to double the principal. In at least one instance these incongruities do not merely affect individual passages, but actually extend to the

instrumentation of the entire movement. All the Op. 6 concertos employ the standard scoring in four parts for the same number of stringed instruments plus a part for principal violin. In contrast, the scoring of the slow movements of the concertos RV 324, RV 259 and RV 239 becomes reduced to principal violin and continuo alone, following the model of contemporary violin sonatas.\textsuperscript{24} The lone exception occurs in “Concerto III”, RV 318, in which we find an anomalous omission of the second violin and a use of the first violin only in the middle movement.

The scoring for the first movement employs merely a principal violin with the customary “Solo” and “Tutti” directions, plus viola and continuo. The only way in which Roger could have been tempted into error was if the text at his disposal employed an abbreviated form of notation in which all the violin parts were written on a single staff. We do know that Vivaldi used this radical form of abbreviation in the autograph manuscript of the concerto RV 231, which Peter Ryom includes among the composer’s “partitions exceptionnelles”.\textsuperscript{25} In that instance, the reason for the adoption of such an unusual manner of notation seems to have been that Vivaldi originally intended to compose a concerto for orchestra without soloist (in three real parts), but then changed his mind in favour of a more common concerto a cinque, which meant that he had to add the soloist’s part on the only available staff, previously intended for unison (“Unis[oni]”) violins.\textsuperscript{26}

A more pragmatic explanation is that the kind of notation used for the autograph manuscript of RV 231 was chosen in order to save space on the page. Since the ripieno violins appear only in “Tutti” passages, where they double the principal violin part, and

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 181-82.
are not used in any way to provide accompaniment in solo passages either together with other instruments or as an independent bassetto, the resulting reduction to three staves would have made it possible to have three systems on each page instead of two, thereby achieving a considerable saving of paper. In Op. 6 this very strict form of doubling occurs quite frequently, but never so pervasively as to remove the distinction between first and second violins or to exclude them from the accompaniment of solo episodes.

The slow middle movement of RV 318 calls, as we saw, for an additional part for the first violins. The fact that this extra melodic line can be comfortably performed by the principal violin by means of double stopping has led some commentators to wonder whether Roger adapted a part originally conceived for a single player and accordingly notated on a single stave, reassigning it to two different instruments (perhaps because the notes of the diads had their stems pointing in opposite directions). However, on every occasion when Vivaldi employs the characteristic mode of writing in which a series of repeated chords assigned to the “Tutti” alternates with brief figurational passages for the soloist the accompaniment always features the standard scoring with two violin parts (one of which doubles the solo part during “Tutti” passages) plus viola and continuo. It is therefore easy to imagine that Roger simply mistakenly assigned the second violin part – probably written in the score on a single staff intended for all the ripieno violins – to the first violins. In reality, the latter should have carried on doubling the solo violin part in “Tutti” passages, even if it is possible that the score made no prescription to that effect, since it was a matter merely of continuing the formula adopted in the preceding movement.

27 See, for instance, the first movement of RV 324, the third movement of RV 216 and, especially, the fast outer movements of RV 280 and RV 239.


29 In Op. 6, for example, this type of solution is adopted in the middle movement of the concerto RV 280.
The third movement of the concerto is written, just like the first, in only three real parts. The writing here is based on the alternation of registers and the contrast of dynamics, for which the directions “F[orte]” and “P[iano]” are employed. It is probable that this abrupt structural simplification, made without too much regard for the symmetry of the ensemble, was the result of a certain haste and impatience to complete the piece. The presence of similar hybrids elsewhere in Vivaldi’s concerto output – among works purely for strings it suffices to mention the ripieno concertos RV 155 and RV 159, which after two conventional movements unexpectedly introduce one or more soloists – provides in itself sufficient evidence to support this hypothesis. Moreover, the third movement of RV 318 shows similarities to the corresponding movement in a concerto for violin (or oboe), cello, strings and continuo, RV 812, recently discovered in the archive of the Counts of Harrach in Rohrau.

Members of this family, whose principal seat was the Austrian castle of Rohrau, cultivated an interest in music and collected some works of Vivaldi.\(^{30}\) In fact, the family archives also contain a manuscript of the violin sonata RV 35a (a variant of RV 35, published in Op. 5), while another copy of the same sonata, once possessed by the Harrachs, is today preserved in the Foyle Menuhin Archive at the Royal Academy of Music, London. Even though it is uncertain which particular member of the family acquired the works, we know that Ferdinand Bonaventura II Anton von Harrach was an accomplished singer – in 1724 he participated, together with other members of the imperial court, in a performance of Antonio Caldara’s *Euristeo*) – and the fact that in 1728 the same man visited Venice makes him the most likely candidate.

---

\(^{30}\) On the music-related activities of the Harrachs linked to Vivaldi, see Michael Talbot, *The Vivaldi Compendium* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), 95.
The Rohrau source of RV 812 comprises a set of separate parts written out by an unidentified Italian copyist on music paper in oblong format ruled with ten staves on all pages. The paper type, together with certain orthographic features of the headings, points to Venetian provenance. The finale of RV 812, which paraphrases its counterpart in RV 318, is likewise a movement for orchestra without soloists, where “Soli” are obtained a little artificially via echo-repeats entrusted to the obbligato instruments.\footnote{31} Since the movements are otherwise similar and date from the same period, perhaps in RV 318, likewise, the soloist should always play alone in the “P[iano]” echoes, leaving the ripieno violins to play, in unison, only in passages governed by the dynamic mark “F[orte]”.\footnote{32}

Whatever the case, if Op. 6 had been obtained as a unified manuscript source prepared for publication, it is very probable that this source would have possessed a degree of internal consistency sufficient to rule out the inclusion of RV 318. There is no reason to suppose that the printer’s copy supplied by Vivaldi to the publisher did not contain all the indications needed to identify each part unequivocally, especially those taking their content from the staff of another instrument, even at the cost of a certain economy in the use and rationalization of available space on the paper. In this instance, however, Roger’s uncertainties seem to have resulted from difficulty in interpreting correctly a text that very probably employed the notational shorthand devices shared by many of Vivaldi’s other composition manuscripts. So the possibility exists that the materials used by the publisher to assemble the collection were obtained, at least in part, from sources acquired on the ‘free market’ of manuscripts. On the other hand, if the published set had been simply an agglomerate of works of diverse provenance and nature, we would probably have witnessed a wider dissemination of its individual pieces in manuscript form.

\footnote{31}{See Federico Maria Sardelli, ‘Dall’esterno all’interno: criteri di autenticità e catalogazione di nuove fonti vivaldiane’, \textit{SV}, 8 (2008), 93-108: 103-5.}
\footnote{32}{I am grateful to Federico Maria Sardelli for discussing this hypothesis with me.}
One of the features that characterize and in certain respects differentiate Op. 6 from earlier and later sets of Vivaldi concertos is precisely the meagreness of its manuscript textual tradition. We know only of two works from Op. 6 that circulated independently in this form, as against eight from Op. 4 and nine from Opp. 3 and 7 (in all three cases, out of a total of twelve compositions). These two are, respectively, “Concerto II”, RV 259, surviving in score in two copies preserved at Dresden in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (SLUB) and at Wiesentheid in the Gräflich von Schönbornsche Musikbibliothek, and “Concerto VI”, RV 239, of which a complete set of parts is preserved among the Vivaldi manuscripts in Dresden.

We cannot exclude, of course, the likelihood that other sources have gone missing. This is the case, for instance, with a further manuscript of RV 259 that once belonged to the Piarist monastery of Podolínce. What remains of this rich collection of instrumental music is a single set of partbooks today held by the state archive in Modra (Slovakia), which contains a total of eight Italian (or Italianate) concertos from Vivaldi’s period.\textsuperscript{33} The original contents of this collection are shown in a manuscript thematic catalogue, entitled “Regestrum”, drawn up by Fr. Ferdinanudus Pankiewicz (1706-1773), which lists as many as 53 works by well-known Italian and German composers active between the end of the seventeenth and the middle of the eighteenth century (among whom appear Alberti, Albinoni, Torelli, Valentini, Vivaldi, Telemann and Meck), as well as by other, less well known composers active for the most part in central Europe. The “Regestrum” contains the incipit of a “Concerto a 5 Authore Vivaldi” (no. 40) matching the six opening bars of the principal violin part for the first movement of RV 259.

