

# CLASSIFYING MISATTRIBUTIONS IN PERGOLESI'S SACRED MUSIC

CLAUDIO BACCIAGALUPPI



On 16 March 1736 Giovanni Battista Pergolesi died from consumption at age twenty-six in the Franciscan monastery of Pozzuoli near Naples, leaving a considerable number of compositions in all genres: stage works, cantatas, instrumental music and sacred music. On account of the success these compositions had enjoyed in Italy during his life, and the extraordinary fame they achieved in the rest of Europe after his death, a multitude of works bearing his name continued to be disseminated, many of which had little, if any, connection with Pergolesi himself. This phenomenon invites us to question what mechanisms are at work when a piece of music is misattributed, for if spurious or doubtful works can be classified according to their origin, then the identification of recurring patterns may help disentangle similar cases. This essay aims to classify the origins of misattributed sacred works from the first decades of Pergolesi's posthumous reception.

The artificial multiplication of Pergolesi's compositions ebbed after a few decades. By the turn of the nineteenth century, European reception of his music was reduced to just a few works: the intermezzo *La serva padrona* and the *Stabat mater*, and to a lesser degree *Livietta e Tracollo* and the *Salve regina* in C minor.<sup>1</sup> Catalogues of Pergolesi's works were first compiled at this time, with the beginning of a historical interest in 'classical' Neapolitan music from the early eighteenth century. During the 1820s one of Pergolesi's earliest biographers, the collector and amateur composer Giuseppe Sigismondo (1739–1826), mentioned only works that he knew or owned in score.<sup>2</sup> In the second half of the nineteenth century, François-Joseph Fétis, Hans Michael Schletterer and Friedrich Chrysander, among others, rediscovered and described with commendable bibliographical effort not only Pergolesi's authentic compositions, but also many of the spurious works, leading to the surprisingly extensive work-lists included in Robert Eitner's *Quellenlexikon* and in Giuseppe Radiciotti's biography.<sup>3</sup>

---

<[claudio.bacciagaluppi@rism-ch.org](mailto:claudio.bacciagaluppi@rism-ch.org)>

- 1 On the reception history of Pergolesi's works see Giuseppe Radiciotti, *G. B. Pergolesi: vita, opere ed influenza su l'arte* (Rome: Musica, 1910), 203–253; Francesco Degrada, 'Linee di una storia della critica pergolesiana', *Il convegno musicale* 2 (1965), 13–43; Francesco Degrada, 'False attribuzioni e falsificazioni nel catalogo delle opere di Giovanni Battista Pergolesi: genesi storica e problemi critici', in *L'attribuzione, teoria e pratica: storia dell'arte, musicologia, letteratura*, ed. Ottavio Besomi and Carlo Caruso (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1994), 96; and Hans-Günter Ottenberg, 'Giovanni Battista Pergolesi "La Serva padrona" und "Stabat mater" im Spiegel des deutschsprachigen Musikschritftums des 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts', *Studi pergolesiani / Pergolesi Studies* 8 (2012), 453–497.
- 2 See Francesco Degrada, 'Giuseppe Sigismondo, il marchese di Villarosa e la biografia di Pergolesi', *Studi pergolesiani / Pergolesi Studies* 3 (1999), 251–277. Sigismondo's manuscript 'Apotheosi della musica nel regno di Napoli' (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung (D-B), Mus. ms. autogr. theor. Sigismondo), which contains the Pergolesi biography, is currently being edited by Claudio Bacciagaluppi, Giulia Giovani and Raffaele Mellace, with an introductory essay by Rosa Cafiero (Rome: Società Editrice di Musicologia).
- 3 François-Joseph Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique* (Brussels: Meline, Cans, 1835–1844), volume 7, 192–195 (the work list remained unchanged in the second edition of 1860–1865); Hans Michael Schletterer, 'Giovanni Battista Pergolese', in *Sammlung musikalischer Vorträge, neue Reihe*, ed. Paul, Count Waldersee (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1880), 141–175; Friedrich Chrysander, 'Giovanni Battista Pergolese', *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* 17 (1882), columns 65–70, 81–85, 97–103, 113–122, 129–137, 145–149, 161–166, 177–180, 193–202, 209–219, 225–231, 893; Robert Eitner, *Biographisch-bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten*



