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CHAPTER 1  
INTRODUCTION

This dissertation promotes the further study and performance of the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) by Alessandro Rolla (1757-1841) as a complement for existing standard Classical repertoire for the viola, thus providing the means for greater stylistic education and technical foundation for viola study from this time period. In order to make the music from this lesser-known composer more readily available for future performers, I have edited this concerto into a performance edition from current unpublished sources using the music notation software Finale.® I have also combined separate parts into a conductor’s full score, which did not exist in the original sources. In addition to the full score, I have made a chamber concerto score for reasons that will be discussed in Chapter 4. A performance edition consisting of a full score and parts will provide greater access to Rolla’s music for viola performance and study.

Rolla’s viola concerti are valuable and should be made available for three main reasons. First, the viola has a lack of Classical repertoire compared to the violin and cello. At present, the most-often played viola concerti from the Classical era include those of Carl Stamitz and Franz Anton Hoffmeister. The Rolla concerti provide an excellent alternative or complement to the Stamitz and Hoffmeister viola concerti because Rolla’s writing for the viola is different than that of either of these two composers. Second, the Rolla concerti can serve a similar purpose for the viola as Mozart and Haydn concerti do for the violin and cello. The Mozart and Haydn concerti for violin and cello are currently used not only for instruction, but also in the evaluation process for auditions. As the violists do not usually have classical concertos on audition repertoire lists, the Rolla concerti would be very useful in this role. Finally, the Rolla concerti provide a viable choice for research and performance to represent the style of the Classical Era at a time when
musicians are turning to the study and performance of historically informed performance practice.

Rolla’s concerti for viola, fifteen in number, remain widely unknown.¹ The author of Rolla’s entry in the Oxford Companion of Music, Antonio Rostagno, gives a slight editorial comment concerning the popularity of Rolla’s works for viola in stating that “[they are] inexplicably neglected by 20th-century performers.”² The SHAR Catalogue, the largest resource for string music in the United States, has only recently added works for viola by Rolla in the catalogue but still offers none of his viola concerti.³

A closer comparison between the standard viola concerti from the Classical Period of Stamitz and Hoffmeister and the lesser-known Rolla concerti reveal differences in style. One basic difference is more use of the higher register of the viola in the Rolla concerti. The highest note in the Stamitz and Hoffmeister Concerti is a B-natural (B₄). In the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), the highest note written is almost an octave higher (B-flat⁵). In general, Rolla explores the higher register of the viola in three ways: in melodic content, in figuration and passagework, and in virtuoso gestures that feature extreme high notes. Stamitz and Hoffmeister composed more for the lower register of the instrument to highlight its darker tone, as if to set it apart from the violin. Rolla, on the other hand, allows the viola freedom to express its entire range.

¹ Luigi Alberto Bianchi and Luigi Inzaghi, Alessandro Rolla: Biography and Thematic Catalogue of his Works (Milan: Nuovo Edizioni Milano, 1981), 276-282. Also see http://imslp.org/index.php?title=Category:Rolla,_Alessandro&pagefrom=Tantum+ergo%2C+bi+0568~~rolla%2C+alessandro%0ATantum+Ergo%2C+BI+568+%28Rolla%2C+Alessandro%29#mw-pages. IMSLP gives links to twelve viola concertos and does not include BI 552, BI 553, or BI 554. BI 546 is listed as BI 328 in IMSLP because it is a viola concertino, and is marked with both numbers in the thematic catalogue. IMSLP also includes an additional concerto attributed to Rolla that is not in the thematic catalogue, a Concerto in C.
Currently, four sources for the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) are in existence. The first is the original manuscript held at the Giuseppe Verdi Library in the Milan Conservatory. The source contains fifty-five pages consisting of one copy of the solo viola part and each of the orchestral instrument parts. This source is also available on the website imslp.org, made accessible due to the efforts of Carlo Barato, a Rolla performer and scholar. The second is an edition from 1799 by Johann André located in the Westfälische Wilhelms University in Münster, Germany. Like the manuscript, this edition consists of a solo viola part and each of the orchestral parts. There is no full score. The concerto is in the standard three-movement format. Many inconsistencies exist within the manuscript and within the André edition, and these two copies of the concerto differ from each other in bowings, articulations and, in a few cases, notes. The third source is a piano and viola score by “Günther” from 1938. This edition comes from a time when different stylistic elements were valued, and only exists in piano score. For these reasons, I do not use this edition in my study. More recently, violist and editor Ken Martinson published the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) through his publishing company Gems Music Publications. Martinson’s edition was published in 2012, after this study began.

The Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) is the most feasible of the Rolla concerti for my study and would most significantly contribute to the viola repertoire. Unlike many Rolla viola concerti, the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) has complete parts in all instruments. It exists in two primary

sources, the original manuscript and the André edition, which will ensure a reliable interpretation. In comparison to other Rolla concerti, the form, pleasing melodies, and idiomatic writing for the viola make the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) a better choice. Other Rolla concerti under consideration for this study were the Concerto in B-flat (BI 555) and the Concerto in F (BI 551). The BI 555 was not complete, and the BI 551 was an alternate version of the Concerto in F (BI 550).