Taken as a whole, the source situation regarding RV 259 is rather interesting, since it points to the existence of a German tradition comprising only manuscripts of Italian origin. The older manuscript (D-Dl, Mus 2389-O-111, formerly Mus.c.Cx 1080, hereafter identified simply as “P”) is a score copied in Venice by the German violinist Johann Georg Pisendel during the time when he headed a small group of Dresden musicians in the retinue of Friedrich August, electoral prince (Kurprinz) of Saxony-Poland, who sojourned in that city in 1716 and 1717. This source, written on music paper exhibiting the generic Venetian watermark of three crescent moons, possesses certain notational characteristics that appear to link it directly to the composer’s autograph manuscript, today lost. The use of a single large bracket for the systems grouping all the instrumental parts (none of which needed to be named, since the order and type of the clefs suffice to identify each instrument unambiguously), the employment of the Latin formula “ut supra” for notes ‘cued in’ from another staff and, especially, the custom of writing the note immediately preceding a passage derived via vertical assimilation from another part as a crotchet, even when its effective duration is shorter, are only a few of the features that Pisendel’s copies have in common with Vivaldi’s autograph originals dating from the first half of the 1710s.

At some later point Pisendel made changes to the score similar to ones found in many other Dresden manuscripts of Vivaldi concertos copied in his hand. In large part, these are alternative versions of figurational passages for the soloist introduced in the score underneath the original text (utilizing blank spaces left in other parts within the score) or immediately after the end of a movement (in the blank spaces in the margins or lower down on the page). The first type of change concerns fairly short portions of musical text

---

(ranging from a few notes to a maximum of four whole bars), for which two or more alternative solutions, which preserve the original length and harmonic structure, are often supplied. The second type of change, in contrast, takes the form of a quasi-cadenza, even if none of the instances is long or radical enough to require the insertion of one or more extra folios in the score. Considered as a whole, this corpus of alterations has great importance for the study of performance practice and shows how Pisendel sought to mediate Vivaldi’s instrumental idiom via his own violinistic technique.

The second manuscript source for RV 259 is a score prepared by an unidentified Italian copyist no earlier than 1717, which is today held by the Gräflich von Schönbornsche Musikbibliothek, Wiesentheid (D-WD, Ms 777, hereafter identified as “W”). The title page, which is the first page of the manuscript, reads: “Concerto 2. Del Sig: D. Antonio Viualdi | 1717”. In former times, the correspondence between the number indicated in the title and the position of the concerto within Roger’s collection gave rise to a belief that the Wiesentheid source was based on an example of the Dutch edition. Today we know that the discordance between the terminus ante quem of Roger’s print (1719) and the date appearing on the manuscript (which probably refers to the year in which the manuscript was copied rather than that in which it was acquired by the collection where it remains today) rules out a priori any idea that the second was

---

35 As, for example, in the case of the concerto RV 340, analysed and discussed in Nicholas Lockey, ‘Second Thoughts, Embellishments and an Orphaned Fragment: Vivaldi’s and Pisendel’s Contributions to the Dresden Score of RV 340’, SV, 10 (2010), 125-41.


derived from the first. The orthography employed for the ascription of the work to Vivaldi – “Viualdi” (employing the rounded, “u” form for the consonant “v”, as Venetian hands often do) –seems in fact to go back to an autograph manuscript or at least to one of Venetian provenance. However, since the hand in which the manuscript is written matches none of those identified by Everett in his comprehensive survey of Vivaldi’s Italian copyists,\(^{39}\) it is very probable that this scribe did not belong to the composer’s inner circle. Even though the presence of an Italian form of handwriting in a manuscript belonging to the Wiesentheid repertory does not necessarily mean that it was copied in Italy, in view of the presence \textit{in situ} of innumerable resident or visiting Italian musicians, its provenance receives confirmation from the characteristics of the paper used for the manuscript.

How the copy of RV 259 became part of the rich musical collection of Wiesentheid is not easy to establish. It is well known that the interest in Vivaldi’s music shown by the Schönborn family reached its height in the years running from the end of the first decade of the eighteenth century to the beginning of the next decade. In the winter of 1708 Count Johann Philipp Franz, Provost and later Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, charged a young musician in his employment, Franz Anton Horneck, with copying and purchasing music by Italian composers for his own use and that of his brother Rudolf Franz Erwein during a sojourn in Venice coinciding with the carnival season.\(^{40}\) Since the correspondence between Horneck and the Schönborns mentions Vivaldi’s name only from 1710 onwards,\(^{41}\) it is likely that to begin with, at least, the copies and purchases were limited to

\(^{39}\) See Paul Everett, ‘Vivaldi’s Italian Copyists’, ISV, 11 (1990), 27-88.
works by Lotti, Albinoni and Caldara.\textsuperscript{42} Other music by Vivaldi was acquired between 1708 and 1713 via the diplomatic representative of Mainz in Venice, Matthias Ferdinand von Regatschnig.\textsuperscript{43} Since the latter retained his post until 1720,\textsuperscript{44} it seems possible that other instrumental compositions by Vivaldi preserved at Wiesentheid were copied or bought with his assistance even after 1713.\textsuperscript{45} Conversely, a collection of arias, choruses and recitatives from the setting of \textit{Tito Manlio} staged at the Teatro della Pace (Rome) during carnival 1720 (Ms 893, ff. 91r-142v), which constitutes one of the earliest testimonies to the patronage of Vivaldi by the Venetian cardinal Pietro Ottoboni, is a little later, and almost certainly of Roman provenance.\textsuperscript{46}

On the other hand, the contribution by musicians resident in or visiting Venice (not composers alone but also instrumentalists and singers) to the formation of the Wiesentheid collection is certainly not limited to the commissions entrusted to Horneck around the end of the first decade of the century. For example, the manuscripts of a “Messa à Capella” taken from the \textit{Selva morale e spirituale} of Claudio Monteverdi (Ms 817),\textsuperscript{47} and a similar composition attributable to Giovanni Rovetta (Ms 809),\textsuperscript{48} both prepared by a Venetian \textit{copisteria} and brought to Wiesentheid by the alto castrato

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[42]{Ibid., 58-59.}
\footnotetext[44]{Cf. Friedrich Hausmann, \textit{Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648)}, Band II: 1716-1763 (Vaduz: Sändig Reprint Verlag, 2011), 426.}
\footnotetext[45]{To this group of compositions belong perhaps the cello concertos RV 405, 407 and 423; Cf. Stavria Kotsoni-Brown, ‘The Solo Cello Concertos of Antonio Vivaldi’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Liverpool, 2000), 47 and 266-71. Besides the manuscript of the concerto RV 259 the Wiesentheid collection contains the sources of 16 instrumental works attributable to Vivaldi: RV 24, 42, 44, 46, 60, 402, 405, 407, 415, 416, 420, 422, 423, 459 (now RV Anh. 111) and 457, plus a fragment of a violin concerto without a catalogue number.}
\footnotetext[46]{Cf. Saverio Franchi, \textit{Drammaturgia Romana II: 1701-1750}, Sussidi eruditi 45 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1997), 159 (no. 242).}
\end{footnotes}
Raffaele Signorini, date from a slightly later period.\textsuperscript{49} It is also known that Johann Philipp Franz von Schönborn attempted, albeit unsuccessfullly, to enlist the help of the \textit{maestro di coro} of the Ospedale della Pietà, Carlo Luigi Pietragrua, in identifying and recruiting musicians for his own \textit{Kapelle}.\textsuperscript{50}

So far as Vivaldi himself is concerned, we know that from 1715 to 1717 he had professional contact with the Parma-born composer Fortunato Chelleri, who would shortly afterwards gain the post of \textit{Hofkapellmeister} to Johann Philipp Franz von Schönborn. Chelleri had previously been “maestro di cappella della camera” of the Elector Palatine Johann Wilhelm in Düsseldorf and in 1715 began his collaboration with the Venetian theatre of Sant’Angelo, setting a libretto by Grazio Braccioli: \textit{Alessandro fra le Amazzoni}. For carnival 1716-1717 the impresario of Sant’Angelo commissioned from him the second opera of the season, \textit{Penelope la casta}, intercalated with disastrous results between the two other programmed operas, \textit{Arsilda, regina di Ponto} and \textit{L’incoronazione di Dario}, both by Vivaldi.\textsuperscript{51} It is also likely that the latter conceived the obbligato cello parts in the arias “Sempre piace goder il suo bene” (\textit{Arsilda, regina di Ponto}, RV 700, I.6), “Col furor ch’in petto io serbo” (\textit{L’incoronazione di Dario}, RV 719, II.20) and “Sentirò fra ramo e ramo” (ibid., III.2), especially for the purpose of allowing Chelleri to display his talents on the instrument (assuming that he held the position of first cellist in the theatre’s orchestra).\textsuperscript{52} Even if the failure of \textit{Penelope}, which led even to an attempt on Chelleri’s life, may have damaged the relationship between the two composers, the

\textsuperscript{49} Before joining the Cappella Marciana Signorini was between 1722 and 1724 in the service of Prince Johann Philipp Franz von Schönborn; see also Colin Timms, \textit{Polymath of the Baroque: Agostino Steffani and His Music} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 126-27.