Considerable confusion was introduced by the infamous ‘complete works’ edition in vocal score by Filippo Caffarelli, published during the Second World War. Caffarelli did not enter at all into the question of attribution, printing anything that bore the name of Pergolesi, and most often even failed to mention the sources he had used.<sup>4</sup> Understandably, post-war musicology had to deal with attribution problems for several decades, starting in the late 1940s with studies by Frank Walker and Charles Cudworth concerning the instrumental music.<sup>5</sup> From the 1960s to the 1990s, a second generation of musicologists questioned the authorship of several other doubtful compositions using different approaches. To mention only a few of the most important studies, Francesco Degrada examined the style of Pergolesi’s sacred music, Marvin E. Paymer and Barry S. Brook described his handwriting and Hanns-Bertold Dietz discussed conflicting attributions among works by contemporary Neapolitan composers.<sup>6</sup> In the 1980s Brook, Degrada and Helmut Hucke were general editors of a series of Pergolesi’s complete works, of which only four volumes were published. The goal of a complete critical edition was taken over by a new series that started in 2012. As part of this endeavour, a thematic catalogue of the composer’s works will be published.<sup>7</sup> It is easy to predict that one of the more challenging tasks will be to list all spurious works and to identify reworkings of authentic compositions.

There are two main ways of resolving attribution issues, by examining internal and external evidence. Internal evidence is roughly equivalent to style analysis, a topic that was of central interest for Pergolesi scholars such as Brook and Paymer.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, even a work stylistically near to those of Pergolesi must exhibit convincing external evidence – that is, a transmission of sources with some connection to Naples. Such evidence may be found, for example, in the history of music collections and in the identification of copyists’ hands and Neapolitan paper types.<sup>9</sup> In this essay I follow a different line of thought, still pertaining to external evidence, in seeking a methodology by which to classify misattributions. Many spurious works were evidently created for commercial reasons, as a new Pergolesi work would certainly have been easy to sell in the mid-eighteenth century. Still, the aim in attributing a foreign work to a famous composer need not be dishonourable: it may be a sincere, if unfortunate, attempt at identification. Three main mechanisms in the production of misattributed works can be identified: parodies, false attributions and homages. In

---

*christlicher Zeitrechnung bis Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1900–1904), volume 7, 366–371; and Radiciotti, *G. B. Pergolesi*.