Contemporary research on Alessandro Rolla begins in the 1970s with the work of two Italian scholars, Luigi Alberto Bianchi and Luigi Inzaghi, who wrote *Alessandro Rolla: Biography and Thematic Catalogue of his Works*. Bianchi and Inzaghi have each written articles on Rolla and his string music published in the 70s and 80s. Recently, new developments have emerged in the research of Rolla’s life and works, including an important collection of essays published in 2010 entitled *Alessandro Rolla: Un caposcuola dell’arte violinistica lombarda*, edited by Mariateresa Dellaborra. Essays on Rolla are also found in two separate collections of works about Nicolò Paganini: *Nicolò Paganini: Diabolus in Musica*, edited by Andrea Barizza and Fulvia Morabito; and *Paganini divo e comunicatore: atti del convegno internazionale: Genova, 3-5 Dicembre 2004*, edited by Maria Rosa Moretti.

In addition to scholarship directly related to Rolla, other sources were helpful in understanding the context in musical and performance tradition in which Rolla wrote his Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). Examples of these sources include *The Italian Solo Concerto, 1700-1760: Rhetorical Style and Strategies History* by Simon McVeigh and Johoash

---

8 For complete information about this work, see footnote 1.
Many works about Rolla and his time were in other languages, but financial resources did not allow for all scholarship on Rolla to be translated. Works that may offer relevant information on Rolla and his music are “Virtuoso Viola Technique in the Work of Rolla and Paganini” by Luigi Alberto Bianchi, “L’eredità di Niccolò Paganini nelle musiche di Camillo Sivore e Antonio Rolla” by Renato Ricco, and “Alessandro Rolla e Niccolò Paganini: il maestro e l'allievo” by Tatiana Berford.

The date of the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) is significant because of the stylistic issues that influenced Rolla by Mozart and Beethoven, his contemporaries. Bianchi and Inzaghi’s catalogue does not specify in what chronological order Rolla’s pieces were written, nor does it give dates of his compositions. Online access does not allow for any physical analysis that would provide information of the exact time the concerto was written, i.e. watermarks, type of paper, etc. Though this concerto is undoubtedly attributed to Rolla, it is not certain in whose hand this concerto was written, as his manuscripts bear different handwriting styles. However, it is known, according to the date of the edition by André, that the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) was written during or before 1799. The surmised date of this piece falls after the death of

Mozart and at the beginning of Beethoven’s rise to prominence.

Earlier editions of Rolla’s concerti and his other works for viola and orchestra do not sufficiently address stylistic issues. This is especially true for the first modern edition of a Rolla viola work: Rolla’s Concerto in F (BI 550), published in 1970 by Edizione de Santis and edited by Paolo Centurioni.17 For example, issues of the vorschlag appoggiaturas are not directly addressed in any kind of commentary. Additions of bowings and articulations and changes to notes in the solo viola without explanation make the edition by Sydney Beck of Rolla’s Concerto in E-flat, Op. 3 (BI 545), published in 1990 by Rarities of Music inadequate for stylistic study.18 Gems Music Publications offers neither a critical edition nor a performance edition of the Rolla Concerti. These editions are labeled with the word “Urtext,” implying that the edition is true to the original score; however, they do not include critical notes or descriptions of sources, aside from a preface.

Rolla’s increasing popularity is reflected not only in published editions of his music, but also in the number of recordings that have been released since the year 2000. Fabrizio Merlini recorded the Concerto in C (BI 541), the Concerto in D (BI 543), and the Concerto in E-flat (BI 547).19 Victor Nagy has recorded the Concerto in F (BI 550),20 and Massimo Paris uses Sydney Beck’s edition of the Concerto in E-flat, Op. 3 (BI 545) in his recording with I Musici.21 Some of Rolla’s chamber music also has been recorded, mostly under the Italian label Tactus, most

19 Fabrizio Merlino, *Alessandro Rolla: Concerto per viola e archi*, Tactus TC 751804, 2006, CD.
21 Alessandro Rolla, *Viola Concertos*, recorded by Massimo Paris and I Musici, Decca ASIN: B0040JEKXA, 2010, CD.
notably Carlo Barato’s recording with Francesco Lattuada of Rolla’s viola duets. Because audio media can make such a powerful impression in the music industry, a recording of the highest level of playing and artistry is one of the most crucial factors to promote and increase the popularity of a piece new to the listening audience such as the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549).

22 Barato, Carlo and Francesco Lattuada, *Alessandro Rolla: Sei duetti a due viole*. Tactus, TC 751803, 2003, CD.
CHAPTER 2

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Alessandro Rolla was born in 1757 in Pavia, Italy. Rolla’s parents consigned him to
learn music as a trade, as the other options at that time were military service and hard labor. His first teacher was Sampietro, a Kapellmeister at the local cathedral. In 1770, a concert
celebrating the arrival of Duchess Maria Luigia was given in Pavia with musicians from Milan, one of whom was Rolla’s uncle and another the brother of the composer Giovanni Andrea
Fioroni. Due to this connection, Rolla came to study in Milan at the age of 13 with Fioroni as well as violinists Renzi and Giacomo Conti.