\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Ibid., ‘Fortunato Chelleri’s \textit{Cantate}’, cit., 53.
patchy state of the biographical data on him does not rule out his presence in Florence – at the court of the Dowager Electress Palatine, Maria Luisa de’ Medici – in 1718, the year when Vivaldi stayed in that city to superintend the production of his *Scanderbeg*, which received its premiere at the Teatro della Pergola.⁵³

We cannot, therefore, exclude *a priori* the possibility than in those years Chelleri had access to some manuscript scores of Vivaldi concertos, especially since the latter had already allowed Píndel and some other Dresden colleagues of his to take away certain works that he did not intend to store in his personal archive, at the time already in the process of formation, since he evidently regarded them as of no further use to him. We know, furthermore, that Chelleri often visited Amsterdam and that on at least one occasion he went there in the company of Johann Philipp Franz von Schönborn’s architect, Balthazar Neumann, probably purchasing musical editions on behalf of his master or the latter’s brother, Rudolf Franz Erwein.⁵⁴ On the other hand, we have no evidence that Chelleri ever acted as an intermediary between Dutch publishers and the Italian composers with whom he was in contact during those years, even though the copy of the concerto RV 259 preserved in Wiesentheid exhibits links with the text as published by Roger that are too significant to be regarded as coincidental.

The first common feature is the strange similarity of their titles, which identify both the manuscript and the printed version of RV 259 as the second work in a longer set. Since neither Roger’s print nor the Wiesentheid manuscript can have acted as copy text for the other, one might easily be led to believe that the wording “Concerto 2do” appearing on the title page of the latter source was a mere coincidence explicable by the fact that on

---


⁵⁴ I thank Bernhard Jainz for having given me this information privately.
an earlier occasion this work belonged to a group of manuscript concertos, today lost, that was unrelated to the Dutch edition. However, this hypothesis is contradicted by the presence of at least two ‘conjunctive errors’ that link the Wiesentheid score and Roger’s print to the same line of transmission, which is different from the one from which the only other surviving manuscript copy, that made by Pisendel, derives.


Considering that it is very improbable that the copyist of R and W would have committed the identical errors independently, it follows that both sources derive from a common archetype (‘α’) different from that ancestral to P. The first variant allows us, moreover, to formulate hypotheses on the nature of this archetype. Since this is a case not

---

of a lapsus calami as found in many of Vivaldi’s composition manuscripts but of an accidental duplication caused almost certainly by a mechanical copying error (the same bar, in the principal violin part, was inadvertently copied twice in succession), it is very likely that the copy text from which both R and W were prepared was, in its turn, a copy made, as was P, from a no longer extant Vivaldian original. If we ignore the English and Dutch reprints of the Roger edition, a stemma of the transmission of the concerto RV 259 would thus show a twofold branching:

Figure 1. Concerto in E flat major, RV 259, Op. 6 no. 2, genealogical table of witnesses.

```
original (x)

archetype (α) Pisendel, [1716/17] (P)

Wiesentheid, 1717 (W)

Roger, [c. 1719] (R)
```

This examination of the manuscript tradition of RV 259 allows us to draw some important conclusions. The variants evidenced by the surviving copies point decisively to the existence of a copy (α) that remained in circulation long enough to give rise to at least two later sources (W and R). The wording “Concerto 2°” found in source W suggests, moreover, that α transmitted a group of works and not just a single concerto. Since it would have been contrary to the interests of the publisher to permit the copying of a manuscript in his possession prior to its publication, it is very unlikely that Roger was already in possession of source α at the
time when the score preserved at Wiesentheid was copied. The Venetian paper used for this score makes plausible the idea that in 1717 the copy text for this manuscript was still in Venice. If this copy text became the ‘printer’s manuscript’ of a set of concertos intended for Roger from which Op. 6 would subsequently emerge, this would drastically reduce the time interval between the receipt of the manuscript and the start of the engraving, which is normally thought to have been longer. In fact, Vivaldi scholars tend to believe that the composer sent his concertos to the editor as early as c. 1712-1714, when Op. 4 was presumably already being prepared for publication. If, on the contrary, Vivaldi dispatched the manuscript to Amsterdam not before 1717, one might well wonder why he waited so long, even though he might have been induced to do so by a lack of trust towards Roger, perhaps caused by the impasse that had delayed the publication of Op. 4.

Unfortunately, the dearth of manuscript sources of the Op. 6 concertos does not permit us to draw firm conclusions in support of this hypothesis. The only other surviving manuscript of the period is a complete set of parts for “Concerto VI”, RV 239, held by the SLUB in Dresden (D-Dl, Mus 2389-O-68, formerly Mus.c.Cx 1037, hereafter identified as “H”). However, this manuscript, prepared by an unidentified copyist (“Schreiber H”, in Karl Heller’s classification), exhibits two features shared by the Wiesentheid source of RV 259. The first concerns the title, “Concerto. J. | Del S. Viualdi”, which, in the absence of a common title page, is reproduced in concise form at the head of each instrumental part (except for the first Basso part, which omits it). This is, in fact, the only Dresden manuscript of a Vivaldi concerto to contain the traces of a numbering probably inherited from a no longer extant copy text, even though in the present instance there is no correspondence with the position of the concerto within the

set published by Roger.\textsuperscript{60} Second, as we saw earlier in the case of the Wiesentheid copy of RV 259, the Dresden source transmits some variants found also in the Roger print that are perhaps the result of mechanical errors of copying.

Example 3. Concerto in D minor, RV 239, Op. 6 no. 6, third movement, bars 14-18.

Example 4. Concerto in D minor, RV 239, Op. 6 no. 6, third movement, bars 74-77.

\textsuperscript{60} The catalogues of both Ryom and Landmann equate the inscription “J” with the number “1”; Heller, however, does not call attention to this detail.
In the first example the copyist may have committed a typical error of reproduction by repeating the content of the second beat of bar 16 on the third beat of the same bar, while in the second example the melodic cell played by the bass in bar 76 becomes accidentally reversed, leading to parallel fifths with the upper strings. Both instances are due to corruptions that were present both in the exemplar used for the Dresden manuscript and in that for the partbooks published by Roger, even though our present state of knowledge does not allow us to determine whether the copy text from which the Dresden parts were prepared was the same source as the one that gave rise to W and R.

Taken as a whole, the variants exhibited by the manuscript tradition of the Op. 6 concertos clearly show how many of the corruptions that compromised the quality of Roger’s print were not due to insouciance on the part of the publisher but stemmed, rather, from the sources he used. Some of these errors could easily have been weeded out before publication if only the composer had been given the opportunity to exercise some measure of control over the various stages of the engraving process. The fact that this did not occur does not necessarily mean that the publication took place without his knowledge or collaboration. Indeed, the distance and the Alps limited the exchange of information between publisher and composer to the necessary minimum, so that the only form of control that the latter could exercise over the quality of the final product was to multiply the markings in the printer’s copy in compensation for his physical absence. It is precisely the lack or scarcity of these markings that constitutes one of its most puzzling aspects, especially since the paucity of surviving manuscripts leads one to suppose that the publication was based on a single source obtained directly from the composer rather
than on a heterogeneous assortment of materials collected at different times and via different avenues.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{61} Cf Rudolf Rash, ‘La famosa mano’, cit., 104.
3. The music

On the purely musical side, it has been observed how these six apparently so unpretentious works in reality mark a decisive step forward in relation to the first two collections of Vivaldi concertos, an advance evident both from the systematic adoption of the three-movement Fast-Slow-Fast plan and from the absence of any supplementary solo parts beyond that of the principal violin. The most significant advances, however, concern the handling of form and the emancipation of the solo instrument from its orchestral partners. The remarks that follow are not intended to offer an analysis *in abstracto* of the characteristics of each individual concerto, but serve instead to contribute towards the formation of an interpretative ‘grid’ capable of incorporating the widest possible spread of data relevant to the formulation of plausible hypotheses regarding the genesis and intrinsic nature of the collection. In Vivaldi’s case, this task is rendered particularly difficult by the fact that he exhibited a certain tendency to use a number of different technical and formal solutions over the course of his entire career. Nevertheless, it is possible to observe how some features associated with his early works tend to peter out gradually in his later music, where they survive only as archaic or purely ‘occasional’ expedients.62

For example, one of the features that mark the ritornello forms found in his concerto allegros composed in the first decade of the century is a tendency to expand the tonal area reserved for the tonic at the opening and close of the movement.63 This habit, which seems to be the result of an over-cautious approach towards a formal design that was still in the process of achieving definition, becomes decreasingly evident subsequently, but

---

62 For a very precise and detailed analysis of the main characteristics that go to make up Vivaldi’s early musical language, see Federico Maria Sardelli, ‘Le opere giovanili di Antonio Vivaldi’, *SV*, 5 (2005), 45-78: 66-71.

