The Fondo Ottorino Respighi was established at the Fondazione Giorgio Cini in Venice in 1967 following a donation made by the composer’s widow, Elsa Olivieri-Sangiacomo. This collection brings together a considerable amount of manuscripts, scores, books, letters and photographs, along with a few instruments that belonged to the maestro and his wife. A study of the materials conserved therein is fundamental for any study dedicated to this composer.

This article focuses on Ottorino Respighi’s collaboration with Sergei Diaghilev, which between 1917 and 1920 led to the birth of three ballets: *La boutique fantasque* (1919, Rossini – Respighi), *Le astuzie femminili* (1920, Cimarosa – Respighi) and *La serva padrona* (1920, Paisiello – Respighi). The work is aimed at filling a gap in academic research, whether music or dance studies, given that little or nothing had been published on their common artistic endeavours, in spite of the great success of *La boutique fantasque* and *Le astuzie femminili* (which later became *Ballet de l’astuce feminine* and *Cimarosiana*), both of which count among the ballets most often performed by the *Ballets Russes*. In particular, this essay is intended to clarify the extent of Respighi’s contribution to the aesthetic turn towards neoclassicism endorsed by Diaghilev’s
Ballets Russes following the First World War, when they broke away from nineteenth-century music and turned instead to eighteenth-century, pre-classical models and stylistic traits. A further objective consisted in locating the score of *La serva padrona*, never staged and thought to have been lost, which, as I discovered during my research in the archives on the Island of San Giorgio Maggiore in 2012, is now found in the United States.2

The Fondo Ottorino Respighi conserves a small number of materials pertaining to *La boutique fantasque*, which mainly consist in a substantial correspondence between Ottorino Respighi and the London-based editor J. & W. Chester, starting from 1921 and concerning the transfer of the rights for the piece with subsequent annual updates.3 Further elements are found in the correspondence maintained by Elsa Respighi after the composer’s death, in which she unsuccessfully attempted to locate and regain possession of this manuscript.4 A comparison with the literature conserved in the Fondo Aurél M. Milloss of the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, in any case, allowed the salient features of the work on this ballet to emerge. According to the autobiographical notes left by Léonide Massine,5 who was responsible for the choreography and danced in the role of the *Can-can dancer*, it was Respighi who brought to Diaghilev’s attention the then little-known *Péchés de vieillesse*, a series of piano pieces written by Gioachino Rossini between 1857 and 1868. Respighi and Diaghilev met in Rome in early 1917 during work on the staging of *Les femmes de bonne humeur*, a ballet based on Vincenzo Tommasini’s orchestration of a few keyboard sonatas by Domenico Scarlatti.

As appears in a letter written by Respighi to the singer and friend Chiarina Fino-Savio on 26 August 1917,6 the former met with the impresario and the choreographer in Viareggio during the summer months to decide upon the ballet’s musical content. Respighi wrote to Diaghilev on 29 August, informing him that he had made considerable progress on the preparatory score.7 In September he sent him a piano score which consisted in a selection of the *Péchés* in their first printed edition, appropriately renumbered and annotated, and accompanied by manuscript scores joining the various parts, along with an entirely hand-written finale. Over the following year, Massine worked on the choreography under Diaghilev’s supervision. Diaghilev heavily annotated the piano score, and offered Respighi indications as to the kind of orchestration he wanted.8 The impresario’s requests were accepted by Respighi while setting to work on the orchestration in December 1918. The orchestral forces chosen by the composer consisted in a large orchestra enhanced by celesta, harp and tubular bells. With these instrumental resources Respighi recreated an orchestral colour that can no longer be associated with Rossini, evoking rather the late
eighteenth-century Russian school, with which Respighi had come into direct contact during the two seasons he spent as a violist in the orchestra of the Mariinsky Theater, and during the few but important lessons he took from Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov between 1900 and 1902. Conversely, Respighi's treatment of the intervallic, harmonic and rhythmic content of the original music was conservative: he did not modify the melodies, harmonies or rhythms, but amplified their potentiality in a new orchestral guise. The work on this ballet lasted two years, allowing music and choreography to develop along parallel lines and benefit reciprocally from one another. The synergy between impresario and composer was perfect on this occasion, and was amply rewarded by the enthusiastic reception of the ballet at its première on 5 June 1919 at the Alhambra Theatre in London. The reason for this work's enduring success can perhaps be pinpointed in the synthesis of its constitutive artistic layers: choreographies based on traditional European dances (Massine), music written in France by an Italian opera composer (Rossini) and orchestrated in a late eighteenth-century Russian manner (Respighi, à la manière de...) and corps de ballet in the Russian tradition but already pan-European in its actual composition.