Rolla’s first period in Milan was a time of transition, both in his own life and in his
surroundings. His time in Milan coincided with both the death of Giovanni Battista Sammartini and the building and establishment of La Scala Theater in 1778. Rolla participated actively in the musical life of Milan during this time, both in his performances on violin and viola and in composing. His debut in 1772, in which he played his own viola concerto with the elderly Sammartini conducting, was a success and was thought to be the first viola recital ever given. Rolla studied with Fioroni from 1770 until Fioroni died in 1777.

During his twenty years in Parma from 1782-1802, Rolla composed the bulk of his concertos, mainly for violin or viola. In 1782, Rolla was hired as the first violist in the Court

---

23 Bianchi and Inzaghi, 16.
24 Ibid., 16. Sampietro’s full name and name of cathedral are not stated.
25 Ibid., 15.
26 Ibid., 16.
27 It is unknown which of his concertos Rolla played, or if this concerto is included in his catalogue.
28 Ibid., 17. Recounts of the story of his debut say that the people who stood outside the concert mistakenly wanted to know who was singing.
Orchestra of Parma for Duke Ferdinand of Spain and Duchess Maria Amalia, daughter of Empress Maria Theresa from the Habsburg family. Rolla was then made first violin and acting conductor of the orchestra in 1792. During the last ten years in Parma, Rolla conducted sixty operas, mostly Italian, as well as symphonies by those associated with Vienna, including Haydn and Mozart. Rolla’s music reflects the influence of Mozart, and towards the end of his time it also begins to reflect Beethoven.30 In 1796, Napoleon invaded and occupied Parma in his campaign to take over regions occupied by the Habsburg Empire.31 When Duke Ferdinand died in 1802, Rolla returned to Milan.

Rolla met the young Nicolò Paganini in Parma in 1795 and was credited by some as being his teacher, although little evidence supports any pedagogical influence from Rolla to the young Paganini, whose extraordinary gifts are widely known to be self-developed.32 The famous anecdote of thirteen-year-old Paganini playing for Rolla, who was sick in bed, only suggests that Paganini was in no need of a teacher, as Rolla jumped out of bed to tell Paganini that he had nothing to teach him upon listening to the young prodigy. After this famous encounter in Parma, Paganini stayed for two more years and, while he studied composition with someone else, he frequently met with Rolla. Rolla and Paganini continued to correspond and even perform together, and it is likely that Rolla was at times a guiding force in the life of the famous virtuoso. Paganini, near his death in 1840, asked for “news of our great Rolla,” indicating that he thought of him fondly throughout his life.33 Although both Rolla and Paganini explore challenging passagework in their concertos designed to show the mastery of the soloist, Paganini’s writing

30 Ibid., 156.
32 Bianchi and Inzaghi, 20.
33 Ibid., 22.
for the instrument is on a higher level of difficulty and more for the sake of virtuosity and self-expression than within the bounds of the Classical ideals of courtly manners and good taste.

It was the La Scala Theater that brought Rolla back to Milan, where he remained for the remainder of his life. Due to his experience as an opera conductor in Parma, he was appointed to lead the orchestra. The French were in power at this time, and the musical culture had changed from Sammartini’s predominance to the music of the Viennese, retaining Italian opera as an established tradition. Fortunately, the French were patrons of the arts and sought to establish La Scala as the most important orchestra in Italy. Rolla directed operas by Mozart, Rossini, and other Italian masters, as well as symphonies by Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven. Paganini performed with the La Scala Orchestra under Rolla’s direction in 1813. Another notable soloist with La Scala was the violinist Louis Spohr in 1816. Rolla led the orchestra until 1833.

The Milan Conservatory was founded in 1808 with Rolla as its first professor of violin and viola until 1835. Significant from his time at the Milan Conservatory was his interaction with young Verdi in 1832. When Verdi was initially rejected by the conservatory, he sought Rolla’s advice for private musical instruction. After Rolla retired, he held private chamber music parties in which Antonio Bazzini was involved. Bazzini was best known for his Dance of the Goblins, but was also a foremost interpreter and performer of the Mendelssohn Concerto and works for violin by Beethoven.

As a composer, Rolla did not seek to compete in the most important genres of his time:

34 Prefumo. 154.
37 Bianchi and Inzaghi, 27.
38 Ibid, 47.
39 Ibid, 47.
the symphony, the sonata, the string quartet, or the opera. Although he did write sinfonias and string quartets, these pieces have not come to the fore as his music has been recently discovered. He wrote very few sonatas, though his sonatas for violin and pianoforte are discussed at length by Daniel Prefumo. Of his 576 works, chamber music for strings comprises the largest group of his musical works. Almost half of Rolla’s total compositional oeuvre is comprised of duets for two string instruments.