- 4 Giovanni Battista Pergolesi, *Opera omnia*, ed. Filippo Caffarelli, twenty-six volumes (Rome: Gli amici della musica da camera, 1939–1942).
- 5 Frank Walker, ‘Two Centuries of Pergolesi Forgeries and Misattributions’, *Music & Letters* 30/4 (1949), 297–320, and Charles Cudworth, ‘Notes on the Instrumental Works Attributed to Pergolesi’, *Music & Letters* 30/4 (1949), 321–328.
- 6 Barry S. Brook and Marvin E. Paymer, ‘The Pergolesi Hand: A Calligraphic Study’, *Notes* 38/3 (1982), 550–578; Hanns-Bertold Dietz, ‘Durante, Leo and Pergolesi: Concerning Misattributions Among Their Sacred Music’, *Studi pergolesiani / Pergolesi Studies* 2 (1988), 128–143; Francesco Degrada, ‘Le messe di Giovanni Battista Pergolesi: problemi di cronologia e d’attribuzione’, *Analecta Musicologica* 3 (1966), 65–79. Degrada provided a summary of authenticity studies up to the 1990s in ‘False attribuzioni’.
- 7 The ‘Edizione nazionale delle opere di Giovanni Battista Pergolesi’ is based at the Centro Studi Pergolesi of the Università di Milano. To date, the first two volumes have appeared: *Stabat mater*, ed. Claudio Toscani (Milan: Ricordi, 2012), and *La fenice sul rogo ovvero la morte di San Giuseppe*, ed. Alessandro Monga and Davide Verga (Milan: Ricordi, 2013). Giovanni Polin is the editor of the thematic catalogue in progress.
- 8 Marvin E. Paymer, ‘Pergolesi Authenticity: An Interim Report’, *Studi pergolesiani / Pergolesi Studies* 1 (1986), 196–217, and Barry S. Brook, ‘The Pergolesi Complete Works Edition and the General Problems of Using Internal Analysis for Determining Authenticity’, in *Opera incerta: Echtheitsfragen als Problem musikwissenschaftlicher Gesamtausgaben*, ed. Hanspeter Bannwitz, Gabriele Buschmeier, Georg Feder, Klaus Hoffmann and Wolfgang Plath (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaft und der Literatur; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1991), 319–334.
- 9 For an example of transmission see Claudio Bacciagaluppi and Janice B. Stockigt, ‘Italian Manuscripts of Sacred Music in Dresden: The Neapolitan Collection of 1738–1740’, *Fonti Musicali Italiane* 15 (2010), 141–179. Stephen Shearon pioneered scholarship on Neapolitan copyists and paper types in his PhD dissertation ‘Latin Sacred Music and Nicola Fago: The Career and Sources of an Early Eighteenth-Century *Maestro di cappella*’ (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1993).



posthumous parodies and pasticcios, most of the music is actually by Pergolesi but the work itself has to be considered spurious. Source evidence suggests that this was the first means whereby new titles were added to Pergolesi's works list. False attributions attach the name of Pergolesi to music that may or may not resemble his works in style, and can have a very distant origin in both time and space. Finally, some cases exist of compositions that are stylistically very near to Pergolesi's, but whose sources do not provide enough evidence to confirm his authorship: these may be instances of Pergolesi's compositional influence in Italy.

## PARODIES AND REWORKINGS

The simplest way to augment Pergolesi's output and thereby quench the thirst for new works by him was to resort to parody.<sup>10</sup> Consider the example of Girolamo Chiti (1679–1759), born in the Tuscan town of Siena and maestro di cappella of the Roman basilica of San Giovanni in Laterano from 1726 to the end of his life. Most of his extant sacred vocal works are scored a cappella, since instruments were only exceptionally used in the basilica. Still, he owned a collection of concertato works with instrumental accompaniment. Some of these are mentioned in a letter he sent in 1754 to Giovanni Battista Martini in Bologna: sacred compositions by the Neapolitans Domenico Sarro, Leonardo Vinci, 'Ciccio' (Francesco) Durante and Giovanni Gualberto Brunetti. Chiti mentions, incidentally, that he had ordered two motets and a mass by Durante directly from the composer in Naples.<sup>11</sup> Comparatively few concertato compositions are preserved today in the music archive of the Lateran basilica. Among these is a responsory, *Christus factus est*, for which Chiti does not supply the author's name, only giving the date of his copy, 1744. In fact, it is an adaptation of the 'Qui tollis . . . suscipe' from the Mass in D major by Pergolesi.<sup>12</sup> Chiti changed the text and the scoring, reducing the original five vocal parts (with double soprano) to four.

More complex cases result from reworkings that mix together several authentic works; for some of these, no conclusive evidence is available. The 'Laudamus te' from Pergolesi's Mass in D major replaces the original setting of the same text in a copy of his Mass in F major.<sup>13</sup> The fugue on 'propter magnam gloriam', again from the Mass in D major, was parodied as the fifth movement, 'Et abundantia diligentibus te', of a *Laetatus sum* in D major attributed to Pergolesi. The rest of this work is a parody of Pergolesi's authentic *Confitebor* setting. This 'pasticcio-parody' is preserved in two eighteenth-century manuscripts in Naples and Milan;<sup>14</sup> two early nineteenth-century copies in Paris and Washington derive from an unidentified Roman score.<sup>15</sup>

10 See Claudio Bacciagaluppi, 'Parodies in Pergolesi's Sacred Music: Some Reflections on Central European Sources', *Studi pergolesiani / Pergolesi Studies* 8 (2012), 259–286.