While turning his attention to eighteenth-century Italian opera music, Diaghilev noted that Cimarosa and Paisiello had spent time at the court of Catherine II in San Petersburg, between 1776 and 1783 and between 1787 and 1791 respectively. The requests made by the Tsarina, who, as she herself admitted, was no expert in music, specified that the compositions by the two maestri di cappella were to be brief, to give ample room to arias and limit the recitatives (because at the Russian court, ‘the [Italian] language is not understood’), and to include ballets: all features that are entirely similar to those sought by the impresario for his future stagings. This was not simply to be a melancholic evocation of the music played at the Tsar’s court – the environment in which Diaghilev had artistically matured, now irretrievably lost after the October revolution – but also a revival of Italian music that had borrowed, from the Russian court, typical elements which could contribute to the success of the Ballets Russes’ upcoming performances in Europe. During the First World War, Diaghilev spent much time in libraries and in antique music shops in Rome, Naples, London and Paris, where he obtained copies of scores by the aforementioned composers who at the time were virtually unknown. He studied the music, annotated the Russian themes that he recognised, and lastly chose the pieces he liked the most. The same selection included music by (and attributed to) Pergolesi that the impresario entrusted to Stravinsky. He autonomously composed the ballet-opera Pulcinella (1920). The remaining scores were assigned to Respighi.
Diaghilev was seduced by the clear references, both musical and textual, to Russian music and dance found in *Le astuzie femminili*, set to music by Cimarosa in 1794. The libretto by Giuseppe Palomba explicitly called for the presence of a *ballo russo* in the last part of this *commedia per musica*, which led to the creation of an interesting overlap between its immanent dramaturgy and its contingent staging. Palomba’s libretto in fact reads (fourth part, second scene):

**BELLINA**

*(ai suonatori)*

Un ballo russo, olà, suonate,
Ch’io con Filandro lo ballerò.

*[to the dancers: A Russian dance, come now, play / And I with Filandro will dance to it.]*

**GIAMPAOLO**

Un ballo russo, su, cominciate.

*[A Russian dance, come on, begin.]*

In composing this ‘Russian dance’, Cimarosa quoted the second theme of the introductory sinfonia, which contains a melody that the composer heard during his stay in Russia. With the exception of this second theme, the remainder of the sinfonia for *Le astuzie femminili* was entirely borrowed from that for *La vergine del sole* (dramma serio in three acts, 1788), also composed at the court of Catherine the Great. Diaghilev recognised these self-borrowings, as appears in a manuscript with miscellaneous pieces by Cimarosa transcribed in Naples and dated 1917–1918. In addition to the above-mentioned *Vergine del sole*, the ballets to be added at the end were all extrapolated from other compositions written by Cimarosa at the Russian court: *La felicità inaspettata* (theatrical action in two acts, 1788), *Atene edificata* (cantata for 4 solo voices and chorus, 1788) and *Sorpresa* (pastoral cantata for 5 solo voices and chorus, 1790–1791). Lastly, the impresario annotated the order of the pieces, the transpositions necessary to link them efficaciously and the Russian themes to be exploited. Perhaps owing to the success met by *La boutique fantasque* at its London première, Diaghilev charged Respighi with orchestrating the opera-ballet he had in mind. This was a strategic choice, for a number of reasons: not long before the 1920s, Respighi was rapidly gaining fame as one of the most significant Italian composers of his generation, and his collaboration would have contributed to the success of performances in Italy, a nation that,
on account of its own deeply-rooted tradition of opera and ballet, had proved to be less receptive than others to the innovations of the *Ballets Russes.*

Numerous materials conserved in the Fondo Ottorino Respighi contain indications pertaining to *Le astuzie femminili.* First and foremost, a copy of the contract signed by Diaghilev in Naples on 5 September 1919, in which the impresario ‘entrusts Respighi with adjusting the score of the operas: *Astuzie femminili* by Cimarosa and *Serva padrona* by Paisiello, that is, creating all the recitatives using themes by the composers themselves, completely renewing the orchestration adding the dances established in agreement with Diaghilev’ (FIGURE 1).