Rolla is a very important composer for the viola because he is the first composer to write for the violin and the viola on an equal level. As the viola has become more of an equal to the violin in the 20th and 21st century, his music has become more popular. His duets for two violas have only recently been discovered and published. Besides his Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), his other viola concertos are being discovered as well and, it is hoped, will be included in the viola canon.

Rolla died in 1841 in Milan. His life extends from the end of the Baroque period to the beginning of the Romantic. He was born in the early days of the Galant, with echoes of the Italian Baroque tradition still lingering. At the peak of his life, he took an active part in the development of Viennese Classicism. Later in his life, he witnessed the innovations of string playing through Paganini and Spohr. By the time he died, Mendelssohn had already begun his violin concerto. Rolla’s long life span gives a unique perspective on the progression of musical style.

CHAPTER 3

STYLISTIC INFLUENCES

Alessandro Rolla’s training came in the midst of many influences marking the transition between the Baroque and the Classical Period. As a result of increasing commerce and travel between Western European nations, different musical traditions and styles began to converge and to influence each other. Though Rolla remained in the same region of Italy all of his life, he was exposed to the changing trends and important composers of his day. In his formative years, the styles and genres that influenced Rolla included the Italian concerto tradition, the composers and style of the early Galant, the Italian and Neopolitan opera tradition, the Milanese style, and the Viennese style.

Pavia, the city of Rolla’s birth and early training, had an active musical culture with a few academies, or centers of musical activity. An opera house, where opera seria had been performed, had closed around the time Rolla was born. Pavia was especially known at the time for its string playing. Rolla’s first teacher was Sampietro, a Kapellmeister at the local cathedral.42 It is unknown from what region he came and what influences he had, as well as how he influenced Rolla’s early education.

Rolla learned the Neopolitan style and tradition from Fioroni, who wrote no concertos or symphonies, but composed mostly sacred music. According to Sven Hansell and Maria Teresa Dellabora, writing for Oxford Music Online, “Fioroni’s sacred music…is characterized by a strict…contrapuntal style and by pleasing melodic lines…. The instrumental music, partly composed before his appointment at Milan Cathedral [in 1747], displays lively imagination and

42 See footnote no. 24.
originality as well as a good knowledge of the instruments for which he was writing.\textsuperscript{43} His pleasing melodic lines and contrapuntal style can both be traced to his study in Naples with Leonardo Leo, one of the leading \textit{opera seria} composers of his day.\textsuperscript{44} Naples became known as a center for defining Italian style, systematically defining a palette of musical gestures that were thought to be in good taste and reflect courtly manners.\textsuperscript{45} Fioroni was also friends with Padre Martini and had worked with J.C. Bach in his brief stint in Milan (1760-1761). An example of Fioroni’s melodic style is shown in Figure 1.\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{FioroniMotetta.png}
\caption{Fioroni, \textit{Motetta a 2 Lux turbato, Tenore e Basso con organo obbligato, I-Md, busta 94, no. 2}}
\end{figure}

Rolla’s Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) reflects in large part Milanese Concerto tradition, which is closely tied to the Viennese tradition, as well as other Italian traditions and composers such as Vivaldi and Corelli. According to Jehoash Hirshberg and Simon McVeigh, the Milanese-Viennese group is the most coherent school of concerto composition between 1700 and 1760 because of their shared characteristics.\textsuperscript{47} Eight of these characteristics of Milanese concertos are defined by Hirshberg and McVeigh as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Almost all concertos are in the major mode, even in the case of Sammartini, almost half of whose overall output was in minor.

Nearly all concertos are in the range between E-flat Major and A Major.

The opening and closing of the ritornello movement feature proportionately long sections in the tonic, while the second ritornello generally starts in the dominant, then modulates to unexpected keys in a largely unstable harmonic process.

The tendency is to move to the dominant as the first major goal.

After moving to the dominant, there is a remarkable diversity among ensuing tonal schemes between concertos.

After the dominant, the tonal structure follows one of two strategies: either a single extended peripheral degree with its own extended tonal area or a succession of two or more peripheral degrees, each held stable for a short duration, or just articulated by a single cadence.

The choice of peripheral degrees features one of two strategies: either a variety of several diatonic degrees, or a reference for iii and vi.

In an unusually high proportion of opening tonic sections in the Milanese repertory, tutti and solo are intermingled, further blurring structural distinctions and emphasizing the lack of correspondence between harmonic and textural functions.  

The Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) follows all of the characteristics given by Hirshberg and McVeigh of the Milanese concerto. The piece is in the key of F Major. The opening ritornello is sixty-five measures long, or almost a quarter of the entire movement. The closing ritornello after the cadenza is nine measures long with three different moods before the end. The first major goal is to the dominant during the first solo section. The second ritornello begins in the dominant and moves to the unexpected key of A-flat, or flat-III.  