11 Museo internazionale e biblioteca della musica di Bologna, Epistolario Martiniano, I.6.62a, Chiti to Martini, 27 April 1754, catalogued in Anne Schnoebelen, *Padre Martini's Collection of Letters in the Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale in Bologna: An Annotated Index* (New York: Pendragon, 1979), number 1572. The correspondence is published in *Settecento musicale erudito: epistolario Giovanni Battista Martini e Girolamo Chiti (1745–1759)*, ed. Giancarlo Rostirolla, Luciano Luciani, Maria Adelaide Morabito Iannucci and Cecilia Parisi (Rome: IBIMUS, 2010).

12 Rome, Basilica di San Giovanni in Laterano, Archivio Musicale (I-Rsg), ms. mus. B.155a; see RISM A/II, ID No. 850500842, <[www.opac.rism.info](http://www.opac.rism.info)> (29 August 2014).

13 I-Rsg, ms. mus. A.305 (RISM A/II, ID No. 850505810); also preserved in a nineteenth-century copy by Fortunato Santini, Münster, Diözesanbibliothek, Santini-Bibliothek (D-MÜs), Hs. 3068 (RISM A/II, ID No. 451015680).

14 Naples, Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica San Pietro a Majella (I-Nc), 40.1.37/2, *olim* Mus. rel. 1524/2, and Milan, Biblioteca del Conservatorio Giuseppe Verdi (I-Mc), M.S. ms. 215–6. A later source is found in D-B, Mus. ms. 17173 (RISM A/II, ID No. 455028474).

15 Washington, Library of Congress, Music Division (US-Wc), M2020.P36L2 Case, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département de la Musique, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire (F-Pc), D-14352. These belonged to Victor Rifaut (1798–1838); see Fétis, *Biographie universelle*, volume 7, 432–433. Rifaut states that he copied the scores in Rome. His exemplar may have been the *Laetatus sum* in the collection of the Cappella Giulia mentioned by Helmut Hucke, 'Pergolesi: Probleme eines Werkverzeichnisses', *Acta musicologica* 52 (1980), 213.



This kind of reworking was also popular outside Italy. Another pasticcio based on the conflation of the two authentic masses inserts the 'Qui tollis . . . suscipe' and the 'Quoniam' from the Mass in F into the Mass in D. The pasticcio's oldest known source is a set of parts from Breslau dated 1750.<sup>16</sup> One copy eventually found its way to Italy and is today preserved in the collection of Simon Mayr in Bergamo.<sup>17</sup> Another example comes from nearby Prague. The Kapellmeister of the city's cathedral, Josef Antonín Sehling (1710–1756), copied a work indicating its parody status in the title *Cantata versa in offertorium pro defunctis* (cantata transformed into an offertory for the dead). More precisely, Sehling combined extracts from two original compositions by Pergolesi: a parody of Bernardo's aria 'Come non pensi' from the 'sacred drama' *Li prodigi della divina grazia nella conversione e morte di San Guglielmo duca d'Aquitania* (first performed in Naples in 1731) and a parody of the fugal duet 'Fac ut ardeat' from the *Stabat mater*.<sup>18</sup>

Most 'parody-pasticcios' are likely to be posthumous reworkings. Still, their authenticity is a thorny issue, since self-borrowings and parodies were an important part of the compositional method of Pergolesi and his contemporaries. For example, Pergolesi borrowed for the Mass in D the E minor 'Domine Deus' that he had originally composed for the Mass in F.<sup>19</sup> He also parodied the 'Cum Sancto Spiritu' from the Mass in D and inserted it as a 'Sicut erat' at the end of his *Laudate pueri*.<sup>20</sup> Thus evidence for or against the authenticity of similar reworkings can only come from carefully considering the sources. In general, non-Italian copies are more likely to transmit spurious works than Neapolitan manuscripts from Pergolesi's time. However, such evidence cannot be considered conclusive, since we cannot know how many sources have been lost.