---

**OPERA OR BALLET? OTTORINO RESPIGHI VS. SERGEI DIAGHILEV**
Il 5 Settembre 1919 a Napoli fra il Direttore dei balletti di una Serge de Diaghilev e il Maestro Ottorino Respighi è stato concluso il seguente contratto:
La musica Respighi
si aggindare la partitura delle opere: Ospugni femminili di Gimarosa e Sei passioni di Parisiello, cioè di creare tutti i necessari secondo lo stipendiario eletto, di annoverare totalmente l'orchestrazione aggiungendo i ballet stabiliti d'accordo con Diaghilev. Respighi si obbliga di predicare tutte il lavoro completo entro il mese di Febbraio 1920.
Le partiture vengono eseguite in proprietà del sig. Diaghilev per l'esploitation, riservandosi però a Respighi il diritto di pubblicazione per gli spartiti di cantata e piano.
Nei programmi delle rapp
l'orchestrazione.

Per questo lavoro, di diaghilev pagherà a respighi la somma di lire italiane ottomila (8000) munian.

Divisa nelle seguenti rate:
(1. (8000 lire) alla conte-
qua dello spartito per cant e
pianoforte delle "Storie femminili".
(2. (8000 lire) alla consegna
della partitura d'orchestra di detta
opera.
(3. (8000 lire) alla consegna
dello spartito per cant e pianoforte
della "Versa padrona"
(4. (8000 lire) alla consegna
della partitura di detta opera.

Alfredo Cless
The Fondo Ottorino Respighi contains a further two copies without shelf marks of the piano reduction of *Le astuzie femminili*, fundamental for a critical examination of the sources. The first copy is the one used extensively by Elsa Respighi during the staging she prepared for the 1939 Maggio Musicale Fiorentino, collaborating with conductor Mario Rossi; the music contained therein is found in the currently available Ricordi edition. As appears in the working materials now located at the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, the composer’s widow and the conductor reintroduced many parts that had been cut by Diaghilev, integrating them according to Respighi’s 1920 version. A comparison between these posthumous sources and the materials actually used by the Ballets Russes for the first staging, now conserved at the Library of Congress, allowed the magnitude of these interventions to become clear: the score requested by Diaghilev and composed by Respighi was much shorter than the one posthumously reconstructed by the composer’s widow and the conductor. This same kind of change in content befell the ballet to be performed before the work’s finale, at the centre of which a new tripartite musical number was introduced (Moderato, Allegretto vivace, Moderato). Therefore, the score of *Le astuzie femminili* edited by Ricordi must be considered a posthumous and collaborative work that does not correspond to the music actually written by Respighi and staged by Diaghilev in 1920.

The second copy of the piano score of *Le astuzie femminili* conserved at the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, also without a shelf mark, contains many layers of annotations in Russian, Italian and French (FIGURE 2). Some of them are clearly in Diaghilev’s hand, and allow us to deduce that it was used during the work’s first staging. However, most of the annotations are in Russian and can be attributed to Massine, who was responsible for the choreography of the 1939 Florence version as well, and bear witness to the revision carried out by him between the two stagings. They are intended for the singers, and provide choreographically precise indications as to the psychological state of the characters, the actions to be carried out and the postures to be adopted.
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![Image of Domenico Cimarosa's *Le astuzie femminili* (1794) with annotations by Massine, Diaghilev and Respighi. Fondazione Giorgio Cini (Venezia), Fondo Ottorino Respighi]
This exemplar also contains annotations by Respighi that testify to the fact that this was the book from which he had gleaned the recitatives’ orchestrations, closely following the basso continuo as elaborated by the nineteenth-century editor. Respighi used a large orchestra (winds, brass, percussion and strings) and added a harpsichord, giving it a prominent role as early as the opening sinfonia. Cimorosa’s source, respected without modifications in its melodic, harmonic and rhythmic content, suggested the details in timbre and the instrumental solos. In Respighi’s orchestration, the orchestral families become independent: the winds are no longer restricted to simply doubling or reinforcing the strings, but enjoy an autonomy of their own. This was made possible by a different elaboration of the basso: the violas no longer double the part of the cellos and the basses at the octave, but interact with the violins, thus allowing the string voices to proliferate, passing from two or three real parts to four; in much the same way, the bassoons are freed from their servile doubling of the basso and now provide the basis for the self-sufficient section of the winds. Overall, the orchestration that emerges respects its late-eighteenth century model and amplifies the musical content of the source without however completely changing its nature. A comparison between the various materials has allowed the musical content of the danced parts to be established as follows:

Intermezzo:
Taken from *La felicità inaspettata*, ballet from the first act.