Vivaldi readopted it, under very different conditions, in some of his more extended mature works with particularly opulent scoring.\(^{64}\) In the solo concertos of *L’estro armonico* and other works from the same period, an opening with two ritornellos and a solo episode, all in the tonic, is one of the structural options most often taken (RV 175, 192a, 549, 578, 310, 519, 576, 522, 580, 265 and 585), while in the next collection, Op. 4, its incidence is already much lower, since it occurs in only half the movements (RV 279, 301, 347, 196, 204 and 298).\(^{65}\) In this respect, Op. 6 would appear to maintain unchanged the position already reached in *La stravaganza*, since this type of opening occurs with identical frequency (in fifty per cent of cases).

In the works of the early 1710s, however, the solo passage intercalated between the two opening ritornellos was in its turn solidly anchored in the home key. Those from Op. 4, for instance, are characterized by the presence of two ritornellos in the home key linked by a non-modulating episode which seems to result from a certain propensity to regard solo passages as a kind of appendage or addendum to the musical ideas presented in the ritornello, rather than as an autonomous and distinct formal component. A case in point is the opening movement of the concerto RV 357 (Op. 4 no. 4), whose initial ritornello comprises a bipartite period (*Vordersatz* and *Nachsatz*, in Wilhelm Fischer’s terminology)\(^{66}\) lacking an intermediate *Fortspinnung* section, the absence of which is to all intents and purposes compensated for by the first solo episode, based on familiar sequential progressions. The design of the ritornello of the first movement of the concerto RV 298 (Op. 4 no. 12) is, instead, the classic tripartite one of the *Fortspinnungstypus*.

---


However, the first solo episode of RV 298 is an idiomatic paraphrase of the first two structural units of the opening ritornello (Vordersatz and Fortspinnung), followed by a restatement of its closing unit (Nachsatz) performed by the entire ensemble. So in this instance, the two ritornellos in the tonic separated by a solo episode act as a kind of ‘double exposition’ of the opening ritornello.

Conversely, the first “Solo” of the Op. 6 concertos that open with two tonic ritornellos introduces into the harmonic stability of the scheme a momentary digression, effected by means of a ‘false transition’ to a secondary key that is immediately contradicted by a “Tutti” in the original key.67 The opening ritornello of the first movement of the concerto RV 324, for instance, consists of two tri-sectional periods that draw on a very small number of characteristic elements, among which are the pervasive use of a descending melodic diminished seventh and rapid upbeat figures of various kinds, in particular tirades of demisemiquavers formed from the notes of the ascending melodic minor scale.

67 On this concept of ‘false transition’, which denotes a passing digression from the home key before an immediate return to the tonic, see Paul Everett, Vivaldi: The Four Seasons and Other Concertos, Op. 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 41.
Example 5. Concerto in G minor, RV 324, Op. 6 no. 1, first movement, thematic material in the opening ritornello.

The first solo episode is an idiomatic paraphrase of the first two sections of the opening ritornello that ends with a modulation to the dominant minor. The connection to the following ritornello, which corresponds exactly to the second period of the opening one, is effected, as there, by a harmonic hiatus that redirects the tonal trajectory of the movement towards the tonic, passing via the degrees of the subdominant and dominant.68

Example 6. Concerto in G minor, RV 324, Op. 6 no. 1, first movement, bars 24-29.

In the opening allegro of the concerto RV 259 the first solo passage ends similarly in the dominant key. Here, too, instead of confirming the fifth scale-degree just reached, the ritornello immediately following restates *ex abrupto* a portion of the opening ritornello in the tonic key, from which also the second solo episode is launched. At the end of that section, finally, we see a modulation to a peripheral key (C minor), which is confirmed in the ensuing ritornello.


In similar fashion, the first solo episode of the opening allegro of RV 318 modulates to the relative major key, despite which the ritornello immediately following restates the
two concluding sections of the initial ritornello, pulling the movement back to the orbit of the tonic. In this instance, likewise, the effective modulation to a secondary key-area (the dominant minor) takes place only at the end of the second solo episode.


In these two last cases, the momentary reversion to the tonic that occurs in association with the second ritornello serves both to diversify the function of the episodes (modulating) and the ritornellos (stable), and to thwart the listener’s expectation of the most normal secondary key (the dominant in major-key movements, the relative major in minor-key ones), its place being taken by a peripheral tonal area. In fact, the tonal structure of the opening allegro of the concerto RV 324 never manages to overcome the centripetal attraction exerted by the tonic, whose return articulates the main joints around which the tonal plan of the entire movement takes shape. As a matter of fact, the multiplicity of tonal plans available to a composer of Vivaldi’s time for modelling his own concerto allegros is reducible to two basic typologies, which Michael Talbot has described by the labels “pendulum” (characterized by at least one momentary return to the tonic in the course of the movement) and “circuit” (where this return occurs only at the
end of the movement). Unlike other composers contemporary with him, among whom was his older fellow Venetian Tomaso Albinoni, Vivaldi always evinced a clear preference for the second structural option – so much so that in his case the incidence of tonal schemes featuring ‘intermediate’ returns to the home key is a mere tenth of that for those which do not display this feature. In this respect, Op. 6 does not depart from the general tendency, since the opening allegro of the concerto RV 324 is the only fast movement of the set to follow the ‘pendulum’ principle.

Table 3. Tonal schemes of Op. 6 concertos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RV</th>
<th>Tonal scheme</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III i–iv–v–i</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>I I–vi–V–iii–I</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III I–V–iii–I</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>I i–v–iv–i</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III i–III ³: III–iv–i ³</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>I I–V–iii–I</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III I–V–iii–I</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>I i–v–III–i</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III i–III–v–i</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>I i–v–III–i</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III i–v–III–i</td>
<td>circuit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tonal plans encountered in the set show a clear bias towards limiting to two, or three at most, the number of intermediate keys visited in the course of a movement. With

---


rare exceptions, the secondary key visited immediately after the opening tonic is the dominant, with the possible alternatives of the subdominant (RV 342, third movement), the supertonic (RV 259/I) and the relative major (RV 280/III). In this context, there do not seem to be noteworthy differences between the schemes employed in major and minor keys. In one singular instance, the binary-form movement ending the concerto RV 318, the dominant key is scrupulously avoided. More than half the schemes employed are content to visit no other keys than the dominant and mediant, which were traditionally regarded, from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards, as the most suitable scale-degrees on which to form a cadence.\(^{71}\) As many as three movements (RV 324/I/III and RV 318/I) assign especial importance to the degrees of the dominant and subdominant.

The tonal scheme of the first of these, the opening allegro of RV 324, is derived directly from that of its ritornello, which thus illustrates in a particularly neat way the concept of a “piece within a piece” coined by Michael Talbot with reference to a musical subunit that paraphrases in miniature the design of a whole movement.\(^{72}\) If one examines the relatively stable tonal areas reached in the course of the movement, it is possible to observe how the tonal design of the opening ritornello is replicated at least four further times, both in unvaried form (i–v–iv–i: bars 1-13 and 14-29), and after undergoing elementary processes of expansion (i–v–III–iv–i: bars 30-56) or contraction (i–iv–i: bars 57-70).