## FALSE ATTRIBUTIONS

Conflicting attributions are helpful in establishing the authenticity of works because one can compare the compositional style and transmission patterns of two or more known authors. But when all sources ascribe a composition to Pergolesi, the results of style analysis and a study of transmission may be confirmed by investigating the origin of a suspected misattribution.

Recently, attention has been drawn to a composition attributed to Pergolesi in many sources from German-speaking countries, especially Catholic ecclesiastical circles in southern Germany and Austria. The oratorio *Septem verba a Christo in cruce moriente prolata* was first published by Hermann Scherchen in 1952 based upon a set of partbooks copied in Zurich 1770.<sup>21</sup> In 2013 Richard Fehling published a new edition using three

16 Warsaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka (PL-Wu), RM 5013 (RISM A/II, ID No. 300514162). Moreover, the 'Cum Sancto Spiritu' is a reworking of the 'Sicut erat' which will be discussed later (and which was itself a reworking of the original 'Cum Sancto Spiritu').

17 Bergamo, Civica Biblioteca Angelo Mai (I-BGc), Mayr 536a (*olim* C.4.27) (RISM A/II, ID No. 850006420).

18 Prague, Archiv Pražského hradu: Knihovna metropolitní kapituly, hudební sbírka katedrály svatého Víta – hudební sbírka Kaple sv. Kříže katedrály (CZ-Pak), 972; RISM A/II, ID No. 550268171. The manuscript is also interesting because most other sources for the *San Guglielmo* reflect a later oratorio version rather than the original 'dramma sacro'; see Marc Niubo, 'Giovanni Battista Pergolesi in Eighteenth-Century Bohemia', *Studi pergolesiani / Pergolesi Studies* 8 (2012), 287–311.

19 The autograph score, preserved in New York, contains many passages corrected on the spot, before the completion of the score, proving that the movement passed from the Mass in F to the Mass in D and not vice versa (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Department of Music Manuscripts and Books (US-NYpm), Cary 438 (RISM A/II, ID No. 000109152)).

20 Pergolesi later replaced the borrowed movement in the psalm setting with a freshly composed 'Sicut erat'. For this reason, the parody 'Sicut erat' is today preserved separately from the rest of the score: the original 'Sicut erat' is in I-Nc, Rari 1.6.27, f. 46r–56v, while the rest of the *Laudate pueri* with the later 'Sicut erat' is in I-Nc, 18.3.3/20, *olim* Rari 1.6.29/2.

21 Giovanni Battista Pergolesi (attributed), *Die sieben Worte des Erlösers*, ed. Hermann Scherchen (Vienna: Ars Viva, 1952), based upon the manuscript partbooks in Zurich, Zentralbibliothek (CH-Zz), AMG XIII 735 & a–m (RISM A/II, ID No. 400008211). The collection of the Zurich Allgemeine Musik-Gesellschaft (AMG) preserves the music scores once owned by the local seventeenth- and eighteenth-century *collegia musica*.



additional manuscripts in Kremsmünster, Metten (both dated c1760) and Munich (undated, originating from the monastery of Aldersbach).<sup>22</sup> Other sources are preserved in Ottobeuren and Regensburg.<sup>23</sup> Thus the transmission pattern of the known sources points to north of the Alps. Does this disqualify the work as authentic? Surely not, but the specific pattern of dissemination through ecclesiastical circles does suggest that the attribution may be incorrect, as with the following examples.