49 This harmonic change fulfills another characteristic defined by McVeigh and Hirshberg in The Italian Solo Concerto: 1700-1760; namely, that the Milanese concerto places a high premium on contrast and unexpected changes over continuity and thematic unity. See p. 275.
before the retransition to the dominant. The sections in flat-III and flat-VI are both about sixteen measures with the intermediary step to minor I being a brief transition. The viola solo part does not intermingle with the opening tutti save for a couple of moments with the tutti violas that stand out; the viola solo could be left out during the opening tutti; however, in the third movement rondo, the tutti and solo parts are more intermingled.

The use of ritornello form is what separates Rolla from Mozart and Haydn, whose concertos are more unified in their use of themes and whose form is now known as sonata form. The use of ritornello form reflects the conventions of the Italian concerto and that of Vivaldi in particular. While sonata form uses a head motive, whose function is as a unifying motive for an entire movement, Vivaldian ritornello form uses a motto, which can be changed and alternated throughout the piece. As Simon McVeigh explains:

The various ways in which the motto may be repeated, transformed, or alternated with other important motives... [are some] of the most powerful and sophisticated devices available in ritornello form. The interaction of the recurrent motto with new material creates a dichotomy of unity-versus-diversity that is crucial to the individual trajectory of each ritornello movement. It is thus essential to view reprises of the motto not as static architectural signposts but as stages of a continuous argument.  

Major composers in the Milanese tradition demonstrate the progression and evolution from Vivaldi to the Galant. These composers include Scaccia, Zuccari, and Sammartini. Scaccia (1690-1761) was the first violinist in Milan to publish violin concertos. Sammartini (1700-1775) represents the most important of the Milanese style preceding Rolla’s own career. Figure 2 and Figure 3 show a similarity between a Milanese concerto by Carlo Zuccari (1704-1792) and the

---

50 McVeigh and Hirshberg, *The Italian Solo Concerto*, 12.
Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). In both cases, the first motto in the solo is slightly altered from the tutti, yet retains some relation to the opening motto.

Figure 2: Opening and solo motto in a concerto by Carlo Zuccari, GB-Ckc, Ms. 241

Figure 3: Opening and solo motto of Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549)

Most historians identify Sammartini as the composer who most represents the Milanese style, yet differences exist between his musical style and that of Rolla that suggests that Sammartini was not Rolla’s biggest influence. Sammartini uses short phrases and a stock of musical elements such as dotted rhythms, trills, and triplet figures that are often repeated for effect before cadences, in a way that is somewhat similar to Vivaldi. Rolla’s phrases are longer and based more on forming melodies. There is no evidence that he had contact with Sammartini other than his debut in 1772, though it is likely that Rolla heard many performances of Sammartini’s music during his first period in Milan.

Figure 4: Sammartini Concerto in B-flat, J-C 78.1, 2nd movement, mm. 43-51

52 Bianchi and Inzaghi, 280.
At one time, it was thought that the Galant, or what we now refer to as the Classical Period, was brought about by Haydn and Mozart. Indeed, the style of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) resembles that of Mozart; however, Rolla may have been influenced equally or more by earlier composers of the Galant. According to musicologist Eric Weimer, these predecessors in the transition between rococo and galant were J.C. Bach, Jommelli, and Hasse, who all spent time in Milan. Jommelli and Hasse had formal training in Naples, while J.C. Bach spent his first years of his Italian period there. In their *opera seria*, J.C. Bach and Jommelli used lighter accompanimental textures, slower harmonic rhythm of the galant and varying rhythmic textures to accentuate different sections and key areas. Hasse used the cadential 6/4 chord so commonly used for cadences and cadenzas in the galant in his last opera,

---

54 Gjerdingen, 40, 42.
composed in Milan. The orchestration in support of the soloists for opera seria during this transitional time tended to be strings, oboes, and horns. All of these elements are to be found in the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549).

Though Rolla and J.C. Bach never met in person, several links exist between the two composers that may account for their similarities in style. J.C. Bach spent eight years in Italy and worked alongside Rolla’s teacher Fioroni in 1760-1761. Both Fioroni and J.C. Bach were heavily influenced by the musical culture of Naples and passed along an indirect connection to Rolla. Besides the influence from opera seria on the two composers, there was the connection to Padre Martini, the famed historian and musician. During J.C. Bach’s time in Italy, he met the other composers of note who were important for this transition from the Baroque to the Galant and who lived in Milan, including Hasse, Jommelli, and Sammartini. Except for Sammartini, these composers had also lived in Naples and had tried their hand in writing opera seria. Mozart was aware of these composers by the time he had traveled to Milan in 1770-1773 and had learned the Italian “sweet-singing style” from J.C. Bach. Indeed, one possible explanation for Rolla’s similarity to Mozart is their shared influence by J.C. Bach, Hasse, and Jommelli. The example shown in Figure 5 of J.C. Bach’s keyboard concerto features three voices: a long melodic phrase as the focus of the music, a simple bass line, and an Alberti bass. Rolla used this same model in the accompaniment of the solo line of his Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549).