Taking a broad view, the simplicity of the tonal schemes adopted in Op. 6 reflects the stylistic expansion, destined to become more moderate over the course of the years, that sets apart the early concertos of Vivaldi — often characterized by almost rudimentary tonal excursions — from his chamber works, for which at that time he reserved his boldest

harmonic experiments. In general, the main articulations demarcating the tonal trajectory of a concerto allegro are created by the solo interventions. In this respect, the concerto RV 318, which is perhaps the most backward-looking work in the set, constitutes a significant exception, since all its modulations – except the first – take place during ritornellos.

Besides being the only concerto of the set to feature a homotonal design, RV 318 is also alone in having a final movement cast in binary form and, oddly, lacking an independent contribution from the soloist. Even though the adoption of binary form represents a rather unusual choice within the corpus of Vivaldi’s concertos, it occurs quite often in the works of other composers, as, for example, in the Opp. 3 and 7 of Handel, in the Op. 7 of Albinoni, and in the finales of several concertos of Telemann and Marcello. Another unusual feature that RV 318 possesses is to be the only concerto in Op. 6 for which it is possible to identify thematic concordances in other works by Vivaldi, both vocal and instrumental. Some musical ideas employed in the opening movement recur in the third movement of the concerto RV 356 (Op. 3 no. 6), while the central section of the opening ritornello reappears in the aria “Amor sprezzato” composed for Orlando finto pazzo, RV 727, which was staged at the Teatro Sant’Angelo in autumn 1714. Although it is not possible to establish for certain whether the aria or the concerto came first, it is likely that the presence of this material in the vocal movement is a self-

---

73 Cf. Federico Maria Sardelli, Le opere giovanili, cit., 70.
74 Homotony is a term coined by Hans Heller to indicate the practise of placing all movements of a pluripartite works in the same key.
borrowing, since in the concerto it is perfectly integrated into the ritornello, where it forms a paraphrase of the closing gesture of the motto, in its turn based on the descending tetrachord $b''$ flat $- f''$ sharp. Besides those already mentioned, the concerto RV 318 finds musical concordances in at least seven other Vivaldi works – RV 72 (Op. 5 no. 6), 103, 208 (Grosso Mogul), 208a, 316 (lost), 381 and 407 – most of which lie within a relatively homogeneous and circumscribed chronological period.\textsuperscript{80}

Even though these links do not in themselves suffice to give rise to concrete hypotheses regarding the dating of RV 318, its experimental character is evidenced by the design of the first movement, in which the solo episodes are almost entirely elaborations of motivic material drawn from the opening ritornello. These elements, which include the head motive or motto (“M”, bars 1-6), the intermediate \textit{Fortspinnung} (“a”, bars 7-12) and the series of concluding brief cadential phrases (“b” and “d”, bars 13-24), undergo simple processes of repetition, elision and paraphrase that never compromise their recognizability.

\textsuperscript{80} Cf. Federico Maria Sardelli, \textit{Catalogo delle concordanze delle concordanze musicali vivaldiane, QV}, 16 (Florence: Olschki, in preparation).
Example 9(a). Concerto in G minor, RV 318, Op. 6 no. 3, first movement, elaboration of motivic material (head motive).

Example 9(b). Concerto in G minor, RV 318, Op. 6 no. 3, first movement, elaboration of motivic material (*Fortspinnung*).
Example 9(c). Concerto in G minor, RV 318, Op. 6 no. 3, first movement, elaboration of motivic material (cadential phrases).

The contrast with the remaining concertos of Op. 6 becomes even more evident if one considers that in the latter works the integrity of the form appears to depend far more on a felicitous combination of structural units than on any rigorous process of motivic elaboration. In the opening allegro of the concerto RV 318 the presence of a rather expansive block in the tonic key at the end of the movement, balancing that at the beginning, leads inevitably to a compression of the space available for modulation, which becomes confined to the centre of the movement. According to the analytical model developed by McVeigh and Hirshberg used in the table below, the formula R1a-S1a-R1b-S1b indicates a ritornello in the tonic, an episode leading to a further ritornello in the tonic and a solo modulating to a secondary key; the formula R2a-S2-R2b indicates a composite ritornello in a secondary key (V in the major mode; III, v or iv in the minor mode) interrupted by a solo episode; the formula R3a-S3-R3b indicates a composite ritornello in a peripheral key interrupted by a solo episode; the formula R4a-S4-R4b indicates a ritornello in the home key interrupted by a solo episode.\[^{81}\]

\[^{81}\] Cf. Simon McVeigh and Jehoash Hirshberg, *The Italian Solo Concerto*, cit., 11.
Table 4. Timeline of Concerto in G minor, RV 318, Op. 6 no. 3, first movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>R1a</th>
<th>S1a</th>
<th>R1b</th>
<th>S1b</th>
<th>R2a</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>R2b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>1–24</td>
<td>25–49</td>
<td>50–60</td>
<td>61–84</td>
<td>85–95</td>
<td>96–99</td>
<td>100–103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i→ (III)</td>
<td>→ i</td>
<td>i→ v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>M a b c d</td>
<td>M a</td>
<td>a c d</td>
<td>M a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R3a</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>R3b</th>
<th>R4a</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>R4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v//iv</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>iv//i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M d</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M a</td>
<td>b a b d</td>
<td>a c d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The technique used to modulate proceeds not by gradual transitions but by sudden, unexpected jolts involving the transposition of the motivic material (the first two phrases of the opening motto) to different tonal planes, the juxtaposition of which gives rise to a harmonic hiatus within the ritornello. The first of these ‘tonal shifts’ entails a sudden lurch back from the dominant to the subdominant, which represents one of the most singular features of Vivaldi’s harmonic vocabulary;\(^{82}\) but the second, leading from the subdominant directly to the tonic, is particularly significant since it coincides with a return to the home key at the end of the movement.

---

This procedure, too, constitutes an anomaly, since in the overwhelming majority of the Op. 6 concertos the final return to the home key takes place during the last solo episode. These works, moreover, often do not include a repeat of the initial motto in combination with the reprise of the opening material that occurs in the final ritornello. Where this is present, Vivaldi adopts a clever expedient whereby the ritornello is subdivided into two distinct portions – one comprising the motto and the other the remaining units – which are connected by a final solo episode. The frequency with which he resorts in Op. 6 to this structural device is in itself indicative of a precise compositional aim, and this becomes all the more significant when one realizes that within the full corpus of Vivaldi’s concertos its use is rare.83

The specific way in which the device is applied in Op. 6 varies from concerto to concerto, especially with regard to the length of the last solo episode and its degree of integration with the surrounding ritornellos. The gamut of possible solutions runs from

83 Cf. Simon McVeigh and Jehoash Hirshberg, The Italian Solo Concerto, cit., 146.
the extremes of a high level of cohesion (found in RV 216) to a substantial independence (RV 259 and 239), passing via an intermediate stage where the contribution of the soloist starts as a natural prolongation of the ritornello before branching out in an independent manner (RV 280). For instance, in the third movement of the concerto RV 216 the last “Solo” comprises only five bars (bars 86-90): this is a kind of final peroration reprising the musical substance of the motto, which has only just been stated in the previous ritornello (bars 83-85), after the fashion of a *petite reprise*.


In the opening allegro of the concerto RV 280, by contrast, the final solo episode begins with an idiomatic paraphrase of the first three bars of the transitional, *Fortspinnung* part of the opening motto before continuing with highly virtuosic figurations of a fundamentally athematic nature.
Finally, the solo passages that link the two sections of the final ritornello of the third movement of the concerto RV 259 and the first movement of the concerto RV 239 are especially long and well-developed; here, the violinistic idiom takes on the rhapsodic contours associated with a kind of writing based on a combination of arpeggiated chords, scale-based passage-work and double-stopping quasi-polyphony typical of the so-called *capriccio* style. In both movements, where thematic links are irrelevant or altogether lacking, the coexistence of two complementary structural planes, defined by the alternation of episodes and ritornellos, operates on the premise that an expansion of dimensions in the first is counterbalanced by a corresponding contraction in the second. Accordingly, all the ritornellos after the first feature a progressive decrease in the number of bars, against which the passages entrusted to the soloist become ever longer and more prominent. This process comes to a head in the final reprise, which frequently sees a solo episode taking the form of a quasi-cadenza, where the concentration of bravura elements results in an outburst of sheer technical virtuosity, advanced and autonomous in character.
4. Conclusions

The characteristics of the textual transmission of Op. 6 and the strong similarities of form and idiom that mark the individual concertos making up the set unite to form a general picture consistent with the view that this was an anthology artfully compiled especially for publication. Normally, the criterion adopted for the choice and ordering of the individual works within the one or two volumes (depending on whether the set contained six or twelve compositions) followed a perceptible logic dictated by musical considerations, but in this instance, unlike in other Vivaldi opere where the constituent works are grouped according to scoring or key, no criterion of equal rigour seems to have been followed. On the basis of the technical and structural features of the six concertos, it is reasonable to propose a date of composition between 1713 and 1715, which lies roughly at the beginning of the stylistic period described by Jean-Pierre Demoulin as “pre-Mantua”. So far as aspects pertaining to source criticism are concerned, it is certain that there is a single fil rouge linking the few surviving manuscripts to the editio princeps of 1719, even if we do not have enough information to shed full light on the nature of this connection. Unfortunately, the complete absence of autograph materials has unavoidably led to a blurred image. So the only conclusions we can draw are purely conjectural ones.

