
52. JAHRGANG/2006

HEFT 4

MASKE UND KOTHURN

INTERNATIONALE BEITRÄGE ZUR THEATER-, FILM- UND MEDIENWISSENSCHAFT

Lorenzo da Ponte

Ed. by

Michael Hüttler

BÖHLAU VERLAG WIEN · KÖLN · WEIMAR

Gedruckt mit der Unterstützung durch das
Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung Wien

Cover: Loys Egg (nach: *Lorenzo da Ponte*. Lithografie von M. Pekenino)

AU ISSN 0025-4606
ISBN 978-3-205-77617-8

MASKE UND KOTHURN
INTERNATIONALE BEITRÄGE ZUR THEATER-, FILM- UND
MEDIENWISSENSCHAFT

EIGENTÜMER UND HERAUSGEBER:

Institut für Theater-, Film- und Medienwissenschaft an der Universität Wien

Redaktion: Wolfgang Greisenegger, Klemens Gruber, Brigitte Marschall, Monika Meister.

Unter Mitarbeit von Angelika Beckmann und Astrid Bleier

Hofburg, Batthyanystrasse, 1010 Wien, Österreich.

© 2007 by Böhlau Verlag Ges. m. b. H. & Co. KG, Wien · Köln · Weimar

<http://www.boehlau.at>

<http://www.boehlau.de>

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Gedruckt auf umweltfreundlichem, chlor- und säurefrei gebleichtem Papier

Printed in Europe – Prime Rate, Budapest

Contents

MICHAEL HÜTTLER	
Introduction	7
KLAUS HEINRICH	
Notes on Librettology (1999/2007)	11
HERBERT LACHMAYER	
Sharing Omnipotence Fantasies between the Emperor and his Librettist in the Times of Enlightened Absolutism	15
RICHARD HEINRICH	
Daintiness and Rationality. Kant as the Philosopher of Rococo.	29
KLAUS HEINRICH	
Notes on the History of Collecting (2002)	43
DANIELA PILLGRAB	
Lorenzo Da Ponte's Work for the Stage During his Time as a Librettist in Vienna	49
H. E. WEIDINGER	
The "Dux Drafts". Casanova's Contribution to Da Ponte's and Mozart's <i>Don Giovanni</i>	95
JOHANNES SCHWEITZER	
Lorenzo Da Ponte's Struggle against Oblivion	131
REINHARD EISENDLE	
IL POETA BIZZARRO. Da Ponte's <i>Memorie</i> beyond fiction and facticity	157
JOHANNA BOREK	
Staging Life: On Da Ponte's <i>Memorie</i>	173
List of Illustrations	183
Authors	185

The “Dux Drafts”. Casanova’s Contribution to Da Ponte’s and Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*

H. E. WEIDINGER*

In this year’s jubilee display to commemorate Mozart’s 250th birthday, the public viewed an inconspicuous manuscript page among more than a thousand exhibits; the first and third leaves of the page were covered by Italian verses in the handwriting of a famous author;¹ this handwriting, known previously only to specialists in the field but of enormous significance in cultural history, was Giacomo Casanova’s (1725–1798). The verses on the first and third leaves of the folded sheet represent two drafts for stage texts apparently dealing with the Don Juan theme in general, and Lorenzo Da Ponte’s (1749–1838) version of the subject for Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756–1791), in particular.²

When the drafts were discovered³ in Casanova’s estate at the Waldstein family’s Dux Castle in Bohemia in the early twentieth century⁴ and shortly thereafter published as a facsimile,⁵ the confusion surrounding the creation of *Il Dissoluto punito. O sia Il D. Giovanni* was enriched by yet another facet. While research had

* This contribution developed out of “Die Duxer Entwürfe – Casanovas Beitrag”, the last section of the chapter “Der Prager Herbst” in H. E. Weidinger, *IL DISSOLUTO PUNITO. Untersuchungen zur äußeren und inneren Entstehungsgeschichte von Lorenzo da Pontes & Wolfgang Amadeus Mozarts DON GIOVANNI*, Vienna: Doctoral thesis 2002, 16 vols. (vol. I–IV text, vol. V bibliography, vol. VI–XVI appendix containing documentation), here: vol. IV, pp. 988–1014. The author would like to thank Reinhard Eisendle, Michael Hüttler, Hans Peter Kellner and last but not least, his mother, Erna Weidinger. The study, a precursor of a book on the topic, is dedicated to her.

1 Presented and shown in Herbert Lachmayer (ed.), *Mozart. Experiment Aufklärung im Wien des ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts* (catalogue to coincide with an exhibition of the Da Ponte Institute, 17 March – 20 September 2006 at Albertina Vienna), Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag 2006, cat. no. 567 (p. 313); a colour facsimile can be found *ibidem*, p. 66 top.

2 See illustrations 2 and 3.

3 Discovered by Bernhard Marr (1856–1940) while drawing up an inventory of Casanova’s estate in 1913 (Inv. no. U 16 h 31).

4 At that time, Casanova’s estate was in its original location in Dux (now, Duchcov), in the archives of Count Waldstein’s eponymous castle; after World War I the entire archives were transferred to Hirschberg castle, owned by the same family who ran a nearby cotton factory. After that, Casanova’s estate was sent to Münchengrätz Castle (Mnichovo Hradiště) along with the Waldstein library. Today, Casanova’s estate can be found at the Státní oblastní archiv v Praze (Governmental Regional Archives of Prague), which is located at the Chodovec building in the 4th district of Prague).

5 Published by Paul Nettel (1889–1972), *Musik und Tanz bei Casanova*, Prague: Gesellschaft deutscher Bücherfreunde in Böhmen 1924, pp. 83–86 (chapter “Casanova – Da Ponte – Mozart?”), b/w facsimile, *ibidem*, pp. 87–88.

already demonstrated⁶ that Casanova might have been in Prague as early as September 1787,⁷ and certainly by late October 1787,⁸ Mozart scholars now had further cause to ask questions about the relationship between Casanova and Mozart's work: had Casanova, the living myth, not only been in the audience when *Don Giovanni* premièred in Prague on 29 October 1787, but had he also had a hand in the composition of the libretto itself? And what caused him to write the two drafts: did he do this on his own account or had he been asked to do it? Did he volunteer to do it, or was he commissioned to re-write part of the text? And if the re-writing was asked of Casanova, how did this come about?

In the course of the past century, numerous answers to these questions have been proposed, and the large diversity of theories has depended on the contexts of the research and the interests of the particular parties involved, most of whom have been male. This study has drawn on several of the diverging hypotheses because all of them, including the present one, share a common documentary foundation: the "Dux drafts" themselves, as well as the certainty that they were written by Casanova and related to Da Ponte's libretto.

We do not know whether Casanova and Mozart were personally acquainted with each other; we do not even know whether Casanova's name was familiar to Mozart even by hearsay, since neither ever mentioned the other in letters or other writing. Provided that Casanova was indeed in the audience on the occasion of the première or of one of the other four performances Mozart himself conducted at the Prague Theatre, we may safely assume that Casanova had been able to observe the maestro across the distance between box and audience, and had studied Mozart in detail with the help of opera glasses or other viewing aid since back then, the auditoria of theatres were not darkened during performances.

At the time there was much talk in the Saxonian, Bohemian, Austrian and Tuscan papers about a Saxonian-Tuscan engagement and marriage. The bride was Maria Theresia (Maria Teresa in Italian, 1767–1827), Archduchess of Austria and Princess of Tuscany, the first grand-child of late Empress Maria Theresa, eldest daughter of

6 Gustav Gugitz, *Giacomo Casanova und sein Lebensroman. Historische Studien zu seinen Memoiren*, Vienna/Prague/Leipzig: ed. Strache 1921, cf. especially last chapter "XVI. Aus den letzten Lebensjahren", pp. 362–389 (notes pp. 33ⁿ–35ⁿ); the source of information is the correspondence between Count Maximilian Joseph von Lamberg (1729–1792) of Brno and Joseph Ferdinand Opiz (1741–1812), a writer and banking inspector at Czaslau.

7 Lamberg, writing from Brno on 22 September 1787 to Opiz at Czaslau: "Vermuthlich werden Sie auf Ihrer Prager Reise Gelegenheit gehabt haben, an Casanova einen Besuch in Duchs oder vielleicht nur in Prag selbst, wo er in diesem laufenden | Monat seyn wollte, abzustatten. In einem seiner letzteren Briefe fragte er mich beflissen um Sie." (*ibidem*, pp. 371–372).

8 Lamberg, writing from Brno on 4 November 1787 to Opiz at Czaslau: "Casanova ist in Prag. Sein Brief an mich ist vom 25. Oktober. Vielleicht werden Sie ihn dort sprechen können. O! reden Sie auch von mir bei Ihrer Umarmung dieses aufgeklärten Mannes ... Casanova wohnt bei dem Herrn Lieutenant Cusani." (*ibidem*, p. 372).

the empress’ second-born son Leopold (Pietro Leopoldo in Italian) of Tuscany, and niece of the reigning Emperor Joseph II; the groom was Prince Anton Clemens of Saxony (1755–1836), second brother of the reigning Elector of Saxony, Friedrich August I (1750–1827). Friedrich August I was married but childless, which made his brother, Prince Anton, heir presumptive to the throne (indeed he would reign as King Anton from 1827 to 1836). Princess Maria Theresia had already been married by proxy in Florence on 11 September 1787,⁹ and in anticipation of her journey, streets and roads in the Austrian and Bohemian lands were improved, and parties and balls were announced and cancelled again. Eventually, a gala reception was given for the nobility of Prague and a public appearance was scheduled: this was a performance at the Italian opera of Prague upon invitation by the party of Pasquale Bondini, held at the theatre building of Count Franz Anton Nostitz, which had been opened only four years earlier. The media reported on the event in great detail. The first night of *Don Giovanni* had been scheduled for that evening, and a so-called “court print” of the libretto had even been produced in Vienna.¹⁰ The court print was not used, nor was it presented to the Princess; instead, as a consequence of turbulent political preludes and interludes, the festive performance at the opera on that evening of 14 October was *Le Nozze di Figaro*, an opera that was criticised as being an inappropriately immoral work to have been performed for a bride. The Princess and her escort – her brother Archduke Franz, presumptive heir to the Emperor – left before the opera was over, which the press reported had been in anticipation of their early departure to Dresden the following day.¹¹ The Princess arrived in Dresden on 18 October 1787; the wedding took place there on the same day, and after five days the festivities reached their high point with the performance of the actual wedding opera, *La reggia d’Imeneo* | *Die Burg Hymens*.

As we know from their correspondence and from Da Ponte’s *Memorie*¹², Casanova and Da Ponte knew each other well and were friends. They had first met in the

9 On the same day, the festive cantata *La pace tra Amore ed Imeneo* was performed, cf. Weidinger vol. IV, chapter VI., p. 818; cf. Claudio Sartori, *I libretti italiani a stampa dalle origini fino al 1800, Con 16 indici*, 7 voll., Cuneo: Bertola & Locatelli 1990–1994 (Vol. I–V *Catalogo*, Vol. VI–VII *Indici*), cat. no. 17680; with more than 25,000 entries, this libretto catalogue is the most extensive of its kind so far, and the fundamental work in librettology research on Italian opera prior to 1800. In the following text, entries will be quoted as “Sartori”, followed by the catalogue number.

10 See Weidinger, vol. IV., chapter VI, “Der Fund eines Unikats – Die Rätsel des ersten Wiener Textbuchs”, pp. 789–940, in particular the section “Hochzeitspläne – Reisepläne – Festpläne”, pp. 798–812.

11 See Weidinger, vol. IV, chapter VII, “Prager Herbst”, section “Parallelaktionen”, pp. 972–987.

12 Lorenzo da Ponte, *Memorie di Lorenzo da Ponte. Da Ceneda. Scritte da esso*. Vol. I–III. New York: Gray & Bunce, 1823 (hereinafter quoted as *Memorie*, 1823); and –, *Memorie di Lorenzo da Ponte, da Ceneda. Scritte da esso*. Vol. I–III. New York: G. F. Bunce, 1829–30 (hereinafter quoted as *Memorie*, 21829).

houses of the patrician families Memmo and Zaguri in Venice in 1777: ¹³ Casanova was fifty-two, and Da Ponte, at twenty-eight years of age, was a generation (twenty-four years) younger. Between them in age, was a third writer in their circle, Caterino Mazzolà (1745–1806), who worked as the stage poet at the Elector's court in Dresden from 1780 to 1796 and is known to opera lovers as Mozart's last librettist: Mazzolà adapted Metastasio's *La clemenza di Tito*, which premièred in Prague as a festive opera on the occasion of the coronation of Emperor Leopold II (who reigned from 1790 to 1792) as King of Bohemia on 6 September 1791. Casanova researchers agree that Casanova was in Prague for this splendid event, too; and meanwhile, Mozart had again conducted *Don Giovanni* on 2 September 1791, four days before the first night of *La Clemenza di Tito*, which raises the question, who might have met whom in Prague at this time?