Consider the case of a Mass in F major printed under Pergolesi's name in Vienna in 1805.<sup>24</sup> Stylistically, there is no doubt that it is a composition by a Neapolitan master from the 1730s or 1740s; for publication, it was slightly adapted to modern practice through the addition of winds.<sup>25</sup> Francesco Degrada included the work among Pergolesi's authentic works, whereas Helmut Hucke expressed serious doubts, as he did not know any sources prior to the Viennese edition.<sup>26</sup> Today we have a clearer picture of the work's transmission. The earliest datable mention of this composition is found in a 1753 inventory of the music library in the Cistercian monastery of Osek, in Bohemia.<sup>27</sup> Josef Antonín Sehling in Prague owned a set of partbooks for this work which is still preserved there.<sup>28</sup> Later manuscript sources, for example those in Dresden and Zug, Switzerland, were probably copied from the Viennese edition.<sup>29</sup> Thus the so-called *Missa postuma* is an example of a work attributed to Pergolesi showing a similar origin to the *Septem verba*, with sources spreading from the abbeys of Kremsmünster and Osek.

In the eighteenth-century music chapels of monasteries and convents of the Alpine region and of the Habsburg lands, there was a strong desire to update the repertoire with compositions by famous Italian composers. Often this desire was satisfied by attaching sacred texts to opera arias.<sup>30</sup> *Deliciae terrena*e is the Latin text of a parodied alto aria attributed to Pergolesi and kept in the Benedictine abbey of Einsiedeln, Switzerland.<sup>31</sup> Given that the original text was certainly different, and that the music may not be Pergolesi's at all, the task of identifying the original context of the aria becomes a difficult one. False attributions are also found in the case of larger-scale compositions. To remain in Einsiedeln, sacred works attributed to Pergolesi in sources from the late eighteenth century include a five-part *Salve regina* in B flat major (in a nineteenth-century manuscript by Sigismund Keller scored from now-lost older partbooks) and a four-part *Magnificat* in D major (in partbooks dated 1775).<sup>32</sup> Setting aside the question of musical style, it is unlikely that three otherwise unknown compositions by Pergolesi should have been preserved in Einsiedeln.

22 Giovanni Battista Pergolesi (attributed), *Septem verba a Christo in cruce moriente prolata*, ed. Reinhard Fehling (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2013); see also Reinhard Fehling, *Septem Verba: ein Oratorium des 'Signore Pergolesi'* (Essen: Die Blaue Eule, 2011). The work was recorded in 2013 by René Jacobs (*Giovanni Battista Pergolesi: Septem verba a Christo in cruce moriente prolata*, Sophie Karthäuser, Christophe Dumaux, Christophe Behr, Konstantin Wolff, Akademie für Alte Musik Berlin, dir. René Jacobs, Harmonia Mundi HMC902155).

23 Ottobeuren, Bibliothek der Benediktiner-Abtei (D-OB), MO 690, and Regensburg, Fürst Thurn und Taxis Hofbibliothek und Zentralbibliothek (D-Rtt), Pergolesi 3 (see RISM A/II, ID Nos 450008617 and 450010281 respectively).

24 RISM A/I, P 1344–1346, with a later reprint, P 1347.

25 Raimund Rüegge, 'Die "Missa Romana" von Giovanni Battista Pergolesi: ein bedeutendes Sakralwerk', *Schweizerische Musikzeitung* 117 (1977), 320.

26 Degrada, 'Le messe di Giovanni Battista Pergolesi', 75–79; Hucke, 'Pergolesi: Probleme eines Werkverzeichnisses', 217–218.

27 'Syllabus seu catalogus perutilis', Prague, Národní muzeum – České muzeum hudby, hudebně-historické oddělení (CZ-Pnm), Osek, č. př. 65/52.3, f. 3v.