Figure 5: J.C. Bach, Concerto for Keyboard in B-flat, Op. 1, no. 1, 1st movement, mm. 1-6

After consideration of Rolla’s Italian influences as well as possible influence from composers of the early Galant, it is still clear that there is a strong connection between Rolla and Mozart. Rolla’s connection to Mozart comes from three possible sources. First, Mozart visited Milan three times with his father Leopold between 1770 and 1773. Rolla arrived in 1770 and, though no source definitively states that the two met, it is hard to imagine that Rolla did not have any contact with Mozart in Milan during that time, whether direct or indirect.60 Second, Rolla was asked to conduct the music of the Viennese masters during his time as court musician in Parma following the orders of his Duchess, Maria Amalia, member of the Habsburg family. Rolla held this position from 1782-1802, and it was during this time that most of his concertos were written. It is likely that Maria Amalia had Rolla play and later conduct the music of Mozart and Haydn during Rolla’s time at court.61 Third, Rolla may have come into contact with Mozart’s music through his publisher, Johann André. André’s first publication of Rolla’s works was in 1795, his Duets for Violin and Viola, Op. 1 and Op. 2. The catalogue number of André’s publication of Rolla’s Concerto in E-flat, Op. 3 and Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), Nos. 1428 and 1429, is soon after the number of Mozart’s Concerto for Piano, K. 467 (No. 1420). The

60 See Oxford Music Online, s.v. “Fioroni, Giovanni Andrea.” It is known that the Mozarts met Fioroni in Milan in January of 1770.
61 Prefumo, 154.
theme of this piano concerto is shown in Figure 6, and is quite similar to Rolla’s Concerto for Basset Horn (BI 528) written in 1829, adapted from an earlier bassoon concerto written during his time in Parma (see Figure 7).

Figure 6: Mozart Concerto for Piano, K. 467, mm. 1-4

![Mozart Concerto for Piano](image)

Figure 7: Rolla Concerto for Basset Horn (BI 528), mm. 1-4

![Rolla Concerto for Basset Horn](image)

Rolla’s music is Viennese in style, an assertion agreed upon by different researchers. Bianchi’s analysis of Rolla’s viola duets from 1780-1790 concludes that Rolla’s music had elements of Viennese Classicism, though the melodies were Italian by nature. According to Prefumo, Rolla’s style during his stay in Parma was distinctly Viennese. As stated earlier, Rolla’s Viennese influence comes partially from his employment under Duchess Amalia of Parma, an Austrian. Another larger factor was the exchange between German and Italian musicians during the eighteenth century. According to Heinz Gärtner, German courts tended to

---

62 Ibid., 156.
63 Ibid., 157.
65 Prefumo, 154.
employ Italian musicians, while German musicians often went to Italy for training. These two styles came together in Vienna.

Rolla’s music has similarities with Pugnani, Boccherini, and Viotti. Indeed, Chappell White says in his biographical entry in *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* that Rolla’s music shows French influence; however, it is difficult to prove any influence from these composers over Rolla, or how much he was aware of them, despite similarities in musical style. Rolla was unique among Italian musicians in that he remained in Italy all his life. In contrast, Pugnani, Boccherini, and Viotti all traveled to London, Paris, and other musical centers around Europe. No record exists that Rolla met these other composers, and it is not likely that they met; however, without a doubt they were all influenced from the Italian concerto and *opera seria* traditions.

---


67 *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie, s.v. “Rolla, Alessandro,” 1980. I have found no evidence to support this assertion that Rolla’s music shows French influence, other than musical gestures common to all Western music at this time. This entry was written before the publications of Bianchi and Inzaghi in 1981. Though music was spread throughout Europe via the publishing business by this time, there is more evidence that the Italians influenced the French rather than vice versa.

68 Viotti and Boccherini would have been contemporaries of Rolla, while Pugnani would have been from the previous generation. It is well known that Pugnani was Viotti’s teacher.

69 Prefumo, 153.
The music publishing industry at this time was already well established, which allowed Rolla to study the works of other composers from different parts of Europe. By the second half of the eighteenth century, networks were already in place and newly developed printing techniques such as engraving allowed for more efficient production and distribution. This network included both big cities and smaller towns, in which sheet music was advertised in the local papers. Agents were stationed in different regions under the employment of their publishing company, facilitating composers such as Rolla to send them their compositions and request the music of other composers.

---

71 Ibid., 31.
72 Ibid., 28.
73 Ibid., 30. For example, Paul Wranitzky was the Viennese agent for the publisher André, and it is possible that Rolla had his Concerto, op. 4 published through this connection.
A performance edition of Rolla’s Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) was made based on manuscript sources downloaded from imslp.org and the edition of Johann André (1799). This edition is a performance edition rather than a critical edition for the following reasons. First, the purpose is to make this music available to performers. Second, the sources for this piece have been accessed online or through digital copies. Consequently, source material such as manuscripts, types of paper, etc. was not examined in depth. The focus is instead on stylistic issues. The music was edited to a digital format using the notational software “Finale.” Once finished, this performance edition will be submitted for publication.