It is quite possible, almost even safe to assume that Casanova and Caterino Mazzolà, the man who adapted *Tito* for the occasion of the coronation, met in Prague during those days.¹⁴

But as has been mentioned already, we do not know anything certain about a meeting between Casanova and Mozart. We may imagine Casanova's situation on the evening of Mozart's 2 September 1791 performance of *Don Giovanni* as having been similar to that of the evening he watched the same opera in the same theatre four years earlier, with the sole difference that for Casanova, the two drafts had been produced in the interval. After all – and this is the first hypothesis – irrespective of whether Mozart actually ever got to see them, we would not want to attribute the drafts to the tightly scheduled days when *Titus* required all the resources the operatic undertaking of Domenico Guardasoni (1731–1806) in Prague had at its availability in August–September 1791.

One thing can safely be ruled out for the coronation days in Prague: an encounter of Casanova and Lorenzo Da Ponte. The latter had fallen from favour with the man about to be crowned King of Bohemia; in the spring of 1791, he had lost the position of a “Poeta de' Teatri Imperiali” in Vienna to which he had been appointed by Emperor Joseph II (who reigned from 1765/80 to 1790) and in August–September of that year he was staying in Trieste where he married the companion of his life, Anna Ernestina Grahl (called Nancy), in the summer of 1792. The couple left the city shortly after their wedding and headed north for Paris. They

13 “Fu nell'anno 1777 ch'ebbi occasione di conoscerlo e di conversare familiarmente con lui, in casa or del Zaguri or del Memmo [...]” (Lorenzo da Ponte, *Memorie*, 1823, Vol. III., p. 11, and –, *Memorie*, ²1829, Vol. II., Parte I, p. 11).

14 The relationship between Casanova and Mazzolà has not been studied; however, in 1792 they corresponded and exchanged literary ideas. See Mazzolà's letter from Dresden dated 28 May 1792 to Casanova at Dux, printed in: Pompeo Molmenti, *Carteggi Casanoviani*, 2 vols., n.p. [Milano/Palermo/Napoli/Genova/Bologna/Torino]: Remo Sandron n.d. [1918] (Collezione settecentesca a cura di Salvatore di Giacomo dell'Accademia Pontaniana, Bibliotecario della Lucchesiana di Napoli, vol. V), vol. 1, *Lettere di Giacomo Casanova e di altri a lui*, pp. 351–353.

travelled via Ljubljana, Graz, and Bruck an der Mur to Admont, and from there to Linz and Prague, arriving there in September, apparently after the autumn season of 1792 had started:

“Arrivato a Praga, mi vi fermai alcuni giorni, colla speranza, che fu poi vana, di ricevere novelle del padre abate.¹⁵ Ebbi frattanto l'opportunità d'andar a vedere la rappresentazione delle tre opere scritte da me per Mozart, e non è facile dipingere l'entusiasmo de' boemmi per quella musica. I pezzi, che meno di tutti si ammirano negli altri paesi, si tengono da que' popoli per cose divine; e quello ch'è più mirabile si è che quelle grandi bellezze, che sol dopo molte e molte rappresentazioni nella musica di quel raro genio dall'altre nazioni scoprironsi, da'soli boemmi alla prima rappresentazione perfettamente s'intesero.”¹⁶

The Da Pontes continued to Dresden, just as the Princess of Tuscany had done five years earlier when the première of *Don Giovanni* had been announced for her arrival in Prague but had not materialised. At that time, the stagecoach route passed through Töplitz, close to Dux and the castle of Count Waldstein, Casanova's official residence since September 1785.

“Io voleva allora partire per Dresda, ma, ricordandomi che Giacomo Casanova, il quale dovevami alcune centinaia di fiorini, stava poco lontano di quella città, risolsi d'andar da lui, per ottenere tutto o parte del danaro che mi dovea. V'andai, fui ben ricevuto, ma, accorgendomi in breve che la sua borsa era più smunta della mia, non volli dargli la mortificazione di chiedergli quello che non avrebbe potuto darmi; e, dopo una visita di tre o quattro giorni, decisi d'andar a Dresda.”¹⁷

At the time of the visit, Casanova and Da Ponte had known each other for fourteen years; one could even say they were linked by a very special, multifaceted friendship. Although this would be interesting to explore further as it would bring us forward in several respects, scholars have not yet produced a well-founded study on the subject. In any event, Casanova figured in Da Ponte's *Memorie* in a dramaturgically symbolic way as the last friend Da Ponte had in the Imperial lands he had had to leave, and as the custodian at the threshold to a new life for a newly-wed couple, similar to one of the men in armour in *The Magic Flute* who tell the neophytes Tamino and Pamina how to pass safely through fire and water, although in this case the newly-wedded Da Pontes are on their way to London around 20 September 1792, one year after *Tito* (6 September 1791) and *The Magic Flute* (30 September 1791), and nine months after Mozart's death (5 December 1791).

15 This refers to the Abbot of Admont, to whom Da Ponte turned when he noticed that he had lost his purse after his wife had asked him for it. The abbot had promised to send it to the poet if the purse was found.

16 Lorenzo da Ponte, *Memorie* 1823, Vol. III., pp. 5–6, and *Memorie* ²1829, Vol. II., Parte I, pp. 5–6.

17 Lorenzo da Ponte, *Memorie* 1823, Vol. III., p. 6, and *Memorie* ²1829, Vol. II., Parte I, p. 6.

According to Da Ponte's *Memorie* – first published in 1823, thirty-one years after the encounter – it was Nancy da Ponte (who was about as many years younger than her husband as he was his friend's junior) who voiced her interest in the story of sixty-seven-year-old Casanova's life as they traveled to Dresden, and her memoir-writing husband turned this interest into a literary reason for the account on Casanova that was to become the most extensive of numerous literary portraits in the *Memorie*.¹⁸ The fourteen letters which Da Ponte wrote to Casanova and which are part of the latter's estate, give us a direct, if not literary insight into the level of communication between poet and adventurer that dated from the years before and after the visit in 1792.¹⁹

What makes Casanova's libretto drafts for *Don Giovanni* interesting, apart from the question about how their author was involved in the matter, is the way they could have been positioned within the dramatic structure of the opera, since they are for scene IX in the second act, following the sextet and Donna Anna's exit, just before Leporello's escape, and they end there. Dramaturgically speaking, this is a delicate moment, if not a key scene.

In this scene, Don Ottavio, now convinced that his friend Don Giovanni is to blame for the death of his future father-in-law, the Commendatore, and has been informed about the decision to call in the authorities, asks those who have stayed (Donna Elvira, Zerlina, Masetto) into the house to comfort his bride, and he confirms his intention in an aria about comfort and tears, bloodshed and dead bodies. The scene ends here. The next scene (II/11) directly ties in with the previous one in terms of chronology, and it is quite aptly set in the graveyard.

This is the sequence of scenes (the Prague scenes II/9–10) which underwent major changes by the authors in Vienna in 1788. Apart from a certain degree of curiosity about Casanova himself, an exploration of his involvement in this process of revision, marginal though it may have been, is thus of fundamental interest in the (admittedly complex) attempt to reconstruct the genesis of *Don Giovanni*. Such a

18 Lorenzo da Ponte, *Memorie* 1823, Vol. III., pp. 7–16, and *Memorie* ²1829, Vol. II., Parte 1, pp. 7–17, respectively.

19 Most recently published in Lorenzo Da Ponte. *Lettere, epistole in versi, dedicatorie e lettere dei fratelli*, a cura di Giampaolo Zagonel, Vittorio Veneto: Dario De Bastiani, 1995 (hereinafter quoted as Zagonel, followed by the number of the letter). The first letter dates from 1791: from Vienna, 18 June (Zagonel no. 43). Two letters are from 1792: both are from Dresden, 21 and 24/26 September (Zagonel nos. 53 and 54). Ten letters are dated 1793: four from London, 19 January 1793 (Zagonel no. 55), 1 March (Zagonel no. 57), 2 April (Zagonel no. 58), and 10 May (Zagonel no. 59); one was from Brussels, 18 July (Zagonel no. 60); one from Rotterdam, 29 August (Zagonel no. 61); one from Amsterdam, 27 September (Zagonel no. 62); and three from The Hague, 13 October (Zagonel no. 63), 9 November (Zagonel no. 64), and 17 November (Zagonel no. 65). Two years went by before Da Ponte wrote from London to Casanova at Dux one last time, on 25 August 1795 (Zagonel no. 66).

study might produce evidence that Da Ponte and Mozart, each by himself or together, had been contemplating changing the scenes – or at least had not ruled out the possibility of making changes – long before the first night in Vienna on 7 May 1788, long before any arias were requested for a diva (Caterina Cavalieri in the role of Donna Elvira), and irrespective of the incapacity of the tenor (Francesco Morella in the role of Don Ottavio) to sing dramatic coloraturas (in the middle of his only “Prague” aria “Il mio tesoro intanto”, which marks the ending of the scene in the Prague première version of 1787), an incapacity for which no evidence has yet been found but which is persistently claimed in scholarly literature.

To explore the issue in greater detail (and this will shortly be done in a book-length publication of which the present contribution represents only a concise introduction), the relationship of the three protagonists – Casanova, Mozart, and Da Ponte – and their associations with Prague, the centre of events, will be examined in the first section of this paper. This section will consider proven and potential encounters between the three men, and take into account their stays in the capital of Bohemia.

The second stage of the discussion here will deal with “discovery and research”: the circumstances in which the “Dux drafts” were discovered, first published, and codified in more recent “official” Mozartology, in the research of Da Ponte’s and Casanova’s biographies, and in studies of the Don Juan theme, will be described; moreover, the hypotheses about the role of the drafts in the genesis of *Don Giovanni* as developed from them will be presented, and the drafts will be analysed for their dramaturgical implications.

The third stage consists of review and further development of the insights derived from study of the drafts and questions arising from them. This section will be based on a more detailed dramaturgical examination of the scenes in *Dissoluto punito* (second act, [second scene,] scenes VII–X), and a comparison of the libretto and variants from different sources: first, Da Ponte’s version for Prague in three variants, namely, the one found in the so-called “court print” (Vienna [Wien]: Kurzböck 1787²⁰) for the première announced for 14 October, the one in Mozart’s autograph (Vienna/Prague 1787²¹), and the one in the “première libretto” (Praga [Prague]: Schoenfeld 1787²²) for the actual première on 29 October; and second, Casanova’s two “Dux drafts” featuring Leporello’s new “escape aria” and a quintet of

20 (1) “IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA
GIOCOLOSO | IN DUE ATTI. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL TEATRO DI PRAGA |
PER L’ ARRIVO DI SUA ALTEZZA REALE | MARIA TERESA ARCIDUCHESSA D’
AUSTRIA: SPOSA DEL | SER. PRINCIPE ANTONIO DI SASSONIA | L’ ANNO 1787.
| IN VIENNA.” (cf. Sartori 8032).

21 (2) “*Don Juan*.” Mozarts autographe Partitur. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, shelf mark: Ms. 1548 1–8.

22 (3) “IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA

all the characters present, in the order of appearance,²³ both of which were written as alternative endings for scene IX with Leporello's escape. (The reader will also find in this section of the paper a complete transcript of the passages described.)

Since Casanova's "Dux drafts" mark a number of dramaturgical adaptations of the "Prague première version", the closing section will focus on those dramaturgical changes which were actually made in the above-mentioned passages in the second act by the most skilled persons to intervene: first, by the original Da Ponte-Mozart "team" at the Theater nächst der Burg in Vienna (first night: 7 May 1788; Vienna: Sordi e Muti [Taubstumme]²⁴); second by Domenico Guardasoni, the director of the première in Prague, in Leipzig 1788 (first documented performance: 15 June; playbill²⁵) and in Warsaw in 1789 (first night: 14 October; Varsavia: Dufour²⁶); and last, by the only survivor "at the end of the day", the seventy-six-year-old librettist in New York who produced no fewer than three versions. On the occasion of the first North American production of the work at Park Lane Theatre on 23 May 1826 by the opera company of the world-famous Mario family, Da Ponte produced an Italian "original version" (Nova Jorca: Gray²⁷) and a bilingual libretto with an English translation of the "lyrics" by one of the poet's sons, Lorenzo Luigi (Nuova Jorca:

GIOCOSO | IN DUE ATTI. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL TEATRO DI PRAGA L' ANNO 1787. | IN PRAGA. | *di Schcenfeld.*" (cf. Sartori 8031).

23 (4) Leporello's aria: "Il solo Don Giovanni" (first page); quintet Leporello, Donna Elvira, Don Ottavio, Zerlina, Masetto: "Incerto, confuso" (third page).

24 (5) "IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA GIOCO-
COSO | IN DUE ATTI. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL TEATRO DI CORTE |
L'ANNO 1788. | IN VIENNA, | NELLA IMPER. STAMPERIA DEI SORDI e | MUTI." (cf. Sartori 8033).