Russian ballet:
1. Taken from *La vergine del sole*, overture; transposed from D to B♭. First theme cut, second theme and following parts elaborated as indicated by Diaghilev. In this case, not only was the orchestration involved but also a re-composition of the music based on the source.
2. Taken from *La felicità inaspettata*, ballet, first act; repeat signs indicated by Diaghilev. Respighi maintained the clarinet solo, and the amount of transcription is minimal, only regarding articulation signs, metronome indications and clarifications of the phrasing and expression. In the last reiteration, Respighi doubled the clarinet solo with a cello.

x. Not identified: elaboration by Elsa Respighi – Mario Rossi (1939) of the previous material, given to an ensemble that is reduced in the first part (Moderato) and expanded once again in an Allegretto vivace that has the rhythmic features of a tarantella.
3. Taken from *La felicità inaspettata*, third ballet of the first act; originally Andantino, now Largo; transposed from D minor to C minor. Respighi maintained the original slender orchestration, improving the scoring of the high-pitched winds.

4. Taken from *La sorpresa*, dance of the shepherds. Respighi maintained the original reduced orchestration to allow for a better transition to the opera's finale.

Respighi's autograph orchestral score is dated November 1919 – January 1920. The opera-ballet was first staged on 27 May 1920 at the Théâtre National de l’Opéra in Paris, only a few days after Igor Stravinsky’s *Pulcinella*. After approximately twenty repeat performances, the opera was staged in an abbreviated form in 1924 (*Ballet de l’astuce féminine*) and in 1925 became a further-reduced *divertissement* entitled *Cimarosiana*, which obtained an enduring success with approximately two-hundred repeat performances, up to the last performance of the *Ballets Russes*, which occurred in 1929. Respighi in any case made no contribution to these two latter versions, whose musical contents varied in themselves from one staging to the next and are still an object of musicological research.

In addition to the contract that confirmed the commission for an adaptation of Paisiello’s *La serva padrona*, as mentioned above, the Fondo Ottorino Respighi also conserves an interview in which the composer states that he ‘carried out the same work [of instrumentation] for *La serva padrona* by Paisiello, an opera that does not deserve to have fallen into the oblivion to which it has been condemned by the whims of musical fashion’. Both the contract and the interview were indispensable in order to add this piece to the Respighi catalogue edited by Potito Pedarra. The research carried out at the Fondazione Giorgio Cini allowed me to locate Respighi’s autograph score, which, on 9 May 1984, at a bidding price between six and eight thousand sterling, was sold as item 205 at Sotheby’s auction house in London. It was later purchased by the American collector Frederick R. Koch, who first deposited it at, and then donated it to the Beinecke Library in 1996 and 2001 respectively. Both the autograph orchestral score and the vocal score are lacking a few pages containing a final ballet, whose piano part I was able to identify at the Library of Congress.

In this case as well, Respighi orchestrated all the recitatives, heavily cut with respect to Paisiello’s original work. In his transcription he introduced thematic elements based on adjacent passages of the score, or else taken from other compositions by Paisiello that Diaghilev had priorly indicated. Thus orchestrated, the recitatives guaranteed musical continuity between the closed numbers. A three-voice (S, MS, T) chorus was introduced at the end of the first part of the intermezzo, taken from *Achille in Sciro* and indicated by Respighi as optional.
A comparative analysis between the piano score of the ballets and the sources selected by Diaghilev has allowed me to reconstruct the passages of music as the impresario desired.

**Ballet for La Serva padrona:**

Introduction: *Achille in Sciro*, ballet 1, act III.
1. *Il Mondo della luna*, ballet act I.
2. *Proserpine*, *Trio romance*, act III.
3. *Proserpine*, *Tambourin*, act III.
4. *Il Mondo della luna*, last ballet.

Unlike *La boutique fantasque* and *Le astuzie femminili*, as discussed above, in *La serva padrona* Respighi reduced the ensemble to a chamber orchestra, with solo flute and bassoon. This is a reflection of Paisiello’s original instrumentation, which, with its two bassoons and two flutes, only nominally appears to be more sizeable: at the Russian court, the same instrumentalists in fact shared the flute and oboe parts. Even while maintaining these more modest instrumental resources, Respighi gave the winds a full structural autonomy. They are no longer only used to double other parts, but now feature solo interventions and form a group capable of counterbalancing the strings. In his transcription of the string part, Respighi developed the *basso*, giving the violas greater autonomy and increasing the number of string parts from two or three to four. In comparison to the previous transcriptions, here Respighi shows greater adherence to the original source and to the original composer’s intentions.