The initially attractive hypothesis that Roger conceived and assembled the collection by using only manuscripts received via third parties would presuppose a much wider dissemination of the individual concertos in manuscript form than the state of the sources suggests. It is undeniable that at this time Roger was in possession of a considerable

---

quantity of unpublished materials, some of which were used for the independently conceived anthologies he brought out during the three years preceding the appearance of Op. 6, but it is unlikely that this stock was so copious as to remove completely the need for direct contact with the composer. In this respect it is pertinent to observe that in the period under consideration the sources of supply for the ‘free market’ of music manuscripts were, most of all, the large number of copisterie (professional copy shops) spread all over Italian peninsula. Eighteenth-century copyists made, in fact, a habit of preparing extra copies for themselves of works copied for customers at a composer’s or a patron’s request, thereby building up a private stock that they could sell independently. So far as Vivaldi himself is concerned, it is well known that he tended personally (or with assistance from his father Giovanni Battista) to copy out his own compositions, in order both to save money and to be able to exert more control over the quality of the work, but also, and especially, to reduce the risk – always very real – of allowing unauthorized copies to reach the market. It is therefore no coincidence that the only unauthorized copies of Vivaldi’s compositions made by a Venetian copisteria – a small group of sacred works preserved under the name of Galuppi in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden – are posthumous, since they date from the early 1750s.85

A second hypothesis is that the print was based on a single, pre-existing manuscript set of concertos obtained directly from the composer. However, it is hardly likely that Vivaldi conceived it exactly in the form in which it has reached us. As we have seen, the major problems concern the concerto RV 318, whose key replicates that of the first work in the set, thereby introducing a clear anomaly into the organization of the set. Since it is equally unlikely that Vivaldi sent only five works to Amsterdam, we cannot exclude a

priori the possibility that Roger, for unknown reasons, manipulated the material at his disposal before publication. In an age when the production and consumption of instrumental music took place via the mediation of a publisher, his own logic, by definition commercial, did indeed tend to overlay and, in some cases, prevail over the aspirations of the composer, however legitimate. Something of the sort certainly affected Vivaldi’s next collection, Op. 7, which was published, again by Jeanne Roger, around 1720, since this set contains a few works that are spurious or of uncertain authenticity. In this instance, the most plausible explanation is that Vivaldi conceived the opus as a group of six concertos, which the publisher subsequently augmented on his own initiative by adding six more works obtained via other routes, only half of which may be regarded as authentic.\textsuperscript{86} However, despite all efforts, it is rather hard to formulate convincing hypotheses concerning the original content of Op. 7, seeing that little help is afforded by an examination of its manuscript tradition, which consists largely of anonymous or peripheral sources.

A third possibility is that Vivaldi, having overcome the \textit{contretemps} that had delayed the appearance of Op. 4, sent Roger a complete set of twelve concertos, perhaps planning to provide them with a collective title and dedication closer to the date of publication. The publisher, already possessing a large stock of unpublished concertos, perhaps decided on his own account to use Vivaldi’s manuscript to form two distinct collections, which were brought out a year apart and assembled with purely commercial considerations in mind. Besides explaining the delay before the manuscript reached the publisher, this hypothesis would help to clarify the reason why Vivaldi decided to cease collaboration with Roger, who was guilty of having acted in too high-handed a manner. What seems clear is that the composer’s relationship with his Dutch publishers,

\textsuperscript{86} Cf. Michael Talbot, \textit{Vivaldi and Fugue}, cit., 186-87.
inaugurated under quite different auspices almost a decade earlier, had rapidly
deteriorated and was finally severed completely soon after the mid-1710s. This would
mean that the instrumental works by Vivaldi published during the years leading up to the
rapprochement following the death of both Jeanne and Estienne Roger in 1722, when the
firm passed into the hands of Michel-Charles Le Cène, must necessarily be seen as
initiatives driven by the specific needs of a rapidly and constantly evolving market for
published music.
Editorial Methods

The current edition follows as closely as possible the Roger’s *editio princeps* of 1719. Titles, tempo markings, clefs, key signatures, time signatures, slurs, ornaments, bass figures and dynamics have been altered minimally. All instances of editorial intervention that go beyond simple transliteration of the old notation or which do not conform to a precise system of graphical conversion described below will be mentioned in the *Critical Commentary* or shown by special signs:

1. Square brackets (for marks of expression or directions to the performer absent from the sources or added through horizontal or vertical assimilation; for editorial corrections and additions in cases where none of the sources, in the editor’s judgement, provides a correct text);

2. Broken lines (for slurs and ties added editorially);

3. Square half-brackets (for musical text derived explicitly – by means of an abbreviation – or implicitly from another stave).

The order of the instrumental parts in the score follows modern publishing practice. Tempo markings have been repositioned, in that they are always placed above the uppermost staff. Their original location was always below the staff in each engraved part book.

The original key signatures are retained. The unaltered key signatures utilized in this critical edition include six that do not correspond to modern tonality, because they lack one flat. They include all three that are in RV 324 (G dorian) and RV 259 (E Mixolydian).
Five time signatures are found in the engraved part books. All of them – C, 12/8, 3/4, 2/4, 3/8 – remain in use today.

As regards the treatment of accidentals, the eighteenth-century sources of Vivaldi’s music adhere to the old convention whereby chromatic inflections retain their validity only for so long as the note to which an accidental has been prefixed is repeated without interruption, irrespective of barlines. Conversion to modern notation thus entails the tacit addition of some accidentals and the suppression of others. Chromatic inflections not made explicit in the notation of the original source, but supplied editorially, are shown where possible in the score, the one or more accidentals entailed being enclosed in square brackets. If the same accidental is present in the key signature, the editorial intervention is recorded in the critical notes, where the original reading is given. When reference is made to notes in the source that, even though chromatically inflected, are not prefixed by an accidental (generally because the inflection follows from the key signature), the word or symbol representing the inflection is enclosed in square brackets.

The bass figures are always placed above the part in the sources. In the edition the stave for the bass, which often is assigned not only to the continuo instruments but also to all the lowest instruments of the orchestra, retains all the bass figures present in the original, and these are printed below it. Beaming and stem direction have been altered, wherever necessary, to conform with modern conventions. Accidentals precede the figures to which they refer, and cross-strokes indicating the chromatic inflection of a note are replaced by the equivalent sharp or natural sign. The lowering by a semitone of a previously sharpened bass figure is always indicated by the natural sign, although the sources sometimes use the flat sign synonymously. Where necessary, the figures may be corrected by the editor. The directions “solo” and “tutti” in the bass, always in square
brackets if editorial, call for changes in the instrumentation of the bass line, which are described more fully in the *Critical Commentary*. Particular rhythmic figurations in the bass line are not necessarily meant to be performed by all the continuo instruments: thus, rapid scales may be left to the stringed bass instruments, while the harpsichord may split sustained bass notes into shorter values, where the result conforms to the general rhythm of the piece.