25 (6) "Nächstkommenden Sonntag, den 1sten Junii, wird zum Erstenmale gegeben: Il Dissoluto punito, | o sia: Il D. Giovanni. Der gestrafte Ausschweifende, oder: D. Jean. Ein großes | mit Chören ausgeziertes Singspiel in zween Aufzügen. Die Posie ist vom Abt da Ponte, und | die Musik hat der berühmte Kapellmeister, Hr. Mozart, ausdrücklich dazu komponirt. | M i t g n ä d i g s t e r E r l a u b n i ß | wird heute, Sonntags den 15. Junii 1788. | von der Guardasonischen Gesellschaft | I t a l i ä n i s c h e r O p e r v i r t u o s e n | auf dem Theater am Rannstädter Thore | aufgeführt: | IL DISSOLUTO PUNITO, | o sia: | IL D. GIOVANNI. | Der gestrafte Ausschweifende, | Oder: | D. Jean. | Ein großes Singspiel, mit Chören, vielen Decorationen und doppeltem Orchester, | in zween Aufzügen. | Die Poesie ist vom Abt da Ponte, und die Musik hat der berühmte Kapellmeister, Hr. Mozart, | ausdrücklich dazu komponirt. | Personen: | [...] | Der Anfang ist präcise halb 6 Uhr. Das Ende um 8 Uhr." [playbill].

26 (7) "IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA GIOCO-
COSO | IN DUE ATTI. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | AVANTI DI SUA MAESTA' |
IL RE DI POLONIA, | NEL TEATRO NAZIONALE. | IN VARSAVIA | *Presse [sic] di P
DUFOUR, Consiliere Aulico | di S. M. e Direttore della Stamperia | del R. Corpo de Cadetti. |
M. DCC. LXXXIX.*" (cf. Sartori 8034).

27 (8) "IL | DON GIOVANNI , | DRAMMA EROICOMICO, | DI | LORENZO DA
PONTE , | *Composto da lui per le Nozze del Principe Antonio | di Sassonia— Colla Principessa
M. Teresa Figlia | dell' Impr. Leopoldo.* | E MESSO IN MUSICA DALL' IMMORTALE | V.
MOZZART. | NOVA-JORCA: | STAMPATORI GIOVANNI GRAY e CO. | 1826."

Gray²⁸); and, perhaps spurred by the success of the work on stage, he subsequently produced a literary version which came out the same year (Nova Jorca: Gray²⁹).

The references cited herein are not only relevant for our central scene II/9,³⁰ but form the most significant foundations for *any* kind of research into the dramaturgy and libretto of Da Ponte and Mozart’s *Dissoluto punito o sia Il Don Giovanni*, especially scholarship directed towards clarifying the genesis of the work.

The Discovery – Bernhard Marr and Paul Nettl

All considerations are based on the hand-written drafts from Casanova’s Dux estate. In this context Paul Nettl wrote:

“Über die in Frage stehenden Don Juan-Notizen Casanovas bin ich unterrichtet, da mir die Einsicht in den früheren Duxer Nachlaß möglich war. Marr teilte mir hierüber folgendes mit: ‘Im Casanova-Nachlasse (jetzt Schloß Hirschberg bei Böhmisches-Leipa) findet sich im Umschlag U 16 h unter Nr. 31 ein Bogen mit Casanovas Handschrift vor, welcher die Größe von 34 cm. Höhe und 21 cm. Breite hat und nur auf der ersten und dritten Seite beschrieben ist. Es handelt sich um einen kleinen Teil zum italienischen Libretto in Versen für den Don Giovanni Mozarts. Diese Verse sind, soviel ich mich erinnere, teils ohne Ausbesserung, teils durchstrichen und abgeändert niedergeschrieben, ein Zeichen, dass sie nicht abgeschrieben, sondern entworfen sind.’ [...] Wie man sieht, wollte Casanova dem Sextett, dem bedeutungsvollsten Einschnitt des zweiten Aktes, eine andere Gestalt geben. Ein abschließendes Urteil in dieser Angelegenheit ist zurzeit unmöglich. Immerhin ist die Frage, ob Casanova bei der Fertigstellung des Da Ponteschen

28 (9) “IL | DON GIOVANNI, | DRAMMA BUFFO, | IN | DUE ATTI. | DI LORENZO DA PONTE. | LA PARTE POETICA DELLA TRADUZIONE DA | L. DA PONTE, JUN. | NOVA-JORCA: | STAMPATO DA GIOVANNI GRAY e CO. | 1826.” (with an English translation).

29 (10) “IL | DON GIOVANNI, | DRAMMA EROICOMICO, | DI | LORENZO DA PONTE, | *Composto da lui per la Nozze del Principe Antonio di Sassonia–Colla Principessa M. Teresa Figlia | dell’ Impr. Leopoldo.* | E MESSO IN MUSICA DALL’ IMMORTALE | V. MOZZART. | NOVA-JORCA: | STAMPATORI GIOVANNI GRAY e CO. | 1826.” in: “LE NOZZE DI FIGARO, | IL DON GIOVANNI, | E | L’ ASSUR RE D’ ORMUS; | *Ripubblicati a New-York, l’ anno 1826,* | E DEDICATI AL | GELSOMINO, | ALLA | ROSA, | ED ALLO | AMARANTO. | TRE LEGGIADRISSIMI FIORI | DEL SUO TOSCANO GIARDINO. | STAMPATORI GIOVANNI GRAY e CO. | 1826.”

30 The scene does not have the same number in all the versions: 1787 in the court print (1) and in the Prague première print (3) “Scena IX.”, in Mozart’s autograph (2) “Scena VIII.” 1788 in the Viennese première print (5) “Scena IX.”; 1789 in Warsaw (7) “Scena IX.”; the scene is not included in New York (9): there, “Scena IX.” includes parts of the scene otherwise numbered Scene VIII and X; and it starts with the entrance of Zerlina and Masetto in the sextet and ends with Don Ottavio’s aria “Il mio tesoro”. We will continue to use the scene number IX.

Buches mittätig war, nicht von der Hand zu weisen und wir werden in dieser Beziehung vielleicht noch eine Überraschung erleben.”³¹

Bernhard Marr’s reading that Nettl was quoting „a small part to complement the Italian libretto“ of the Mozart opera is not entirely correct in this form, because the verses are draft texts referring in two ways to Da Ponte’s *Dissoluto punito*:

1. the characters in Casanova’s drafts can be found in Da Ponte’s libretto, and out of all the variations on the Don Juan theme produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, these names and configurations appear exclusively in Da Ponte’s work³²;
2. the dramatic situation represented in the scenes in question refers to Da Ponte’s construction; moreover, the drafts only make sense and their context can only be reconstructed if the reader has Da Ponte’s work in mind or to consult.

However, the drafts do not aim at changes to the sextet as Nettl claims: Donna Anna, who in Da Ponte’s libretto exits with her servants immediately after the sextet at the end of scene VIII (“*D. Anna Parte coi servi*”), is not among the characters in Casanova’s drafts. Instead, the drafts are concerned with a revised version of scene IX which follows the sextet, or to be more exact, they concern only the part that is composed out, starting with Leporello’s aria, “Ah pietà signori miei” (II/9 n. 7), the so-called “escape aria” that appears in both the first Vienna print and the Prague print.

Written on pages 1 and 3 of a sheet of paper (pages 2 and 4 are blank), Casanova’s notes are not about one draft for *one* scene, either, as is often claimed³³ – in which case the existing text would have to be read as a potentially incomplete continuum and, in musical terms, as an “aria ending in a quintet”³⁴ – but about *two* separate and different drafts for one and the same scene: the first version offers a solo scene for Leporello, the second an ensemble scene, although this does not necessarily mean that the author would automatically have discarded the variant he wrote first.³⁵

31 Paul Nettl, *Musik und Tanz bei Casanova*, pp. 85–86.

32 When speaking, the characters are abbreviated as “*Lep.*”, “*D. Elv.*”, “*D. Ott.*”, “*Zerl.*” and “*Mas.*”: in the three printed libretti these are the abbreviations for Leporello, Donna Elvira, Don Ottavio, Zerlina and Masetto. Names written in full are “Don Giovanni”, “Masetto” and “Donna Elvira”. In one line (which was struck out) Casanova used the name “Leporino”: whatever the reason had been for this, this deviation from the names used by Da Ponte does not call into question the connection with Da Ponte’s work.

33 See e.g. Edward J. Dent, *Mozart’s Operas. A Critical Study*, Second Edition. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press 1947, pp. 141–142 (the first edition of 1913 does not mention the Casanova drafts as they were not yet known at the time); Luciano Paesani, *Lorenzo da Ponte: “Don Giovanni”*, Pescara: C.L.U.A Editrice 1985 (Collana di documenti di storia del Teatro), pp. 93–95; and Friedrich Dieckmann, *Die Geschichte Don Giovannis. Werdegang eines erotischen Anarchisten*, Frankfurt am Main/Leipzig: Insel Verlag 1991, p. 377.

34 Friedrich Dieckmann, *Die Geschichte Don Giovannis*, p. 377.

35 From among the commentators known to the author, only Dyneley Hussey and Giovanni

Both drafts by Casanova end with Leporello’s escape: the direction “*Fugge*” marks the end of the text on the first page, and the same “*Fugge*” also closes the text on the third page of the manuscript. In this detail, Casanova’s manuscript conforms with the five printed versions by Da Ponte (1787, 1788, 1826). The drafts are corrected and show some deletions – Leporello’s aria features more corrections than does the ensemble – and they do not seem to be fragments; in fact they are remarkably homogeneous and fit well into Da Ponte’s text from the end of the preceding scene to Leporello’s escape. Notwithstanding the quality of the text and the conceptual approach, they could be inserted into Da Ponte’s libretto after Masetto’s “*Accoppatelo meco tutti tre!*” – and only in this position – in place of Leporello’s “*Ah pietà signori miei*” escape aria.

The Hypotheses – Hussey, Dent, Dieckmann

The first authors to deal with Casanova’s drafts after their publication in 1924 were two highly reputed Mozart researchers: Dyneley Hussey (1893–1972) and Edward J. Dent (1876–1957). Both Hussey – a young man in 1928 – and Dent – well advanced in age in 1947 – shared two fundamental assumptions. The first hypothesis was formulated by Dent who, in the first publication of his *Critical Study* on Mozart’s operas (1913), argues that a three-act structure had been originally planned for *Don Giovanni* in which the sextet would have been the finale of the second act.³⁶ The second hypothesis is that Casanova was directly involved in devising the scenes in question in the libretto of *Dissoluto punito* as we know it.

The following list is a brief overview of the number of acts and the genre designations of the ten currently known Italian Don Juan operas composed before the Da Ponte-Mozart team dealt with the subject (four of these operas have three acts, two have two acts, and three are one-act operas):

Macchia point out that Casanova’s drafts are two alternative texts. See Dyneley Hussey, “Casanova and ‘Don Giovanni’”, *Music & Letters*, VIII (1927), no. 4, Oct. 1927, Oxford, pp. 470–472 (reprinted in Dyneley Hussey, *Wolfgang Amade Mozart*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truber & Co., Ltd., J. Curwen & Sons, Ltd. 1928, pp. 327–332; second ed., Westport/Connecticut: Greenwood Press 1971, pp. 327–332); and Giovanni Macchia, *Tra Don Giovanni e Don Rodrigo. Scenari secenteschi*, Milano: Adelphi Edizioni 1989, p. 155.

36 Edward J. Dent, *Mozart’s Operas: A Critical Study*, London: Chatto & Windus 1913, p. 138 (German version: *Mozarts Opern*, Berlin: Erich Reiss, n.d. [1922], authorised translation by Anton Mayer, p. 150); the first edition of 1913 does not refer to Casanova’s draft because they had not yet been discovered.