28 CZ-Pak, 975 (RISM A/II, ID No. 550268173).

29 The Dresden sources are an early nineteenth-century score and a soprano partbook (Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (D-DI), Mus. 3005-D-16 and Mus. 3005-D-16a). The Swiss source is attributed to Franz Xaver Richter (Zug, Pfarrarchiv St. Michael (CH-ZGm), M 10/185; see RISM A/II, ID No. 400056295) – in fact, the misattribution of a misattribution.

30 See Nicole Schwindt-Gross, 'Parodie um 1800', *Die Musikforschung* 41 (1988), 16–45.

31 Einsiedeln, Musikbibliothek des Klosters (CH-E), 200,30 (RISM A/II, ID No. 400012776).

32 CH-E, 288,6 and 577,4 respectively. Another score of the *Salve regina*, copied in 1874 by Father Keller for Johannes Evangelista Habert, is now in Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (D-Mbs), Mus. Hs. 62; RISM A/II, ID No. 455028145).



Though at least some of the aforementioned works may indeed have been composed in Italy, no sources are known from that country. Possibly these works were preserved north of the Alps precisely because their sources came to carry the name of a famous author. Their putative Italian originals, which were either anonymous or attributed to an obscure maestro, have been lost or lie yet unremarked in some music library. In a central European ecclesiastical context, then, misattributions were often created, perhaps *bona fide*, for the sake of enhancing the prestige of the local chapel's repertoire.

## EXERCISES IN STYLE

Most Neapolitan *Salve regina* compositions from the early eighteenth century divide the text into five to six sections, alternating slow and fast movements and solos and duets in a finely balanced scheme, and a *Salve regina* for two sopranos, two violins and continuo in F minor attributed to Pergolesi is no exception.<sup>33</sup> It divides the text of the Marian antiphon into six movements in binary 'aria da chiesa' form (three short, non-modulating ritornellos and two statements of the aria's text in modulating solo episodes). The first, fourth and sixth sections are duets, and the tonal plan is well balanced: F minor, B flat major, E flat major, G minor, C minor, F minor.

While the composition is likely to be Neapolitan, the source situation is less straightforward. As with the *Missa postuma*, most manuscripts appear to be copies of the two first editions, printed in Paris and in London between the 1760s and the 1770s.<sup>34</sup> The only two sources not derived from the printed editions are late eighteenth-century Italian scores of uncertain provenance, kept today in conservatory libraries in Florence and Venice.<sup>35</sup> The work's transmission pattern, then, does not pass through the ecclesiastical circles encountered above. Is this work a Neapolitan *Salve regina* from the 1730s, falsely attributed to Pergolesi by its first publishers for commercial reasons? While this remains the most straightforward hypothesis, there is another possible explanation.

Let us compare the situation of this *Salve regina* with two well-known cases of clear misattribution to other Neapolitan composers: another *Salve regina* in F minor, for soprano, alto, two violins and continuo attributed to Alessandro Scarlatti, and a *Pange lingua* in D minor for the same scoring attributed to Francesco Provenzale. In their studies of the two composers, Benedikt Poensgen and Dinko Fabris have shown that the attributions are untenable.<sup>36</sup> They also noticed that the two works are closely related: their only sources, two late eighteenth-century scores, are in the same hand.<sup>37</sup> The music was originally transmitted anonymously,

33 A typical scheme according to Magda Marx-Weber, 'Neapolitanische Andachtsmusik zur Zeit Händels', *Händel Jahrbuch* 46 (2000), 52–53, is the following: 'Salve regina' (slow), 'Ad te clamamus' (fast), 'Ad te suspiramus' (slow), 'Eja ergo' (fast), 'Et Jesum benedictum' (sometimes a recitative) and 'O clemens' (slow).

34 *Salve Regina, à deux voix . . . mis au jour par Huberty* (Paris: Huberty, c1760–1770) and *Salve Regina a Due Voce Composta dal Gio Battista Pergolese* (London: Robert Bremner[, 1773]); RISM A/I, P 1387 and P 1388 respectively. The date for the Bremner edition is taken from the *Catalogue of Printed Music in the British Library to 1980*, ed. Laureen Baillie (London and Munich: Saur, 1981–1987), volume 44, 423.