In the *Critical Commentary*, the pitches are cited according to the following system:

![Musical notation](image)

The following abbreviations are used: Vl pr = Principal Violin part; Vl I = First Violin part; Vl II = Second Violin part; Vla = Viola part.
## Critical Commentary

### Concerto I, RV 324

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>movement, part</th>
<th>comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 7 Basso</td>
<td>Note 7 figured “6/4”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8 Vl pr, Vl I-II</td>
<td>The slur joins notes 5-8; similarly in bars 10, 25, 27, 83 and 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10, 27 Basso</td>
<td>Note 2 figured “6”; altered to conform to the parallel passage in bar 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 12 Vla</td>
<td>Note 4 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 12 Basso</td>
<td>Note 4 figured “6/4”; similarly in bars 29 and 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 18 Basso</td>
<td>Note 1 figured “6”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 20 Basso</td>
<td>Note 5 figured “6”. Natural (perhaps in error for a precautionary flat) before note 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 27 Basso</td>
<td>Note 2 figured “6/5”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 29 Vl pr, Vl I-II</td>
<td>In the parallel passage of bar 12 note 3 is printed an octave lower (d'); however, since variants of this kind appear quite frequently in Vivaldi’s music, the reading of the source has been retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 33 Basso</td>
<td>Note 1 figured “7/4&quot;. Similarly in bar 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 56 Basso</td>
<td>“Solo” aligned with note 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 57 Basso</td>
<td>Notes 4 and 5 figured respectively “7-6” and “6/5”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 59 Basso</td>
<td>Notes 4-6 figured respectively “7-6”, “6/5” and “4”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I, 68 Basso Note 3 figured “6”.

I, 79 Basso The figure for note 6 is aligned with note 7.

II, 3 Basso Notes 5-9 printed a second higher (perhaps on account of a misread change of clef).

II, 12 Basso Sharp, in error for natural, in the figure for note 1.

II, 13 Basso Note 7 figured “6/4”.

II, 18 Basso The natural pertaining to the figure for note 2 is aligned with note 1.

II, 25 Basso Notes 1-5 printed a second lower.

III, 9 Basso Note 3 figured “6”.

III, 12 Basso The figure “6” is aligned with note 5.

III, 15 Basso Note 1 figured “6”.

III, 19-21 Basso The bass figures are clearly ‘fictive’, and the passage should remain unharmonized: “Tasto Solo” performance or doubling by the right hand an octave above is recommended. Similarly in bars 38, 66, 68, 70, 72 and 113-116. See the Introduction for a discussion of this notational practice.

III, 48 Basso Note 2 figured “6/4”.

III, 67-72 VI II VI II doubles the VI pr rather than VI I (it appears that there may have been an instruction to double VI I at the unison in the copy text and that the engraver misinterpreted it).

III, 114 VI pr, VI I-II, Vla, Basso Note 1 is g’ in VI pr, VI I-II and Vla, but g in Basso; altered to conform to the parallel passage in bar 20.

III, 116 VI I, VI II Note 1 is b (flat) in VI I but d’ in VI II; altered to conform to the parallel passage in bars 21-22.
**Concerto II, RV 259**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>movement, part</th>
<th>comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10 Basso</td>
<td>Notes 7-8 semiquavers; notes 9-10 quavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 54 Basso</td>
<td>Note 1 figured “6/4”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 56 Vla</td>
<td>Note 6 g’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 62-75 VI II</td>
<td>From the second beat of bar 62 until the end of bar 75 VI II doubles at the unison VI pr rather than VI I (it appears that there may have been an instruction to double VI I at the unison in the copy text and that the engraver misinterpreted it). Similarly from the second beat of b. 91 until the end of bar 101. However, the doubling is interpreted correctly in bars 85-90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 63 VI pr</td>
<td>The slur joins notes 9-12; similarly with notes 1-4 in bar 66 and notes 9-12 in bar 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 79 Basso</td>
<td>Note 8 without natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 102 VI pr</td>
<td>The slurs join notes 1-4 and 5-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 13 Basso</td>
<td>Note 2 figured “6/4”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 14 Basso</td>
<td>Note 2 figured “3/4”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 28 Basso</td>
<td>Note 3 figured “6/4”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 3-4 Basso</td>
<td>Note 3 figured “6/4”. Similarly in bars 43-44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 15 Basso</td>
<td>The “6” is an example of a ‘fictive’ figure added in a unison passage (here, bars 14-20), which should remain unharmonized: “Tasto Solo” performance or doubling by the right hand an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
octave above is recommended. Similarly with note 1 in bars 18-20.

III, 35  VI pr  Notes 4 and 8 both $c''$.

III, 40  VI pr  The content of this bar is the same as that of bar 41.

III, 47  Vla  Note 3 $b$ (flat).

III, 70  Vla  Note 5 $f$.

III, 71-74  Basso  Note 1 figured “7”.

III, 76  Basso  Note 1 figured “7♯”.

III, 81  VI pr  “Solo” aligned with note 4. Similarly in bar 84.

III, 91  VI pr  “Solo” aligned with note 1 of bar 103.

III, 91  VI II  From the second beat of bar 91 until bar 102 VI II doubles at the unison VI pr rather than VI I (it appears that there may have been an instruction to double VI I at the unison in the copy text and that the engraver misinterpreted it).

III, 91-102  Vla  The part is printed in the bass clef (one octave lower) from the second beat of bar 91 until the end of bar 102.

III, 102  VI pr  Notes 3-6 printed a second higher.

III, 102  VI II  Note 1 $b$, crotchet (evidently caused by the erroneous doubling of VI pr beginning in bar 91).

III, 108  VI pr  Note 3 with sharp in error for natural; note 4 with natural in error for flat.

III, 125  VI pr, VI I-II  Note 1 with flat in error for a precautionary natural. Altered to conform to the parallel passage in bar 12.

III, 125  Basso  Note 1 figured “6♯”.

III, 131-133  Basso  The “6” is an example of a ‘fictive’ figure added in a unison
passage (here, bars 127-134), which should remain unharmonized: “Tasto Solo” performance or doubling by the right hand an octave above is recommended.

**Concerto III, RV 318**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>movement, part</th>
<th>comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>VI I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8</td>
<td>VI pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VI I-II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 17-21</td>
<td>Basso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 47</td>
<td>VI pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 49</td>
<td>VI pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 55</td>
<td>Basso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 59</td>
<td>VI pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VI I-II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 72</td>
<td>Basso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I, 75 Basso Note 1 figured ‘‘’ (the correct figure is aligned with note 1 in bar 74).

I, 83 Basso Note 3 figured “6/4”.

I, 84 Vl pr The direction “Tutti” is aligned with note 4 in bar 85.

I, 99 Vl pr The upper note of the two-note chord on beat 1 of the bar is printed as a crotchet in accordance with the normal practice of the time, even though its effective duration is shorter (in this instance, a quaver).

I, 116 Basso The figure for note 1 lacks a natural.

I, 117 Vl pr The slur joins notes 1-3.

I, 131 Basso The figure for note 4 in bar 131 is aligned with note 3. Similarly in bar 133.

I, 132 Basso Note 1 figured “5/4”; the figure for note 2 is aligned with note 3. Similarly in bar 134.

I, 152 Vl pr “Solo” aligned with note 1.

I, 163 Basso Note 3 figured “6”; similarly in bars 164, 165, 169 and 172.

I, 168 Vl pr Note 5 a’.

I, 168 Basso Note 3 figured ‘‘’.

I, 181 Basso Note 1 figured “6”.

I, 184 Vla Note 2 b (flat).

II VI II This part is marked “Tacet” for the entire movement. (see the Introduction).

II, 2 Vl pr “Solo” aligned with note 2 (through lack of space).

II, 4 Basso Note 1 figured “6/5”.

II, 10 Basso Note 1 figured “6/4”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 3</td>
<td>Vi pr, VI I</td>
<td>Note 3 $b''$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10</td>
<td>VI pr, VI I</td>
<td>Note 3 $c''$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I, 32 | Basso | Note 9 $B$. Note 9 figured “7”.
| I, 44 | Basso | The figure for note 8 is aligned with note 7. |
| I, 50 | VI pr | Notes 5-8 quavers. |
| I, 54 | VI pr | “Solo” aligned with note 3. |
| I, 54 | Basso | “Solo” aligned with note 1. |
| I, 55 | Basso | The figure for note 1 lacks a sharp. |

**Concerto IV, RV 216**
I, 60  Basso  Note 1 figured “6/4”.
I, 62  Vla  Notes 1-4 a”.
II, 6  Basso  Note 1 figured “6/5”.
III, 1  VI I  Note 3 e’.
III, 16  VI pr  “Solo” aligned with note 2.
III, 31  VI pr  “Tutti” aligned with note 2.
III, 38  Basso  The figure for note 4 lacks a sharp.
III, 56-62  VI pr  The source does not provide any model immediately preceding these bars to indicate the intended manner of arpeggiating these chords. The simple solution is to break each four-note chord into four semiquavers played in the sequence 1-2-3-4 (reading upwards) and each three-note chord into four semiquavers played in the sequence 1-2-3-2 (still reading upwards).
III, 72-82  Vla  Notated in the bass clef one octave lower from bar 72 until the end of bar 82.
III, 87  VI pr  Notes 1 and 2 are both quavers; note 7 is missing.
III, 90  Basso  Note 2 figured “6/4”.