- | | | |
|--------|------|---|
| 3 acts | 1669 | [Filippo Acciaiuoli] / [Alessandro Melani]:
<i>L'Empio punito. Drama musicale</i>
(Premiere: Rome, T. di Palazzo Colonna in Borgo, Carnival); ³⁷ |
| | 1730 | [Antonio Denzio] / [Antonio Caldara]:
<i>La Pravità castigata. Rappresentazione morale per musica</i>
(Premiere: Prague, T. del conte Sporck, Lent); ³⁸ |
| | 1734 | [Antonio Denzio] / Eustachio Bambini:
<i>La Pravità castigata. Drama per musica</i>
(Premiere: Brno, T. Novissimo della Taverna, Carnival); ³⁹ |
| | 1776 | Nunziato Porta / Vincenzo Righini:
<i>Il Convitato di pietra o sia il Dissoluto. Dramma tragicomico</i>
(Premiere: Prague, Reggio Teatro); ⁴⁰ |
| | 1783 | Wojciech Bogusławski / Gioacchino Albertini:
<i>Don Juan, albo Ukarany libertyn. Opera we trzech aktach, z włoskiego tlomaczona</i>
(Premiere: Warsaw, Teatr Narodowy, 23 February); ⁴¹ |
| 2 acts | 1777 | anon. / Giuseppe Calegari:
<i>Il Convitato di pietra. Dramma giocoso per musica</i>
(Premiere: Venice, T. Tron di San Cassiano, Carnival); ⁴² |
| | 1787 | Giuseppe Foppa / Francesco Gardi:
<i>Il nuovo Convitato di pietra. Dramma tragi-comico</i>
(Premiere: Venice, T. di San Samuele, Carnival); ⁴³ |
| | 1787 | Lorenzo Da Ponte / Wolfgang Mozart:
<i>Il Dissoluto punito o sia Il D. Giovanni. Dramma giocoso in due atti</i>
(Premiere: Prague, T. di Praga, announced 14 October; actually 29 October). ⁴⁴ |

37 Sartori 8828; Weidinger vol. V, p. 95, vol. XII, pp. 19–37.

38 Sartori 19005; Weidinger vol. V, p. 96, vol. XII, pp. 38–46, 49–65.

39 Sartori 19006; further prints: Sartori 19007 – Weidinger vol. V, p. 97, vol. XII, pp. 38–41, 47–48, 66–74.

40 Sartori 6588; further prints: Sartori 6589, 6590, 6591 – Weidinger vol. II, pp. 271–389, vol. V, pp. 98–100, vol. XII, pp. 75–123.

41 Sartori deest; Weidinger vol. II, pp. 390–404, vol. V, pp. 102–103, vol. XII, pp. 137–152.

42 Sartori 6584 – Weidinger vol. III, pp. 537–557, vol. V, p. 101, vol. XII, pp. 124–136.

43 Sartori 16829; further prints: Sartori 6586 – Weidinger vol. III, pp. 586–615, vol. V, pp. 106–107, vol. XII, pp. 222–277.

44 Sartori 8032 (the “court print”/ “Hofdruck”); Sartori 8031 (the Prager “Premieren-Druck”/ “Prague première print”); further prints: Sartori 8033, 8034 – Weidinger vol. IV, pp. 789–940, vol. V, pp. 151–161, vol. XIII, pp. 43–159.

1 act	1783	Giambattista Lorenzi / Giacomo Tritto: <i>Il Convitato di pietra. Commedia di un atto per musica</i> (Premiere: Naples, Nuovo Teatro de’ Fiorentini, Carnival); ⁴⁵
	1787	Giovanni Bertati / Giuseppe Gazzaniga: <i>Don Giovanni o sia Il Convitato di pietra</i> , in: <i>Il Capriccio drammatico. Rappresentazione per musica</i> (Premiere: Venice, T. Giustiniani di S. Moisè, Carnival); ⁴⁶
	1787	Giambattista Lorenzi, arr. anon. [Francesco Ballani] / Vincenzo Fabrizi: <i>Il Convitato di pietra</i> (Premiere: Rome, T. Valle, Fall); ⁴⁷

45 Sartori 8513; further prints: Sartori 8514 – Weidinger vol. III, pp. 557–586, vol. V, p. 104–105, vol. XII, pp. 153–221.

46 Sartori 5052; Weidinger vol. III, pp. 616–788, vol. V, pp. 109–139, vol. XII, pp. 278–481.

47 Sartori deest; handwritten libretto in Vienna, ÖNB Mus.Hs. 3522, Weidinger vol. V, pp. 140–148, vol. XII, pp. 482–591; as for the attribution to Ballani, see Lachmayer (ed.), *Mozart Experiment Aufklärung*, pp. 323–324, no. 591: “No libretto print exists for the première of this Don Juan opera at Teatro Valle in Rome in the autumn of 1787, only this anonymous handwritten libretto with many traces of wear as well as numerous changes and corrections. As in general, libretti are usually available in print and not in the form of librettists’ work manuscripts, this autograph allows for an insight into the dramaturgical practice of adapting older texts for young composers. The autograph states neither the first author nor the name of the person who adapted it. However, the opera it is based on can be identified: it is Giambattista Lorenzi’s *Commedia per musica Il Convitato di Pietra* (Naples 1783). Several persons have been named as having possibly adapted it. So far, the most likely has been Giuseppe Maria Diodati, author of *Impresario in angustie* (cat.no. 590). Diodati lived and worked in Naples where young Vincenzo Fabrizi had studied composition with Giacomo Tritto, who had set Lorenzi’s *Convitato* to music. Diodati wrote for Tritto, too; in 1788 he also wrote for Fabrizi; in the more distant future, *Impresario in angustie* mainly played in combination with Fabrizi’s opera, primarily at Teatro Valle in Rome in the summer of 1787. Moreover, Bertati’s solution of combining a comedy and the “Guest of Stone” seemed convincing. H. E. Weidinger argues against this popular hypothesis: After Metastasio we hardly ever know of any case in which the librettist and composer of an opera would have lived and worked in two different places: Diodati worked in Naples all the time, Fabrizi in Rome. The two pieces – *Impresario* and *Convitato* – are one-act operas and they were often performed on the same evening, but they played at Teatro Valle in two different seasons: Diodati’s work in the summer of 1787, Fabrizi’s opera in the autumn. Along with *Impresario* another work by the same librettist was performed, and its Roman libretto has survived: *Il Credulo*, originally produced in Naples in 1786 (even then it played in combination with *Impresario*). In the autumn of 1787 a printed libretto serves as evidence that the second one-act opera was *Il Viaggiatore sfortunato in amore*, “poesia dell’Abbate Francesco Ballani”. Ballani was from Rome and was more or less the poet in residence of Teatro Valle in 1786. Therefore, it is highly likely that he did the adaptation, especially because this was one of the usual duties of a librettist: Da Ponte reported that he did that in Vienna and London; Mozart confirmed that it was customary practice when in his famous letter of 7 May 1783 – in which he mentioned Da Ponte’s name for the first and last time – he said that the latter was extremely busy correcting (“mit der correctur im theater rasend zu tun”). [...] [RK]” (RK = Rudolf Kubik; *ibidem*, p. 406).

Edward Dent

Renowned Mozart researcher, Edward Dent, believed that the discovery of Casanova's drafts corroborated his theory that the opera had originally been conceived of as having more than only two acts. Even before he knew about Casanova's drafts, Dent had assumed this, and in the first edition of his *Critical Study* on Mozart's operas (1913), he favoured an originally planned three-act structure for *Don Giovanni* in which the sextet would have been the finale of the second act.⁴⁸ In the revised edition of the *Critical Study* (1947) Dent presumed that the structure had initially been envisioned as having four acts, and that Da Ponte had conceived of the libretto as a work similar to *Le nozze di Figaro* in which a second and fourth act ended in grand finales, the first act in an aria – Figaro's "Farfallone amoroso" in *Le Nozze*, and Donna Anna's vengeance aria, "Or sai chi l' onore" (I/13, no. 10), in *Don Giovanni* – and the third act would have had a weighty but concise ensemble – the sextet "Sola, sola in buio loco" (II/7–8, no. 6) in the case of *Don Giovanni*.⁴⁹

Dent's considerations concerning both the genesis of the two-act structure attributable to Mozart's intervention and Casanova's involvement were based on the composition of the sextet in the second act:

"The sextet [...] is obviously designed to end an act; it has the conventional form, with repeated sections and a hurried *stretta* in quicker *tempo*, which we find in all Mozart's Italian finales. It seems clear that something went wrong at this point during rehearsals. Da Ponte can give us no information on this. He had to be in Vienna on 1 October for the first night of Martin's *L'Arbore di Diana*; he left the next day for Prague, but could only stay a week to direct rehearsals, as Salieri summoned him back to Vienna in all haste for the production of *Axur*. [...] I should imagine that at some moment during rehearsals three at least of the singers begin to complain that they have been scurvily treated as regards solo arias. Mozart then decides to put in a scene after the sextet in order to satisfy Ponziani (Leporello) and Baglioni (Ottavio) and asks Casanova to write words for it. Teresa Saporiti (Anna) is provided with the entirely unnecessary aria *Non mi dir* later on. Casanova first sketches the aria for Leporello printed above, followed by an ensemble for all the characters except Donna Anna, who has left the stage at the end of the sextet. Mozart then probably points out that the audience already knows everything that Leporello says in this aria, and that another ensemble would be an anticlimax. Casanova rewrites the scene under Mozart's direction, making it much less formal and far more amusing and dramatic. As Mozart has taken away the sheet with the revised words, it is

⁴⁸ See footnote 36.

⁴⁹ Edward Dent, *Mozart's Operas: A Critical Study*, 21947, p. 138: "[...] it is extremely probable that *Don Giovanni*, like *Figaro*, was originally planned in four acts. Act I would end after Anna's aria, *Or sai chi l'onore*, just as Act I of *Figaro* ends with a solo aria; Act II at the end of what is now Act I. Act III must end after the sextet, *Sola, sola*".

naturally lost; Casanova puts the rejected draft in his own pocket, and accident has preserved it. This reconstruction of what may be happened is purely conjectural.”⁵⁰

Dent’s thought-provoking conjecture is first commented on by Nettle:

“Obgleich nun hypothetisch, ist Dents Theorie außerordentlich einleuchtend. Sie sagt uns natürlich nicht, ob das ungeschriebene Blatt, das Mozart mit sich nahm und das verlorengegang, jemals gebraucht wurde oder wie es sich in Da Pontes Libretto, wie wir es kennen, einfügte; außer wir nehmen an, daß Leporellos G-Dur-Arie das Resultat dieser Revision war, d. h. also, daß es tatsächlich von Casanova geschrieben und in den endgültigen Text aufgenommen wurde. Das ist ein bestechender Gedanke, aber es mag höchst unwahrscheinlich sein, daß so etwas hätte geschehen können. Das Libretto für Don Giovanni war schon gedruckt, bevor Da Ponte Prag verließ. Es hätte ferner vor der Premiere der Zensur vorlegen müssen. Aus diesem Grunde glaube ich zweifeln zu müssen, daß irgendein Text von Casanova bei der Premiere verwendet wurde.”⁵¹

Indeed, it continues to be an interesting working hypothesis that in the first stages of development the authors of *Don Giovanni* could have been considering a four-act structure similar to that of *Figaro*, with the first act ending in Donna Anna’s “Or sai chi l’ onore” and the third act in the sextet, and that this would have informed the initial phases of their work: this would mean that Da Ponte had planned his work to be the first four-act opera about the Don Juan theme.⁵² That such a concept existed before the sextet was committed to “Viennese paper” cannot be ruled out entirely, but the theory that this issue would still have been up for discussion during rehearsals in Prague can be rejected: both the two-act structure and the aria – which according to Dent were added at the request of the singers in Prague – were featured not only in the Prague première print, but had already appeared in the preceding “Vienna court print”⁵³. Nettle alluded to the latter libretto when he wrote that “the

50 Ibidem, pp. 141–142.

51 Paul Nettle, “Don Giovanni und Casanova”, *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1957 des Zentralinstitutes für Mozartforschung der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum*, Salzburg: n.p. 1958, pp. 108–114, here: p. 112.

52 Da Ponte would not have called such a four-act work “dramma giocoso”; in his day and age those were usually two-act operas (one of the few exceptions was by Da Ponte himself, his very first libretto, *Il Ricco d’un giorno* for Antonio Salieri is a *dramma giocoso in tre atti*; Sartori 1979). The designation to denote a four-act work would most likely have been “Commedia per musica”, as was the case with the four-act *Figaro* (the only four-act opera with a libretto by Da Ponte and music by Mozart).

For the number of acts and related genres of the total of ten Don Juan operas in Italian preceding the one by Da Ponte / Mozart (four with three acts, three with one act, two with two acts), see the overview at the beginning of this section.

53 Musicologists were introduced to the “Hofdruck” by Alfred Einstein in 1937: “Das erste Libretto des Don Giovanni”, *Acta musicologica* IX (1937), Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1937, Fasc.III/IV, June–December 1937, pp. 149–150; this brief but important item of information was re-published under the title “Das erste Libretto des ‘Don Giovanni’”, *Österreichische Musik-*

libretto of *Don Giovanni* had been printed before Da Ponte left Prague.” As has already been noted, the libretto had been printed in Vienna at least two weeks prior to Da Ponte’s departure from Prague (and according to Dent, Da Ponte’s departure was the most important reason Casanova became involved); in fact, it had been printed before Da Ponte even left for Prague, and it had most likely been taken to Prague by the poet himself.⁵⁴ The verses for the passages in question had long been written and the arias of Leporello (II/9 no. 7: “Ah, pietà Signori miei”), Don Ottavio (II/10 no. 8: “Il mio tesoro intanto”) and Donna Anna (II/12 no. 10: “Crudele !” / “Non mi dir”) mentioned in this context by Dent were already composed in Vienna, as is evident from watermark analysis.⁵⁵

Dent did not deal with the question of on which text Mozart based the composition of these arias.⁵⁶ However, his statements imply that the words of Leporello’s so-called escape aria were a version of the first of the two drafts of the aria found in Dux, revised by Casanova himself at Mozart’s request.⁵⁷ Although Dent’s “purely conjectural reconstruction” cannot be maintained,⁵⁸ it offered one of the first potential explanations in which the “Casanova case” has a well considered place.