The process of making a performance edition is necessarily a compromise between studying performance practice of the time the piece was written and writing for modern instruments. James Grier states that editing is an act of interpretation, and is a balancing act between the authority of the composer and the authority of the editor, dependent on the editor’s critical engagement with the piece and its sources. In addition to study of the copies of the two sources of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), much research has been done as background study to understand the culture, musical trends, and influences surrounding this piece, as well as the instruments Rolla would have had at his disposal. Consequently, this edition will, to a limited extent, be an interpretation of Rolla’s stylistic intentions through his sources for the instruments intended. Nevertheless, this performance edition will be intended for modern instruments using modern performance practice, and interpretive decisions will be subjective. In summary, this edition will approximate for modern instruments the editor’s interpretation of the

intended articulations the composer would have meant for instruments of his period.

The issues encountered in background study of performance practice in Rolla’s time were inconsistencies in sources, articulation, and ornamentation. While inconsistencies in sources are a normal occurrence from any region, the differences in markings in the sources for Rolla’s Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) may be due to a difference in thought for notation. According to Stowell, the Italian style from the Baroque period to the Romantic was “unfettered, capricious, expressive, and virtuoso-like.” These characteristics for Italian style applied not only to playing but also to composing and interpreting a written score. To show the freedom of the Italian style, one may contrast it with the French style, which was very formal and mannered, strictly following the written score, or the German style, which was the median of Italian and French. The French wrote several treatises to define correct style of violin playing and ornamentation; the Italians wrote only one during the same period. Though it is not stated whether or not this Italian tendency for interpretive freedom extended to bowings, it is a reasonable assumption. Leopold Mozart, who was influenced by the Italian masters, states in his treatise that questions about which notes to slur and if they should be slurred are answered by the “cantalina of the piece and on the good taste and sound judgment of the performer, if the composer has forgotten to mark the slurs, or has himself not understood how to do so.” In comparing the manuscript to the André edition, the manuscript has more inconsistencies, some of which the André edition resolves. However, the manuscript seems to be the more reliable

______________________________

76 This treatise is the Elementi Teorico-Pratici di Musica in four volumes by Francesco Galeazzi.
77 Leopold Mozart, A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing, trans. Edith Knocker (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), 83. It should be noted that Leopold Mozart’s Violinschule was not published in Italy. While it is unlikely that L. Mozart was influential in Italy, it is more certain that Mozart was influenced by his travels to Italy. Indeed, L. Mozart quotes Tartini in his treatise. Therefore, Mozart’s treatise largely reflects Italian style.
source in terms of capturing the spirit and style of the piece. The most notable elements missing from the André edition, that are included in the manuscript, are slurs and ties that bind the piece together and suggest the appropriate phrasing and style.

Instrumentation

The first issue to be reconciled in the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) is the instrumentation of the orchestra, which has some unusual features. The original manuscript contains only the following string parts: Violin primo obbligato, Violin secondo obbligato, Viola, and Violoncello obbligato. The André edition lists the orchestral string parts as Violin Primo, Violin Secondo, Viola, and Basso. The “viola” part does not play during the solo sections. The “Viola Principal,” or solo viola, has notes that double the orchestral viola part during all of the tuttis. The instances in which the Viola Principal diverges from the orchestral viola are in the transitions between the tutti and solo sections. For these transitions, the solo viola has a bar of rest, and the notes missing from the solo viola part that are in the orchestral viola part are also in the 2nd violin part. Like the violas, the oboes and horns play only during the tutti sections. Two points to be decided in regards to the instrumentation are the use of double basses and the formation of a separate chamber concerto from the parts marked “obbligato.”

Several arguments can be made against using the double bass in this piece. Because of the open harmonies with wide intervals between voices, the added lower octave of the bass part upsets the balance between registers. The bass line in this concerto often plays or emphasizes the third or the fifth of the harmony rather than the root. Adding the extra octave adds too much emphasis on the weak notes of the harmony. In other concertos during this time in which cello and bass are both specified in the score, the bass line tends to emphasize the root of the chord. An example of voicing harmonies comes in measure 4. The 2nd horn part plays the root of the
dominant chord. With the added bass part playing an octave lower, the fifth of the chord becomes doubly emphasized with the cellos, making the root of the chord weak. Many times the cello/bass part is a moving line, arpeggiating the harmonies. The bass octave adds heaviness and bulk to a line that needs to be light and concise.

Historical precedent exists of scoring the cello without double bass. The first example is the set of keyboard concertos, Op. 1 by J.C. Bach, mentioned in Chapter 3 (see Figure 5). The keyboard concertos, Op. 7 are specifically scored for “two Violins and a Violoncello” in the title page. The three Mozart keyboard concertos, K. 107, all adapted from J.C. Bach sonatas for piano, are scored for two violins and “basso.” According to the Bärenreiter notes on these concertos, “The execution of the ‘Basso’ is more likely to be the cello than the double bass, in view of the transparent chamber music concerto structure. Therefore, the two violin parts in the chamber version should as a rule have only one player each.”