The piano score sent by Respighi to Diaghilev contains numerous annotations added at a later moment by the impresario, indicating further cuts, modifications of the order of the musical numbers, insertions of other pieces and a few sporadic remarks as to the staging. They bear witness to how Diaghilev, dissatisfied with the work he had received, wished to substantially modify the outlay of the entire intermezzo, transforming it into a *pastiche* of music by Paisiello: a sort of ‘Paisielliana’ based on this composer’s most successful and immediately appealing pieces. The notes jotted down by the impresario allow us to identify the pieces that were taken from *Il barbiere di Siviglia* and *Nina, ossia La pazza per amore*. The originally mute character of Vespone acquired a tenor voice and became the lover (Count in the *Barbiere* and Lindoro in *Nina*) of Serpina (Rosina and Nina), needed to kindle Uberto’s jealousy (Bartolo and Conte). The impresario also called for the sinfonia from *La serva padrona* to be substituted with the one from *Il duello comico*, which is in the same tonality but lasts one minute longer.
These modifications were never orchestrated, and the collaboration between impresario and composer was broken off, for reasons we can only imagine. We do possess indications as to their different conception of the integrity of the music: while Respighi desired an instrumentation that ‘did not upset the nature of the score’, making the recitatives more animated and creating ‘an opera with high artistic probity, in order for the work of art to come back to life within current tastes’, Diaghilev wanted the duration of the pieces to be shortened for choreographic purposes, condensing the more significant parts into succinct and effective numbers and thus overturning the original dramaturgical framework in favour of a music that could more easily be adapted to the timing required by ballet. One must also consider that Respighi completed the transcription of *La serva padrona* one month later than the date stipulated in the contract. He was in fact engaged in a large number of transcriptions for Ileana Leonidoff’s *Balli russi*, a direct competitor of the *Ballets Russes* in Italy, whose manuscripts have recently come to light and are currently being studied. It is therefore likely that the impresario, who had always been jealous about the artists he engaged, voluntarily broke off their collaboration because it was no longer exclusive.

There is also another reason, involving durations and contents. *La serva padrona* as orchestrated by Respighi lies halfway between two contemporaneous stagings: it is shorter than *Le astuzie femminili* (opera-ballet), but not as brief as Stravinsky’s *Pulcinella* (ballet-opera). These works were the two alternatives immediately available to Diaghilev and, in light of the success gained by both, had already met with public approval as of May 1920. The financial disaster caused by the staging of *The Sleeping Princess* (Tchaikovsky – Stravinsky, 1921) forced Diaghilev to turn to older stagings, concentrating his resources on productions that had already become public successes.

The large number of annotations by Diaghilev on the materials pertaining to *La serva padrona*, and in the books that bear witness to his preliminary study for this work, show how dear this project was to the Russian impresario. Furthermore, they provide unprecedented proof of his desire to discover, study and subsequently revise eighteenth-century Italian music, beginning with Paisiello and Cimarosa. These composers, with their stay in Russia at the court of Catherine the Great, provided musical materials that already contained an embryonic synthesis between Russian and Italian musical cultures, and laid the groundwork for the native nineteenth-century Russian school. As demonstrated above, Respighi played a fundamental role in suggesting some of this music to Diaghilev but, as though to guarantee the integrity of the work of art as desired by the original composer, in the end shied away
from the dismemberment of the dramatic-musical unity towards which the impresario inevitably tended. Nonetheless, research on the process thanks to which pre-Romantic sources, unknown at the time, were rediscovered by Respighi and Diaghilev has shown the degree to which Italian and Russian musical cultures had drawn upon a common, cosmopolitan and pan-European root, which acted as an unquestionable guarantee for the success of these performances in the post-war period, and, we fully hope, in the coming future.

Translated by Brent Alton Waterhouse
Notes


4. ‘Rapporti tra Ottorino/Elsa Respighi e Vittorio Podrecca, Serge de Diaghilev, Ileana Leonidoff’ (FOR, RES.ARCH.D–01; I, D–02). In the author’s opinion, the manuscript is currently possessed by the editor Chester.


FOR, RES.MUS.A.065.

The manuscript piano score of the ballet in its 1939 version is found in FOR, RES.MUS.A.132.


Incagliati, ‘Un Rossini ignorato alla luce della ribalta: intervista col maestro Respighi’: ‘ho istrumentato senza turbare il carattere della partitura […] e ho reso più animati i recitativi. È un’opera di alta probità artistica, cui mi sono accinto, tanto perché l’opera d’arte possa rivivere con i mutati gusti’.