Zeitschrift XI (1956), issue 1 January 1956, pp. 4–6, and in Alfred Einstein, *Essays on music*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co. 1956, pp. 217–220. The “Hofdruck” was added to Einstein’s revision of the Köchel Register/KV (*Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke Wolfgang Amade Mozarts nebst Angabe der verlorengegangenen, angefangenen, übertragenen, zweifelhaften und unterschobenen Kompositionen von Dr. Ludwig Ritter von Köchel. Dritte Auflage bearbeitet von Alfred Einstein*, Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel 1936. [Ann Arbor, 1947] p. 677 in both); the KV wording has not been changed, only complemented since then (6th edition, 1964, p. 597). When Köchel first published the Register (1862) he had limited himself to listing Mozart’s autograph score under no. 527, and the second edition (1905) by Paul Graf Waldersee also lists two old copies: in both cases there are no hints at libretti, and adding libretti was one of the fundamental novelties about Einstein’s third edition.

54 For details about this very rich topic see Weidinger, vol. IV, chapter VI, “Die Rätsel des ersten Wiener Textbuches [sc. des *Don Giovanni*]”, pp. 789–940, here: p. 940.

55 See the section “Prager Papier” in: Weidinger, vol. IV, pp. 942–971, here: p. 960.

56 Not even in the two marginal notes on *Dissoluto punito*; cf. Edward J. Dent, “The problem of ‘Don Giovanni’”, *The Atheneum* 4689, London 12th March 1920, p. 345; –, “Three notes on article Don Giovanni by Christopher Benn”, *MR* 5 (1944), No. 1, February 1944, pp. 71–72.

57 It does not seem likely that Casanova collaborated on the Prague libretto but it cannot be entirely ruled out. As discussed, such hypothetical collaboration would not, however, relate to the parts in the libretto quoted or implied by Dent, but rather to those scenes where revisions of the Viennese first print were made for the Prague libretto, and written – at least partly – on so-called “Prague paper”: this concerns the recitatives of scenes III (Donna Elvira, Leporello), IV (Don Giovanni, Masetto) and V (Masetto, Don Giovanni) in Act 2.

58 When he revised his study, Dent presumably did not know Einstein’s note on the “Hofdruck” from 1936 nor his new edition of the Köchel Register from the same year which was disseminated internationally as late as 1947 when it was re-published. 1947 was also the year when Dent’s revised study appeared.

Dyneley Hussey

In a study dating from 1927 and in his Mozart biography first published in 1928, Dyneley Hussey (1893–1972) had presented similar arguments regarding the Casanova drafts, influenced by Dent’s 1913 theory of the original three-act structure of *Don Giovanni*.⁵⁹ As already mentioned, the Casanova drafts were unknown at the time that Dent first published his *Critical Study* on Mozart’s operas. Whereas in later explanations, Dent said that the wishes of singers had initiated the process that led eventually to Casanova’s involvement and to the two-act version, Hussey believed that the reason Casanova had been brought in was to satisfy a desire to streamline and shorten an overly long work: to streamline by means of conversion into two acts, and to shorten by paradoxically making the piece longer:

“I conjecture, therefore, that what happened was as follows. After his arrival in Prague Mozart reached the sextet, and decided that the length of the opera must be curtailed. He consulted with da Ponte, who was much too busy to rewrite the opening of the last act and make a respectable join to the sextet. But, whatever suggestions he may have made, the librettist was called back to Vienna and asked his friend, Casanova, to give Mozart any assistance he could in spatch-cocking of the two acts. On this assumption Casanova is responsible for the recitative after the sextet, Leporello’s air, ‘Ah, pietà, signori miei!’ and the recitative, which follows it and introduces Ottavio’s air, ‘Il mio tesoro.’ The sketches found at Schloss Hirschberg are probably the first drafts for Leporello’s air with a variant, in which Casanova plays with the idea of continuing the sextet as a quintet (without Donna Anna). Certainly the words of Leporello’s air in the score are superior to the draft and show considerable skill in the use of international rhymes. It is tantalising that one link in the chain of evidence is missing, for, unless a further sketch in Casanova’s hand, which bears a more direct verbal resemblance to Leporello’s air, is found, we cannot be sure of our ground. But I can see no other explanation of the existence of the sketches, which have been discovered at Schloss Hirschberg. At least, my theory relieves da Ponte, normally so fine a craftsman, of a part of the responsibility for what is a bad piece of work.”⁶⁰

Unlike Dent, with whom he shares the “gap theory”, Hussey assumes Don Ottavio’s aria “Il mio tesoro” was originally intended to open the final act in a three-act opera. Thus, it would have been Casanova’s task to write words linking the sextet of the “original” ending of the act with the “original” beginning of the following act; this means that Da Ponte would have opened the graveyard scene with Don Ottavio, in a variation reminiscent of Giovanni Bertati’s *Duca Ottavio*.⁶¹ The Hirschberg texts

⁵⁹ Dyneley Hussey, “Casanova and ‘Don Giovanni’”, *Music & Letters*, VIII (1927), no. 4, Oct 1927, Oxford, pp. 470–472.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 472.

⁶¹ “IL CAPRICCIO | DRAMMATICO | RAPPRESENTATIONE | PER MUSICA | *DI*

would thus have been Casanova's first drafts for Mozart, and the part of the *Dissoluto punito* libretto between the sextet and Don Ottavio's aria (and the shift from the graveyard to the *Atrio terreno oscuro* where the sextet is sung) would be the product of Casanova's work. The arguments that speak against Dent's approach also apply to Hussey's hypotheses.

Friedrich Dieckmann

Friedrich Dieckmann (b. 1937) also presumed that Da Ponte had appointed his "Venetian friend" as his "deputy librettist"⁶² in Prague before he departed. Dieckmann did not deal with the question of why Casanova would have had to make changes at all, but unlike Dent and Hussey, he did not assume that Casanova's work on the libretto would have been included in the libretto prints of *Don Giovanni*. Dieckmann thought,

"Casanovas Variante [hätte] als Arie mit Quintett-Schluß jenes zweite Finale geschaffen, das Edward Dent als Urkonzept des Sextetts vermutete; die Oper wäre dann mit der Friedhofszene in ihren dritten Akt eingetreten. Allerdings läuft Casanovas nicht ganz abgeschlossener Text auf eine Begnadigung des Dieners hinaus, womit Leporellos Entspringen, damit aber auch das Zusammentreffen der beiden Flüchtigen auf dem Friedhof entfallen wäre. Jedenfalls hätte es einer neuen Motivation bedurft."⁶³

In my opinion Dieckmann's dense text contains several errors:

1. The Casanova texts do not pertain to an "aria ending in a quintet". As mentioned, they offer alternative versions of one and the same part of a scene.
2. The notion that a draft may provide a "fragment of a scene" may be admissible, but each of the parts is a self-contained section, corrections and deletions notwithstanding: both "fragments" have a beginning contributed by Leporello and an ending contributed by Leporello, as is evident in the stage instruction "*Fugge*".
3. There is no way that we can infer from Casanova's texts and their form that they were drafts based on a three-act structure, let alone that the scene devised by Casanova would have been the finale of a "second act".

GIOVANNI BERTATI | PER LA SECONDA OPERA | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL TEATRO GIUSTINIANI | DI S. MOISE' | IL CARNOVALE DELL' ANNO 1787. | IN VENEZIA. | Appreso Antonio Ca. ali. | *Con Licenza de' Superiori.*., and in it as Atto Secondo: "DON GIOVANNI | O SIA | IL CONVITATO | DI PIETRA." (pp. [31]–71), here, Scena XIX (pp. 55–56). Copy from Venezia, Biblioteca della Casa di Goldoni, shelf mark 59 A 70/11.

62 Friedrich Dieckmann, *Die Geschichte Don Giovannis*, p. 377.

63 Ibidem.

4. It would make sense to answer the question as to where the Casanova texts should be placed by considering that they should not directly follow the sextet, but instead replace the escape aria in Da Ponte’s first two printed versions.
5. Nothing in the texts corroborates the claim that Casanova’s “not entirely complete text” would be tantamount to “pardoning the servant”. Obviously, Leporello’s escape would not have been omitted: both drafts are consistent in that they end with the servant’s escape. Thus Dieckmann’s conclusion that because Leporello’s escape was omitted, the meeting in the graveyard with Don Giovanni would be likewise left out, is as pointless as is any need for renewed motivation.

A New Attempt

Unless Casanova had written the drafts purely for his own pleasure (and the fact that they dealt with a delicate moment in the dramaturgy – Leporello’s escape – is food for thought), and had done so by direct agreement with Mozart, Da Ponte, Bondini or Guardasoni – or even had been commissioned to do so – he would not have done so before Da Ponte had left. At that time, the first libretto version by Da Ponte (which we know from the Vienna libretto, the so-called “court print”) was available in print and had been largely set to music by Mozart with slight modifications: the Casanova drafts confirm that the compositions of the sextet (II/7, 8 no. 6), Leporello’s aria (II/9 no.7), the recitativo following it (II/10), and Don Ottavio’s aria (II/10 no. 8) existed already. Only after the sextet and Donna Anna’s exit is something missing: the brief recitativo (“Dunque quello sei tu”; II/9), in which there are minor differences between the Prague libretto and the Viennese first print that was written on paper of type VII⁶⁴.

Thus, Casanova’s task was not to fill a gap as Dent and Hussey had assumed, as there was simply no such thing; his drafts could only have been meant to redesign a scene which had already been written and composed. In this context it must be said that four more or less differing versions of the scene in question – scene II/9 – by Da Ponte himself appeared in print: two for Prague, one for Vienna, and three for New York. These comprise the above-mentioned “court print” of 1787, printed in late September or early October 1787 for the première planned for 14 October on the occasion of the visit of the Princess of Tuscany who was passing through; the libretto for the actual première at the National Theatre of Prague on 29 October;⁶⁵ the libretto for the first performance at the Burgtheater in Vienna on 7 May 1788 (seven months later);⁶⁶ and finally, thirty-eight years later, the Italian libretto for the

64 Mozart used eight types of paper for *Don Giovanni*; cf. the section “Prager Papier” in Weidinger, vol. IV, pp. 942–971.

65 Wien: [Kurzböck]; see footnote 20 – Prague: Schoenfeld; see footnote 22.

66 Wien: Sordi e Muti (the printing shop of the deaf-mutes’ institution); see footnote 24.

first performance at the Park Lane Theatre on 25 May 1826, the Italian/English libretto, and an edition for a more literary public, all of which appeared in New York.⁶⁷

In Da Ponte's text, scene II/9 and the one that followed it develop primarily because the threads of the stage action were intertwined in new constellations in the sextet:

1. Don Giovanni is again, or at least seems to be confronted with a whole load of force on the part of those who pursue him;
2. Don Ottavio's change is confirmed as he now recognises Don Giovanni as the perpetrator, and this happens as a result of either new suspicions or an emotionally motivated need to act; and he signals that he is prepared to go to any lengths; and
3. the fact that Donna Elvira has dropped out of the phalanx of Don Giovanni's opponents becomes clear to her former co-combattants as she begs for his life and calls him her husband.

As already noted in a similar vein by Abert⁶⁸, the insight into the deception caused by Leporello's (self-)disclosure also exposes the existential nakedness of the other characters. In terms of the content, this is part and parcel of the sextet which has often been praised for its musical structure: its last part all but freezes the stage action and lays bare interior processes via a polyvalent textual structure ("Mille torbidi pensieri"). However, the dramatic texture of the sextet does not provide any justification for Leporello's acts and presence that would be comprehensible to other characters and which would explicitly direct the focus of attention in the text to the involvement of Don Giovanni, the person present in absentia: Leporello triggers the confusion, but he is not its cause.

SCENA. VII.

Lep. D. Elv. poi D. An. D. Ott. con servi e lumi

Atrio terreno oscuro in casa di D. An.

[...]

D. Elv.

[...]

Sola sola in bujo loco

Palpitar il cor mi sento

E m' assale un tal spavento

Che mi sembra di morir.

Lep.

Più che cerco , men ritrovo (*andando a tentone etc.*)

Questa porta sciagurata :

Piano piano l' ho trovata,

67 New York: Gray; see footnote 27 – New York: Gray; see footnote 28 – New York: Gray; see footnote 29.

68 Hermann Abert, *W. A. Mozart, Neubearbeitete und erweiterte Ausgabe von Otto Jahns Mozart*, 2 parts, Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel 1923–1924, here: Part 2 1783–1791, p. 527.