**Concerto V, RV 280**

*movement,*  *part*  *comment*

**bar**

I, 1-2  Basso  Note 2 figured “6/4”.
I, 4  Basso  Note 4 figured “6”. Similarly with note 2 in bar 47.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Figured Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I, 13 | Basso | Notes 2-4 respectively figured “6/♯”, “4/♯” and “#4/2”.
| I, 14 | Basso | Note 2, c’ (sharp), figured “4/2”.
| I, 28 | Basso | Note 3 figured “6/4”.
| I, 29-30 | Basso | Note 1 figured “6/4”.
| I, 35 | Basso | Note 1: the figure is “6”, without natural sign.
| I, 39 | Basso | Note 1: the figure is “6”, without natural sign.
| I, 43 | VI I | “Tutti” aligned with note 7.
| I, 45 | Basso | Note 1 figured “6/4”.
| I, 57 | Basso | The figure for note 3 lacks a natural.
| I, 70 | VI pr | Note 7 a’.
| I, 73 | Basso | Notes 2 and 3 respectively figured ‘♯’ and ‘6’.
| I, 75 | Basso | Note 1 figured “6/4”. “Tutti” aligned with note 4.
| I, 78 | Vla | Note 1 crotchet, followed by a quaver rest. The appoggiatura e’ is tied to note 4.
| I, 83 | Basso | Note 7 figured “6/4-5/♯”.
| II, 2 | Basso | Note 1 figured “6/5”.
| II, 8 | Basso | Note 1 figured “6/5”.
| II, 10 | VI pr | Note 8 without sharp.
| II, 17 | Basso | A redundant natural precedes the figures for note 1. Similarly in bars 23 and 28.
| II, 19 | VI pr | Note 3 without sharp.
| II, 21 | VI pr | Note 3 without sharp.
| II, 28 | VI pr | Only notes 2, 6 and 10 with sharp.
| III, 16 | Vla | Note 3 a; altered to conform to the parallel passage in bar 150.
| III, 59 | Basso | Note 1 figured “7/5”.

Ⅰ, 13 Ⅰ, 14 Ⅰ, 28 Ⅰ, 29-30 Ⅰ, 35 Ⅰ, 39 Ⅰ, 43 Ⅰ, 45 Ⅰ, 57 Ⅰ, 70 Ⅰ, 73 Ⅰ, 75 Ⅰ, 78 Ⅰ, 83 Ⅱ, 2 Ⅱ, 8 Ⅱ, 10 Ⅱ, 17 Ⅱ, 19 Ⅱ, 21 Ⅱ, 28 Ⅲ, 16 Ⅲ, 59
Concerto VI, RV 239

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text {movement, part} & \text {comment} \\
\hline
\text {bar} & & \\
I, 2 & \text{VI pr, VI II} & \text{Note 2 with sharp in error for a precautionary natural: VI I has the correct reading, which has been adopted. Similarly in bar 71.} \\
I, 6 & \text{VI pr, VI I-II} & \text{Notes 3 and 4 both quavers; altered by analogy with bar 7.} \\
I, 15-18 & \text{VI pr} & \text{The abbreviated form of notation employed in the source from the second half of bar 15 until the first half of bar 18 requires the notes to be broken into groups of four semiquavers where the lower notes (variable) alternate with the higher ones (fixed). The same bariolage pattern can be used in bars 19-21 (in alternation with the four double-stopped quavers in the second half of each bar) and in bar 22.} \\
I, 18 & \text{VI pr} & \text{The chromatic inflections (required by a more scrupulous notation) are missing.} \\
I, 22 & \text{VI pr} & \text{A sharp, in error for a precautionary natural, precedes the e” on beat 3 of the bar.}
\end{array}
\]
I, 23-27 Vi pr  
The two upper notes of the three-note chord on the first beat of bar 23 and of the lower note of the ensuing two-note chords (up to the first half of bar 27) are printed as crotchets in accordance with the normal practice of the time, even though their effective duration is shorter (in this instance, a quaver).

I, 30 Basso  
Note 1 figured “6/4”.

I, 39-41 Vi pr  
The lower note of the two-note chord on the first beat of each bar is printed as a crotchet, even though its effective duration is shorter (in this instance, a semiquaver).

I, 40 Vi pr  
Notes 2 and 4 both g’.

I, 42-47 Vi pr  
The abbreviated form of notation employed from the first beat of bar 42 until the second beat of bar 47 probably requires the notes to be broken in the same way as in bars 15-18 in connection with bariolage.

I, 42-49 Vi II  
It is possible that the engraver inadvertently omitted to take account of an instruction in his copy text for the unison doubling of the Vi I part (followed, however, in the manuscript version of the concerto preserved in Dresden).

I, 48 Basso  
The figure for note 2 is aligned with note 6.

I, 58 Vi pr, Vi I-II  
Note 2 c”.

I, 62 Basso  
The figure “7” is aligned with note 1.

I, 73 Vi II  
The appoggiatura for note 5 is missing.

I, 74 Basso  
“Solo” aligned with note 5 of bar 73.

I, 80 Vi pr  
Note 8 without natural.

I, 81 Vi pr  
Note 8 without sharp.
I, 83  |  VI pr  | Note 16 $d''$.  
I, 89  |  Vla    | Notes 2-4 respectively $f'$, $a'$ and $f'$. Altered by analogy with bar 7.  
II, 1  |  Basso  | “Solo” aligned with note 1 of bar 2 (through lack of space).  
II, 8  |  Basso  | Figure ‘$6$’ aligned with note 1.  
II, 11 |  Basso  | Note 2 c. Note 3 figured “$6/4$”.  
II, 19 |  Basso  | Figure “$6$” aligned with note 2.  
II, 23 |  VI pr  | Note 3 without sharp.  
II, 23 |  Basso  | Notes 1-3 $g$. Note 1 figured “$4/2$”.  
II, 25 |  VI pr  | Note 3 without natural.  
II, 33 |  Basso  | Note 2 figured “$6/4$”.  
III, 16-18 | All parts | Through an engraving error, or more probably through an error in the copy text, the text of the second beat of bar 16 has inadvertently been repeated on the third beat of the same bar. In the edition the passage has been emended conjecturally by removing the superfluous notes and completing bar 18 (in VI pr, VI I and VI II) by the addition of a crotchet rest. The notation of the third beat of bar 16 and the whole of bar 17 (in Vla and Basso) has been emended by analogy with the parallel passage in bars 109-110.  
III, 34 |  VI pr  | “Solo” aligned with note 3 (through lack of space).  
III, 36 |  VI pr  | Note 12 without sharp.  
III, 37 |  Basso  | Note 4 figured “$6/5/4$”.  
III, 40 |  VI pr  | Note 9 $b'$ (flat).  
III, 41 |  VI pr  | Note 7 $a''$.  
III, 44 |  VI pr  | Note 3 without sharp.  
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III, 49  Vla  Note 4 \( b' \) natural.

III, 68  Basso  Note 6 figured “6/5”.

III, 71  VI pr VI I-II  The natural for note 3 appears by mistake before note 1.

III, 71  Vla  Note 1 e'. Emended by analogy with bar 8.

III, 71  Basso  Note 1 \( G \) sharp (figured “6”); note 2 g sharp.

III, 72  Vla  Note 1 \( b' \) natural. Emended by analogy with bar 9.

III, 72  Basso  Note 1 figured \( \frac{5}{4}/\# \).

III, 73  Vla  Note 1 \( a' \).

III, 76  Basso  Notes 2 and 3 respectively \( a \) and \( g \) (making parallel fifths with the part of the upper strings).

III, 92, 94, 96, 102  VI pr  The upper note of the two-note chord on the first beat of each bar is printed as a crotchet, even though its effective duration is shorter (in this instance, a quaver).

III, 112  VI pr  The abbreviated form of notation requires the notes to be broken into groups of four semiquavers where the low notes (variable) alternate with the higher ones (fixed). The same bariolage pattern can be employed in bars 114, 116 and 118-120.

III, 123  Basso  Note 2 figured “6/4”.
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