35 Florence, Biblioteca del Conservatorio di musica Luigi Cherubini (I-Fc), E.I.132; Venice, Biblioteca del Conservatorio di musica Benedetto Marcello (I-Vc), Fondo Liceo-Società Musicale (LSM) 78/3.

36 Benedikt Johannes Poensgen, 'Die Offiziumskompositionen von Alessandro Scarlatti' (PhD dissertation, Universität Hamburg, 2005; <<http://ediss.sub.uni-hamburg.de/volltexte/2005/2646>> (18 September 2014)), 169–170 and 234–235; and Dinko Fabris, *Music in Seventeenth-Century Naples: Francesco Provenzale (1624–1704)* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 240–242 and 259.

37 I-Nc, Mus. Rel. 3147, *olim* 22.4.2/15 (RISM A/II, ID No. 850009074) and I-Nc, Mus. Rel. 1798, *olim* 22.5.22/14. There are also two nineteenth-century scores in the Nosedà collection in the Milan conservatoire, but these are certainly copied from the Neapolitan sources.



and the two 'wrong' attributions were added later, possibly by Giuseppe Sigismondo.<sup>38</sup> It is unclear why works inspired by Pergolesi were attributed to two older composers. The close relationship of both works to Pergolesi's *Stabat mater* was noticed by both Fabris and Poensgen; Fabris suggested, moreover, that the attributions may be falsifications inspired by the *Stabat mater*'s fame or preparatory material for the masterpiece by Pergolesi himself.<sup>39</sup>

In fact, it might be more accurate to view these works as compositional exercises based upon Pergolesi's model. As such, they reflect the reception of Pergolesi's music in Naples. If they are conscious style copies, they may date from well after Pergolesi's time. Perhaps, given the lack of earlier sources, the *Salve Regina* printed in Paris and London was also composed in a deliberately old-fashioned manner, not long before its publication. In this case, it too might be viewed as a part of Pergolesi reception history. The Neapolitan musical 'canon' for sacred music from the 1720s and 1730s had indeed a long life, and its influence lasted well into the nineteenth century.<sup>40</sup>

To sum up, we have seen that evidence derived from the transmission pattern of a doubtful work may be strengthened by reference to other works with similar patterns. Combined with style analysis, such evidence facilitates hypotheses about the origins of misattributions to Pergolesi. Moreover, by classifying misattributions as parodies, false attributions or exercises in style, as with the examples discussed above, we may be able to recognize further cases that will help refine our knowledge of the Neapolitan master and his influence.

---

38 Fabris (*Music in Seventeenth-Century Naples*, 240) suggests, unconvincingly, that the music may also be in his hand. Sample facsimile pages of the two manuscripts are published in Poensgen, 'Die Offiziumskompositionen', volume 1, 170, and volume 2, 130, and in Fabris, *Music in Seventeenth-Century Naples*, 277.

39 Dinko Fabris, 'La musica sacra di Francesco Provenzale', *Studien zur italienischen Musikgeschichte* 15 (*Analecta Musicologica* 30) (1998), volume 1, 354, and Poensgen, 'Die Offiziumskompositionen', volume 2, 234–235.

40 This is a well-known fact as regards the pedagogical traditions of the Neapolitan conservatories; see, for example, Giorgio Sanguinetti, 'Decline and Fall of the "Celeste Impero": The Theory of Composition in Naples during the *Ottocento*', *Studi musicali* 34 (2005), 451–502. The nineteenth-century reception of compositions from the Neapolitan 'classical' age still await a deeper investigation; see, for example, Rosa Cafiero, 'Tracing a History of the Neapolitan School: Giuseppe Sigismondo's "Apoteosi della musica" from Naples to Berlin', *Musicologica Austriaca* 30 (2011), 57–71.