Tutti. Dei! Leporello!
 Che inganno è questo;
 Stupido resto,
 Che mai sarà!
 Mille torbidi pensieri
 Mi s'aggiran pel cervello
 Che disordin è mai quello
 Che impensata novità!

Lep. Mille torbidi pensieri
 Mi si aggiran per la testa;
 Se mi salvo in tal tempesta
 E' un prodigio in verità!⁶⁹ (*D. Anna Parte coi servi*)

The lyrics of the sextet do not verbally shift any fault attributable to Leporello to Don Giovanni; this is not required for the audience, although Leporello's various justifications seem to be aiming at identifying an explicit relation for the other characters. Both the recitativo written by Da Ponte to replace the escape aria in the Vienna première (1788) and Casanova's first draft show that the two authors considered Leporello's justifications and a clarification of relations for the other characters necessary. It is therefore no coincidence that Casanova's first draft for this scene starts with the phrase "Il solo Don Giovanni", a wording that recurs at the end of the justification speech. If the connections between Leporello's acts and Don Giovanni's acts, which only the audience can see through, are not clear to the other characters, Don Ottavio's insight that Don Giovanni is the perpetrator is inexplicable. This seems to have been the reason why it was out of the question for Da Ponte to delete scene IX when *Don Giovanni* was created; and the same held true for Casanova, whose work only makes sense if considered in terms of dramaturgical structure and motivations.⁷⁰

Da Ponte's Prague Variants of Scena II/9 and the comments in Mozart's autograph score

If we want to know more about the substance of Casanova's changes which were intended to improve the dramaturgy, we need to look at the structure Da Ponte gave to the scenes in three versions prepared for the Prague première:

⁶⁹ Prague: Schoenfeld; see footnote 22.

⁷⁰ In any event, it was only in old age that Da Ponte decide to strike Leporello's justification speech from the New York Libretto (1826), writing at the end of the sextet: "*Don* [sic] *Anna, Zerlina, Leporello partono.*" We can safely assume that Donna Anna enters the house, and Leporello runs away, Zerlina following him. Donna Elvira, Don Ottavio and Masetto remain behind on stage.

1. the first Viennese print (the “court print” by Kurzböck in late September/early October);
2. the Prague version with slight changes (printed by Schönfeld in October, presumably after 14 October, but before the performance on 29 October); and
3. Mozart’s autograph (Leporello’s aria, written in Vienna before 1 October, the opera score was entered in the autograph list of works on 28 October).

After the sextet has ended, the individual accusations against Leporello begin, and the wording is the same in the first Viennese and the Prague versions:

Da Ponte II/9

D. Elv., D. Ott., Zerl., Mas., Lep.

<i>Zerl.</i>	Dunque quello sei tu che il mio Masetto Poco fa crudelmente maltrattasti!
<i>D. Elv.</i>	Dunque tu m’ ingannasti, o scellerato, Spacciandoti con me da D. Giovanni?
<i>D. Ott.</i>	Dunque tu in questi panni Venisti qui per qualche tradimento?
<i>D. Elv.</i>	A me tocca punirti:
<i>D. Ott.</i>	Anzi a me:
<i>Zerl.</i>	No no a me.
<i>Mas.</i>	Accoppatelo un poco tutti tre.

Zerlina is the first in line, accusing him of having cruelly maltreated Masetto; Donna Elvira and Don Ottavio follow, but their accusation is veiled in a question; they ask for a justification while at the same time insinuating that something else is hidden behind his “prank”. After Zerlina’s explicit reproach, the charges become increasingly abstract with each character. Don Ottavio can only assume “all kinds of treason”: what else would he expect from a servant who is discovered in somebody else’s house in the night, wearing his master’s clothes, and secretly seeking to mate with a fellow conspirator?

In spite of their questions, they seem to be sure of Leporello’s involvement and guilt; in a different order of appearance, they start calling for punishment. The specific structure of the accusation makes it clear that the punishment is not just for misdemeanours committed by Leporello for which there is evidence, but also because he is to be the scapegoat even though his identity has been recognised. Even Don Ottavio, who has no hard-and-fast evidence for anything, joins the “argument” about the privilege of punishing Leporello in which nothing is said about the actual punishment.

Only now does Masetto appear. In the court print, he addresses the punishment-happy group with “Accoppatelo un poco tutti tre.”; in the Prague version and in Mozart’s autograph the wording has been changed to “Accoppatelo meco tutti tre.” The wording of the court print gestures towards buffo style when Masetto suggests

that the group, hell-bent for punishment, should “take occasional turns” in beating Leporello to death while he counts himself out. In the score, this has been replaced by a more aggressive exhortation to punish Leporello, with Masetto leading the group.

At this point, the escape aria “Ah pietà signori miei” starts, and this is also where Casanova’s first draft scene would have begun.

Da Ponte II/9

Zer. Mas. D. Elv. D. Ott. Lep.

[...]

Lep.

Ah pietà signori miei
 Ah pietà pietà di me ,
 Do ragione a voi , a lei
 Ma il delitto mio non è .
 Il padron con prepotenza
 L’innocenza mi rubò :
 Donna Elvira, compatite [Aut.-Erg.: *piano à Donna Elvira:*]
 Voi [Aut: già] capite come andò !
 Di Masetto non so nulla ,
 Vel dirà questa fanciulla, [Aut.-Erg.: *accennando Donna Elvira*]
 E’ un oretta circumcirca ,
 Che con lei girando vo .
 A voi signore [Aut.-Erg.: *à D: Ottavio con confusione:*]
 Non dico niente
 Certo timore [W1: Certe avventure]
 Certo accidente [W1: Per accidente]
 Di fuori chiaro,
 Di dentro oscuro [Aut: scuro]
 Non c’ è riparo – –
 La porta il muro [Aut.-Erg.: *lo . . . il . . . la . . .*
additando la porta dov’ erasi chiuso per errore:]
 Vo da quel lato [W1: Andai girando]
 Poi quì celato [W1: -]
 L’affar si sa [W1: Di quà di là ⁷¹]
 [Aut. Erg.: *oh si sà . . .*]
 [Aut: Erg.: *S’ avvicina con destrezza alla porta e fugge:*]
 Ma s’ io sapeva
 Fuggia [W1: Fugia] per quà. (Parte) [Aut: -]⁷²

71 “Andai girando | Di quà di là” – Da Ponte may have alluded to Masetto’s “Non andate girando quà, e là,” (I/7) here.

72 IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA GIOCOSO |

In the aria, Leporello comments on the accusations. His first words describe his current main interest: “Ah pietà”. He first turns to the entire group – or rather, to “the ladies and gentlemen” (“signori miei”), whom he will also address individually during the aria. At least in the first part of the aria, Leporello seems to have composed himself after having realised his situation: he says that the accusers are right (“Do ragione a voi, a lei | Ma il delitto mio non è.”), explains that he cannot be blamed for the charges and, without giving any details, he refers to “the master” (“Il padron”), using the imagery of the abused virgin which is understood by everybody present, and saying that he was violently robbed of his innocence (“con prepotenza | L’innocenza mi rubò:”). This is all he says about the involvement of his unnamed master in the nocturnal adventure.

Subsequently, Leporello turns to the ladies and gentlemen individually. In the Viennese first print and the Prague libretto, this can be gathered only from Leporello’s own words because with the exception of “*Parte*” at the end of the aria, there are no instructions: Mozart’s autograph contains five additional instructions. This is unusual because the instructions in the Viennese first print and/or the Prague libretto were only partly transferred to Mozart’s autograph, and the escape aria is a rare example of the process working the other way round. The handwriting of the aria lyrics and of the instructions differs so there is no doubt that the instructions were not written at the same time as the composition. An in-depth examination would be required to determine whether the instructions are in Mozart’s hand at all.

Three of the five instructions in Mozart’s autograph are about the persons Leporello addresses and the way he does so. Donna Elvira is the first one, and according to the autograph (“*piano a. D. Elvira:*”⁷³), we gather that the words are implicitly directed solely at Leporello’s involuntary nightly companion: “Donna Elvira, compatite | Voi [Aut: già] capite come andò!” He tries to draw her into a chummy relationship by alluding to intimacies. The following four verses – with no related instructions in Mozart’s autograph – make clear that Leporello wants Donna Elvira as a witness who could exonerate him from the charge of having maltreated Masetto: —“Di Masetto non so nulla, | Vel dirà questa fanciulla⁷⁴, | E’ un oretta circumcirca, | Che con lei girando vo.” These words, which once again reproach Donna Elvira, are likewise chummy and are directed at Zerlina, whom Leporello obviously hopes will act as an intermediary; they are not meant for the other men present.

Leporello’s verses change abruptly as he addresses Don Ottavio: the autograph says “*a D: Ottavio con confusione:*”⁷⁵. To the fiancé of the lady of the house, he says,

IN DUE ATTI. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL TEATRO DI PRAGA L’ANNO 1787. |
 IN PRAGA. | di Schœnfeld. pp. 64–65.

73 In Mozart’s autograph this is found above the words “Donna Elvira [Compatite]” (bars 33 and 34).

74 In Mozart’s autograph the instruction “*accennando Donna Elvira*” is noted above the stave of Leporello’s “vel dirà questa fan[ciulla]” (bars 49 and 50).

75 In Mozart’s autograph this is above the words “à voi signore” (bars 65 and 66).

“A voi signore | non dico niente”, only to follow up with allusions and fragmented and ambivalent insinuations.⁷⁶ However, “A voi signore | Non dico niente” does not seem to be intended as a special insult to Don Ottavio, and should be understood as ambiguous in the sense of “I’m not saying anything because I actually don’t know why I landed in this house”: fear, coincidence, lights, darkness, walls, doors. In this house, close to where he witnessed the killing of the Commendatore by his “padron” the night before, Leporello is now faced with the fiancé of the victim’s daughter. This would also point to a second meaning underlying these words and what follows: “I can’t tell you what I know”. Leporello’s fragmented speech reflects fantasies of fear and the feeling of being pursued, and the contrast of light and darkness: light is something threatening because it identifies, enlightens; darkness offers protection and prevents situative action.⁷⁷

From Leporello’s point of view, this defence is improvised and presented well; towards the end it starts disintegrating into fragmented descriptions and increasing speechlessness. At the the end of the aria, the servant regains his ability to articulate himself and act: “Ma s’ io sapeva | Fuggia per quà. (*Parte*)”. From Mozart’s autograph, we learn that Leporello takes flight with the first words of the last two verses. We have to imagine that he continues singing as he leaves and finishes backstage, as his words present the escape as an actual event, an integrated part of the description of past happenings.⁷⁸

76 “Certo timore | Certo accidente | Di fuori chiaro, | Di dentro oscuro | Non c’ è riparo – | La porta il muro | Vo da quel lato | Poi quì celato | L’ affar si sa | Ma s’ io sapeva | Fuggia per quà.” (Prague print). Instead of “Certo timore | Certo accidente” the Viennese first print ran “Certe avventure | Per accidente”; moreover “Andai girando | Di quà di là” – by which Da Ponte may have alluded to Masetto’s “Non andate girando quà, e là,” (I/7) – was replaced by “Vo da quel lato | Poi quì celato | L’ affar si sa”. Apart from the instructions for the stage, Mozart’s autograph is characterised by other differences compared with the Prague libretto: the words “la porta . . . il muro . . .” are complemented by “Io . . . il . . . la . . .” and the instruction “*additando la porta dov’ erasi chiuso per errore*” is found above “vò da quel lato . . .” (bars 82–84). The words “l’ affar si sa . . .” is also complemented by “oh si sa” in the repetition, thus playing with the allusion; after those words, Mozart’s autograph contains the instruction “*s’ avvicina con destrezza alla porta e fugge*” above the stave (bars 90–92). The instruction “*fugge*” is also contained in Casanova’s drafts (whereas the printed libretti have “*parte*”) above the first word of “ma s’ io sapeva fuggia per quà.” (bar 92).

77 The dense events in this scene would make it seem worth while to examine the place of this strange encounter – the *Atrio terreno oscuro* with the three doors to which Mozart’s autograph refers (“*Atrio oscuro con tre Porte*”) – for potential symbolic content.

78 In the Viennese version of 1788 Leporello’s aria has been deleted and replaced by a recitativo which ends in “Ma s’ io sapeva, | Fuggia per là.” – similar to Leporello’s escape aria in the Prague version. After Masetto’s “Accoppatelo meco tutti tre”, the second Viennese libretto print contains the following differing text (only the last lines of the verse are the same as quoted above):

All the scenes completed or drafted, regardless of whether they were written by Da Ponte or Casanova, end with Leporello’s escape. In view of the stage action and as a connection with the graveyard scene, this is a good, if not the only possible solution. Leporello’s escape cuts through the entangled strands of action and arguments like Alexander’s sword cut the Gordian knot. The scene just analysed caused problems because of the overall structure of the work, as it is placed between the sextet and Don Ottavio’s statement that he will take concrete action against Don Giovanni, which is confirmed in Don Ottavio’s only aria.⁷⁹ The interface between the sextet and the statement must have seemed all the more problematic, as the statement,⁸⁰ though necessary, is a somewhat prosaic way to tone down the drama compared with Don Ottavio’s extreme readiness to act in the sextet (“*in atto di ucciderlo*”⁸¹); however, the recitativo after Leporello’s escape tells us not only that Don Ottavio,

“Lep. Ah pietà . . . compassion . . . misericordia.
 D. Ott. Non la sperar.
 Lep. Udiste . . . in questo loco . . .
 Era aperta la porta . . . D. Giovanni.
 Pose a me questi panni, ed io con lei . . .
 Scusate, io non ci’ ho colpa . . . in quel momento
 Capitaste coi servi . . . il lume fuggo . . .
 Sbaglio le stanze . . . giro . . . giro . . . giro . . .
 Mi schermisco [sic] . . . m intoppo . . . in altri incontro . . .
 Di là mi volgo,
 Mi caccio quà,
 Ma s’ io sapeva,
 Fuggia per là. (fug.Lep.)”.

Da Ponte deleted the scene from the New York libretto of 1826 and has Leporello exit with Donna Anna and Zerlina immediately following the sextet, and has Donna Elvira continue with “*Ferma perfido, ferma.*” The numbering of the scene remains the same, staying Scena IX to the end; as in V1 and P, Don Ottavio’s aria “*Il mio tesoro*” follows here, but it is sung to Donna Elvira and Masetto in the New York version, which thus diverges from V1 and P.

79 Whatever the circumstances may have been, in the “Viennese version” not only Scena IX, but also the following Scena X with Don Ottavio’s aria “*Il mio tesoro*” was up for revision, as we can see in the second Viennese libretto.

80 A discussion of the extent to which Don Ottavio’s spontaneity in the sextet and his structuring explanations afterwards give the action a calculated impulse of any kind whatsoever and contribute to characterising Don Ottavio, would carry us too far.

81 Sometimes, the didascalies (stage instructions) are printed in such a way that it is not clear to which part they pertain: they may be placed in front of, or after the words to which they belong. In the sextet, attribution to individual characters is not clear either. The Prague print, where “*in atto di ucciderlo*” is found for the first time, and the second Viennese print (1788) create the impression that “*No no morrà!*” which follows “*in atto di ucciderlo*” in a spot next to Donna Anna’s line (“*Appena il credo;*”) refers only to Don Ottavio (“*D. Ott. No no, morrà!*”), so one would be led to believe that it is Donna Anna’s fiancé who raises the knife for the deadly stab. Mozart’s autograph clearly shows that “*Appena il credo; | No no, morrà!*” is sung by Donna Anna, Don Ottavio, Zerlina and Masetto together, so it is imaginable that not only Don Ottavio, but also Masetto, or even Zerlina and Donna Anna, move in to kill the servant wearing Don Giovanni’s clothes.

who is speaking for everybody, cannot have any more doubts about Don Giovanni being the perpetrator⁸² (which was clear from his unmistakable conduct during the sextet), but also something which contrasted with such behaviour: what looked like the overwhelming urge to act in the sextet, builds a unity of attitude and action at the level of linguistic self-presentation in Don Ottavio after Leporello's escape out of a variety of motivations; the "*atto di ucciderlo*" and "morrà!" are reflected upon and the reason for such action is broken down into "Così vuole dover, pietade, affetto". Although Don Ottavio's words are directed towards future action, they also must legitimise his present acts.

Da Ponte II / 10

D. Elv., D. Ott., Zerl., Mas.

D. Elv. Ferma, perfido, ferma!

Mas. Il birbo ha le ali ai piedi

Zerl. Con qual arte si sotrasse l' iniquo

[W 2: Masetto vieni meco]

D. Ott. Amici miei [W 2: Donna Elvira], dopo eccesso sì enorme

Dubitar non possiam che D. Giovanni

Non sia l' empio uccisore

Del Padre di Donn' Anna.

In questa casa per poche ore fermatevi.

Un ricorso vo' far a chi si deve

E in pochissimi vendicarvi prometto

Così vuole dover, pietade, affetto.⁸³

Casanova's first draft – new aria lyrics

Casanova's drafts do not tell us whether the changes he had planned pertained to Scena IX – Leporello's escape – alone, or whether he had also wanted to change or delete the following scene, nor do the drafts state whether Casanova had conceived of them as a finale for a second act, as claimed by Dieckmann.⁸⁴ On the contrary,

82 "*D. Ott.* Amici miei | Dopo eccessi sì enormi | Dubitar non possiam, che D. Giovanni | Non sia l' empio uccisore | Del padre di Donn' Anna: in questa casa | Per poche ore fermatevi . . . un ricorso | Vo far a chi si deve, e in pochi istanti | Vendicarvi prometto; | Così vuole dover, pietade, affetto."; in the libretto for the first performance in Vienna "Amici miei" is replaced by "Donna Elvira" (Mozart's autograph does not contain an adaptation in this spot) because the peasant couple runs after the fleeing Leporello.

83 "IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA GIOCOSO | IN DUE ATTI. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL TEATRO DI PRAGA L' ANNO 1787. | IN PRAGA. | di Schoenfeld.", pp. 65–66.

84 Friedrich Dieckmann, *Die Geschichte Don Giovanni's*, pp. 377–378.

precisely because of Leporello’s escape, responses are required to keep the action going and to continue the development of the characters. But what were Casanova’s ideas for this scene? After all, the two drafts differ greatly in form and content. The first draft is a solo – most likely an aria – for Leporello, a grand speech in his own defence:

Lep: *Il solo Don Giovanni*
 M’astrinse a mascherarmi
 Egli di tanti affanni
 E’⁸⁵ l’ unica cagion.
 Io merito perdon.
 Colpevole non son

La colpa è tutta quanta
Di quel femineo [sic] sesso
Che l’ anima gl’ incanta
E gl’ incatena il cor.
 O sesso seduttor !
 Sorgente di dolor !

Lasciate andar in pace⁸⁶
Un povero innocente
Non sono contumace
Offendervi non so
 E ve lo proverò
 Fu lui che si spogli

Ei prese i panni miei
Per bastonar Masetto
Con Donna Elvira io fei
Il solo mio dover
 Fu tale il suo voler
 Quel che vi dico e ver⁸⁷

Merita vostro sdegno
Il solo Don Giovanni
 Ite a punir l’ indegno
 Lasciatemi scappar. --- Fugge⁸⁸

85 The “di” following “E” was crossed out.

86 The line “Il pover Leporino” preceding this verse – obviously the first variant for the beginning of the verse – was crossed out.

87 The following five lines of the verse were crossed out.

88 Státní oblastní archiv v Praze (Regional State Archives Prague), shelf mark: Marr U 16 h / 31 (first page of the double sheet).

This first draft by Casanova does not differ from Da Ponte's first two versions due to its conciseness: Leporello's speech in the Casanova version consists of twenty-eight verses, which is three verses longer than Da Ponte's version in the Prague print. The difference lies in the different content of the defence of Don Giovanni's servant. Da Ponte's Leporello argues differently when addressing various persons, which is also reflected in changes in the ductus of the verses, so that the solo is designed as a constantly changing interaction with the characters on stage, thus linguistically preparing the ground for Leporello's escape; by contrast, Casanova's Leporello justifies his actions by addressing everybody in the same way, which seems much more static. He does so in five stanzas, the first four consist of six lines, and the final stanza follows five deleted lines and consists of four lines.

In the first verse of the first stanza ("Il solo Don Giovanni"), Leporello has already put all the blame on Don Giovanni⁸⁹: the disguise requiring explanation would have been due to him, and he alone would be the cause of all those woes. After such a general statement, Leporello says that he deserves pity: "Colpevole non son".

The apparent climax, clearly deviating from Da Ponte's structure, is found in the second stanza which most openly bespeaks Casanova's alternative concept for the scene. Leporello's justification are meant to be in defence of Don Giovanni's action: "La colpa è tutta quanta | Di quel femineo sesso | Che l' anima gl' incanta | E gl' incatena il cor. | O sesso seduttor ! | Sorgente di dolor !". In the first stanza, Leporello denies that he is to blame by putting the blame on Don Giovanni; in the second stanza, he goes one step further by indirectly turning part of the accusers into accused. Leporello implies that he is a victim of Don Giovanni, and Don Giovanni is a victim of the female gender, the gender that seduces, enchants the soul, and puts the heart in chains. At the end of the second stanza – "O sesso seduttor ! | Sorgente di dolor!" – the creative impetus clearly fades, ending in rather cumbersome attempts by the servant to explain, interspersed with protestations of innocence and complaints about the situation, all inspired by Da Ponte.⁹⁰

The third stanza refers to the servant alone – the poor innocent lamb who just wants to be left in peace ("Lasciate andar in pace | Un povero innocente") – and, unlike Da Ponte's versions, it introduces a new argument whereby Leporello tries to evade coming to blows at the hand of the accusers: "Non sono contumace | Offendervi non so". On the one hand, the defence of not being contagious points to the non-violent intentions Leporello had on his nightly errand; on the other hand, the image invokes the fact that the accusers outnumber him by far and that he is totally unprotected. He offers proof ("E ve lo proverò") and wraps a little immoral explosive into the last verse of the ultimate two lines: it was he who got undressed – "Fu lui che si spogliò".

89 In Da Ponte's lyrics of the escape aria, Don Giovanni is not mentioned by name; the lyrics say only "Ma il delitto mio non è. | Il padron con prepotenza | L' innocenza mi rubò:".

90 After a text without many major corrections, it is no coincidence that an entire verse was deleted here: "Il pover Leporino".

In the fourth stanza, Leporello deals with the specific charge of having beaten up Masetto: it had been him (“Ei”), Don Giovanni, who had dressed in Leporello’s clothes to give Masetto a good hiding; meanwhile Leporello had only done his duty with Donna Elvira (“Il solo mio dover”⁹¹), as had been Don Giovanni’s wish. As we know, Leporello can only assume or conclude that it had indeed been Don Giovanni who gave Masetto a working over while wearing his servant’s outfit.

In the last part, Leporello returns to his introductory words – “Il solo Don Giovanni” – and calls for punishment of the “indegno”, who alone deserved to be scorned, while he, the servant, should be allowed to get away: “Ite a punir l’ indegno | Lasciatemi scappar.” And with these words, Leporello takes flight.

Casanova’s second draft – an Ensemble

As has already been mentioned, both dramatic structure and content of the second draft are entirely different from the first draft; obviously, it was intended as a quintet that in principle, could follow the setet:

<i>Lep.</i>		<i>Incerto</i>	
		<i>Confuso</i>	
		<i>Scoperto</i>	
		<i>Deluso</i>	
		<i>Difendermi non so.</i>	
		<i>Perdon vi chiederò.</i>	
<i>D. Elv.</i>			
<i>D. Ott.^o</i>	- a 4	<i>Perdonarti non si può</i>	
<i>Zerl.</i>			
<i>Mas:</i>			
<i>Lep:</i>		<i>Solo da voi dipende</i>	
		<i>Il mio fatal destino</i>	
		<i>Da voi la grazia attende</i>	
		<i>Il palpitante cor</i>	
<i>Zerl:</i>		<i>Ti vò caver mangiar le viscere</i>	4
<i>Mas.</i>		<i>Vo divorarti l’ anima</i>	3
<i>D. Ott:</i>		<i>Appeso ad un patibolo</i>	2
<i>D. Elv.</i>		<i>Devi esalar lo spirito</i>	1
à 4)		<i>Infame traditor</i>	
<i>Lep:</i>		<i>Solo da voi dipende</i>	
		<i>Il mio fatal destino</i>	

91 The parallel structure of “Il solo” for “Don Giovanni” and “mio dover” may indicate that it is Leporello’s only duty (“solo mio dover”) to cover for his master in carnal things.

Da voi la grazia attende
 ‡ *Un palpitante cor*

à 4) *alla forca, alla forca, alla forca*
 Lep: *[two deleted words] Ohibo! che morte sporca!*
 a 4 :) *In galera, in galera, in galera*
 Lep: *Remo, busse, vita austera!*
 a 4.) *Vada a scopar la piazza*
 Lep. *Sono di illustre razza*
 a 4) *Dunque le barche strascinerà*
 Lep: *Ab no signori per carità*
 a 4 *Che dobbiam dunque fare*
 Del perfido impostor

Lep. *Solo da voi dipende*
 Il mio fatal destino
 Da voi la grazia attende
 *Il palpitante cor. ————— Fugge.*⁹²

There is no large-scale justification by Leporello: uncertain, confused, discovered, disillusioned, robbed of powerful arguments, he puts himself at the mercy of his accusers. “Offendervi non so” in the first draft has turned into “Difendermi non so,” which has moved from the middle to the beginning of the scene. Having been rejected by Donna Elvira, Don Ottavio, Zerlina and Masetto (“Perdonarti non si può”), Leporello again asks for mercy, surrendering completely to his accusers: “Solo da voi dipende | Il mio fatal destino | Da voi la grazia attende | Il palpitante cor”. He will repeat the four-line refrain in the course of the scene to counter the desire for vengeance and punishment of the others.

Each of the four accusers has a special way of taking revenge on Leporello. Originally, Zerlina was supposed to start with “Ti vò mangiar le viscere”⁹³, followed by Masetto (“Vo divorarti l’ anima”), Don Ottavio (“Appeso ad un patibolo”), and Donna Elvira who complete the series of impending punishments by “Devi esalar lo spirito,” with all the accusers joining to sing “Infame traditor”. However, Casanova’s numbering of the four solo verses shows that he wanted them to be sung the other way round, which was to increase the imaginativeness and coarseness of the punishments.

After Leporello has repeated his request to be pardoned – which implicitly means that he admits his guilt and is therefore no longer pretending that he is innocent, as

92 Státní oblastní archiv v Praze (Regional State Archives Prague), shelf mark: Marr U 16 h / 31 (third page of the double sheet).

93 Cf. Don Giovanni in: Lorenzo Da Ponte, Prague, Schoenfeld 1787, II/15: “Chi l’ anima mi lacera! | Chi m’ agita le viscere!”

he did in the first draft – the accusers follow up on the more metaphorical drastic curses of the previous stanza by calling for four different kinds of punishment they present together, from gallows to galley and from street-cleaning to ship-towing, always interrupted by Leporello’s responses. He objects to cleaning streets by saying “Sono di illustre razza” which is “eine satirische Anspielung auf jenen ungarischen Adligen, den die josephinische Gerichtsbarkeit trotz seines edlen Blutes zum Platzfegen verurteilt hatte; der Vorfall hatte Aufsehen durch die ganze Monarchie gemacht”⁹⁴. The following lines, “Che dobbiam dunque fare | Del perfido impostor,” reflect the situation of the author in the words of the characters: nobody tries to find a solution and Leporello’s argument is going round in circles. At the end of the number, Don Giovanni’s servant repeats the refrain “Solo da voi dipende” a second time, evading the threatening situation by suddenly taking flight, just like in the first draft; however, this time (“Lasciatemi scappar.”) the idea of the escape is not expressed in Leporello’s words.

While Casanova’s first draft structured this scene as an elaborate apology, the second draft is an animated buffa scene. The wild threats of punishment, Leporello’s repeated entreaties as he puts himself at the mercy of the others ridicule these, too. However, the motivation for the sextet – the existential issues concerning each character – is gone. And what is more, Don Giovanni is no longer the direct pivotal point of the events and all the dramatic weight is shifted to Leporello. Casanova obviously wanted the scene to be more animated, but he achieved this in buffo manner; everything remains outside the actual drama and the specific development of the individual characters.

By contrast, the justification in the first draft – “La colpa è tutta quanta [...]” – seems to reflect Casanova’s self-justification: it “is more about the author of the new versions and not about Mozart’s and Da Ponte’s character. Casanova always saw himself as the man who was seduced, not a lady-killer like Don Juan, but invariably the victim of women. He was to relate to the world in twelve volumes of memoirs a Leporello list of Homeric dimensions.”⁹⁵

Regardless of the question of whether Don Giovanni, the mythical stage character, and Casanova, the living legend, are supposed to be the same or different persons, the Leporello of Casanova’s version does not adequately conform with the characterisation and development introduced by Da Ponte: Leporello may be Don Giovanni’s record-keeper, and in a certain respect he may be his shadow, but he is neither his mouthpiece – as in Casanova’s first draft, in which the accused acts as the accusing defender of his master – nor a sorry figure – as is the case in Casanova’s second draft – a man without arguments who puts himself to the mercy of “the ladies

94 Friedrich Dieckmann, *Die Geschichte Don Giovannis*, p. 377. It was a satirical allusion to a Hungarian nobleman who had been sentenced to street-cleaning by a court of Joseph II, and whose case had made the headlines throughout the empire.

95 *Ibidem*, p. 378.

and gentlemen". Casanova's drafts offer no solutions to the dramaturgical problems arising after the sextet in the second act. Therefore, there was good cause for Mozart and Da Ponte not to consider Casanova's attempts at drama-writing: they were to find a different way out of the dilemma in the so-called Viennese version.

This takes us back to the initial question of what kind of involvement by Casanova would be imaginable. There are a number of possibilities, more or less likely variants, ranging from a commission from Da Ponte/Mozart or Bondini before or after the première of *Don Giovanni* in Prague, to a spur-of-the-moment idea that arose in Dux. It is fairly improbable that Mozart, Da Ponte and/or Bondini would have commissioned Casanova to modify the libretto in any way before the gala performance of *Figaro* on 14 October 1787; it seems more likely that the drafts emerged after conversations between Mozart and Casanova about the new opera following the postponement of the première. The list of subscribers to the *Icosameron* reflects the fact that Casanova frequented the circles of Mozart's Prague friends⁹⁶:

“Man findet darin alle bekannten Namen des böhmischen Adels: die verschiedenen Mitglieder des Waldsteinschen Geschlechts, die Clam-Gallas, Harrach, Kinski, Schaffgotsch, Lobkowitz, Nostitz, Zichy, Clary u. a. Viele der Subskribenten sind mit einer grösseren Anzahl von Exemplaren notiert, so z. B. der General Prinz Christian August von Waldeck mit nicht weniger als 80 Exemplaren. Casanovas Bruder Franz ist generöser Weise mit 22 Exemplaren vertreten, sein Bruder Johann aber nur mit einem. Insgesamt weist die Liste 335 subskribierte Exemplare nach, [...]”⁹⁷

A conversation between Casanova and Mozart about the dramaturgy of *Don Giovanni* and related problems, on whatever occasion it may have taken place, could have prompted Casanova to write the drafts; maybe he volunteered to come up with better texts for the scene; perhaps Casanova never handed over the drafts because he doubted that they were better solutions than Da Ponte's original; maybe they also came about under the impression of several theatre performances Casanova attended (in any event he was in Prague until the end of the 1787/1788 season).

Casanova Again? The Practitioner Guardasoni in Warsaw

It is possible that changes had been made in the same sections for which Casanova had written his drafts (whatever his intentions may have been) for earlier Prague performances which would provide links in the second Viennese libretto print (1788) and the Warsaw libretto print (1789).

96 Alfons Rosenberg, *Don Giovanni. Mozarts Oper und Don Juans Gestalt*, München: Prestel 1968, p. 147.

97 Victor Ottmann, *Jakob Casanova von Seingalt, Sein Leben und seine Werke. Nebst Casanovas Tragikomödie: Das Polemoskop*. Stuttgart: Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen 1900, p. 121.

The Warsaw libretto of *Dissoluto punito*, printed on the occasion of an appearance of Guardasoni’s “Gesellschaft Italiänischer Opernvirtuosén” before the King of Poland, Stanislas Poniatowski, on 14 October 1789, contains an escape scene which differs from the original production in Prague and the first performance in Vienna.⁹⁸ While it does not bear any likeness to the Casanova drafts available to us, it cannot be entirely ruled out that he had a hand in this version, too.

The libretto printed on the occasion of Guardasoni’s appearance in Warsaw is an early mixture of the *Prague* and *Viennese versions*: Donna Elvira’s solo scene “In quali eccessi”/“Mi tradi quell’ alma ingrata” was taken from these; consistent with current practice, it follows Don Ottavio’s “Il mio tesoro” (music numbered II/10 in both cases). Moreover, the Warsaw libretto contains the lyrics of arias which are contained in neither the prints dating from the year when the opera was first performed, nor the second Viennese print.

Thus, Donna Elvira’s aria “Ah fuggi il traditor” (I/10), is struck and replaced by an aria following the recitativo, “In questa forma dunque” (I/6), and the lyrics of this aria (“Odio, furor, dispetto”) can also be found in Porta’s version of his *Don Juan* librettos for Esterházy (1781).⁹⁹ In the Warsaw libretto, Donna Anna sings this aria after her father’s death (I/11) instead of the aria “Tutte le furie unite” sung in this place in Prague 1776 (I/12),¹⁰⁰ Brunswick 1777 (I/12),¹⁰¹ and Vienna 1777 (I/11).¹⁰² The aria interlude of Esterházy is said to have been by Niccolò Jomelli¹⁰³; to date, no information is available as to the music used for the aria and the related new lyrics in Warsaw in 1789.

Further changes in the Warsaw print were as follows:

- new lyrics for both arias of Donna Anna (“Infelice in tal momento | Sono

98 “IL | DISSOLUTO | PUNITO. | O SIA | IL D. GIOVANNI. | DRAMMA GIOCOLOSO | IN DUE ATTI. | *DA RAPPRESENTARSI | AVANTI DI SUA MAESTA’ | IL RE DI POLONIA,* | NEL TEATRO NAZIONALE. | IN VARSAVIA | *Presse [sic] di P. DUFOUR, Consiliere Aulico | di S. M. e Direttore della Stamperia | del R. Corpo de Cadetti.* | M. DCC. LXXXIX.” (cf. Sartori 8034).

99 Esterházy 1781: “IL | CONVITATO | DI PIETRA, | O SIA | IL DISSOLUTO. | DRAMMA TRAGICOMICO | PER MUSICA. | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NEL’ TEATRO | D’ ESTERHÁZ NELL’ ESTATE | L’ ANNO 1781.” (cf. Sartori 6591).

100 Prag 1776: “IL | CONVITATO | DI PIETRA | O SIA | IL DISSOLUTO. | *DRAMMA | TRAGICOMICO.* | DA RAPPRESENTARSI NEL REGGIO TEATRO DI | PRAGA, | SOTTO | L’IMPRESA E DIREZIONE | DI | GIUSEPPE BUSTELLI. | PRAGA, | L’ ANNO 1776.” (cf. Sartori 6588).

101 Braunschweig 1777: “IL | CONVITATO | DI PIETRA, | O SIA | IL DISSOLUTO. | *DRAMMA | TRAGICOMICO.* | *Praga l’ anno 1777.*” (cf. Sartori 6589).

102 Vienna 1777: “IL | CONVITATO | DI PIETRA, | O SIA | IL DISSOLUTO. | *DRAMMA | TRAGICOMICO.* | DA RAPPRESENTARSI | NE’ TEATRI PRIVILEGIATI | DI VIENNA L’ ANNO 1777. | IN VIENNA, | PRESSO GIUSEPPE NOBILE DE KURZ- | BECK, STAMPATORE ORIENT. DI S. M. | IMP. R. A.” (cf. Sartori 6590).

103 Cf. Dénes Bartha, László Somfai, *Haydn als Opernkapellmeister*, Budapest: Verlag der Ungar. Akademie der Wissenschaften 1960, p. 243.

- oppressa dal dolore, [...]”, I/13; “Ah spirar con te vorrei | Dolce fiamma del mio Cor, [...]”, II/12);
- Don Giovanni’s aria, “Metà di voi,” was replaced by a recitativo (II/4);
 - the scene at the table was changed and abridged (II/13); and
 - “the moral of the tale” was re-worded: “Chi nel seno ha un’ alma impura | Bella pace mai non ha: [...]” (II/Scena ultima).

Leporello’s escape scene was different, too:

<i>Mas.</i>	Accoppatelo meco tutti tre.
<i>Lep.</i>	Udite . . . questi panni . . .
	La porta . . . il padrone . . . l’ oscuro . . .
	Il buco . . . si entra . . . è vero?
	Voi lo sapete . . . / Ma se mi confondete!
	Si si . . . adesso . . . uengo – / Con una canzonetta
	A modo mio la spiego netta, e schietta.
	 L’ occasione . . . l’ amor vi dirò . . .
	Sempre il core alterare mi fa . . .
	Peno assai se mi dicon di nò . . .
	E in quel caso più duro si sta . . .
	Là là larela . . . là la larà. <i>Fugge uia.</i> ” (II/9)

It is not impossible that there were more drafts by Casanova than the ones we know of, and that they may have been destined for a different composer who might even have set them to music. It is even conceivable that at least part of the confirmed changes in the libretto printed for Warsaw in 1789 were actually made for Prague and/or Leipzig and can be traced back to Casanova: maybe the Warsaw version of Leporello’s escape is yet another libretto version that was eventually set to music and used.

Be that as it may, from what we know today, and contrary to what Dent and Hussey assumed earlier, we can rule out that Casanova was directly involved in writing Leporello’s escape scene, as we know it from the first Viennese print and the first Prague print. However, the “Casanova episode” indicates the structural problems in those scenes in the libretto of *Dissoluto punito* which were revised in the so-called Viennese version; the changes were no coincidence, however successful one may consider the revisions to have been. Casanova’s drafts draw the unbiased observer’s interest to the way in which Da Ponte and Mozart were to revamp the scene Casanova had worked on, as well as the following scenes to the end of the *Atrio* scene of the so-called Viennese version.