78 If the accompaniment were comprised of the obbligato violins and cello, all voices would be in unison, making ending on the fifth scale degree a non-issue.
79 Johann Christian Bach, A Second Set of Six Concertos for the Harpsichord or Pianoforte, with Accompaniments for Two Violins & a Violoncello, Opera VII. London: Printed by Weleker [ca. 1775]. Merritt Mus 627.3.177.10, accessed March 14, 2014, http://petrucci.mus.auth.gr/imglnks/usimg/8/8a/ IMSLP305112-PMLP163106- Bach__JC_-_A_Second_Sett_of_Six_Concertos__Opera_VII_-_Violoncello-.pdf. See title page. In the Collected Works by Johann Christian Bach, vol. 33, edited by Ernest Warburton, the violoncello parts are listed as “Basso” for all of the keyboard concertos, including op. 1 and op. 7. The editor’s reasons for this listing, and for including the double-bass, are given on pages xii and xiii of the introduction to vol. 33.
The final decision for this edition, however, is to include the double bass in the orchestra for the following reasons. In measures 5 and 6 in the first movement (see Figure 8) and measure 27 in the third movement (see Figure 9), the violas play below the cello part. Because the cellos are playing the root of the chord, it would seem improbable that the violas should be playing the bass line, and more likely that the lower octave provided by the double basses would provide the bass of the chord.\textsuperscript{81} The other reason is that it was so prevalent during this time for the double bass to double the cello part that exceptions must be called into question.

Figure 8: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1\textsuperscript{st} movement, mm. 5-8, performance edition

\textsuperscript{81} In a reading session of the Rolla Concerto held in San Angelo on March 1, 2014, the piece was tried with and without double-basses. Opinion was split between the players as to whether it was better with only cellos or better with double-bass. Each position given by the players echoed the arguments I have stated.
The first movement of Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) functions satisfactorily with either all of the parts or with only the parts marked “obbligato” in the manuscript; therefore, a separate version of the full score as a chamber concerto containing only these parts has been made and is included in Appendix B. As mentioned above, only the two violin parts and violoncello parts are marked “obbligato” in the manuscript. The melodic content and the harmonies in this movement without the oboes, horns, and orchestral viola are complete. The effect is more like a concerto
grosso in the contrast between a larger group and a smaller group of instruments, rather than a contrast between a solo and accompaniment. The other effect of the chamber concerto is that it is simpler and more intimate, free of the added decoration of the horn calls, sustained notes, and reinforcement of the melodic figures in the horns and oboes. Listening to the chamber concerto version through Finale was one of the most fascinating discoveries of this study. The option of presenting Rolla’s Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) as a chamber concerto, as in the decision to score the piece without basses, likely was inspired by J.C. Bach and Mozart. Indeed, there are enough similar chamber concertos that a sub-genre could be adapted to classify them.

The second and third movements of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) do not function well without all of the parts from the full score. The second movement is the only movement in which the orchestral viola is playing while the solo viola is playing. The orchestral viola is important for filling out the harmonies and cannot be left out. In the third movement, the oboes and horns have an important melody line in mm. 16-24 that is answered by the solo viola. The dialogue and melodic balance is lost if a chamber concerto version were to be attempted. For this performance edition, only the first movement will include a chamber concerto score version; the second and third movements will exist only in full orchestral score.

Rolla’s intentions as to a chamber concerto version can only be subject to speculation. One theory is that Rolla originally intended for the entire concerto to exist in both a full and a chamber version, but gave up after the first movement. This theory may explain why the André edition did not use the term “obbligato” for the string parts. Another more likely possibility is that Rolla intended for the first movement to be played as a stand-alone piece. According to Stowell, it was common practice for movements of works to be included in longer performances.

82 Ibid, XIX.
that included a variety of vocal and instrumental music.\textsuperscript{83} As the concertmaster of the court in Parma, Rolla may have arranged the first movement concerto to be played as a chamber concerto in a more intimate venue.

**Pitch and Rhythm Differences between Sources**

The second issue faced in the methodology of creating a performance edition is interpreting differences and abnormalities in pitch and rhythmic values. In the following example, the manuscript of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) differs from the André edition in one note of the second violin part the 4th beat of measure 7 in the first movement. The interpretation of which note was correct was made based on the surrounding harmonies. The E natural in the André edition combines with the other parts in that beat to form a C major chord, dominant of F Major, leading to the tonic in the next

Figure 10: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement: m. 7, 2nd violin part, manuscript

![Figure 10](image)

Figure 11: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement: m. 7, 2nd violin part, André edition

![Figure 11](image)

Figure 12: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement: mm. 5-7, performance edition

measure. The F natural in the manuscript would form a suspended chord without a resolution, or an anticipation of the tonic, neither of which fit the style or standard practice of harmony of the time. Therefore, E natural was chosen for the performance edition. Two differences occur between editions in the 1st violin part of the 3rd movement between measures 84 and 89. In measure 84, the manuscript makes a key change to four flats (key of F minor) but the André edition does not show the key change. In this case, the manuscript is correct because all of the other parts reflect the key change and the absence of a key change would cause a clash between notes. In measure 88 and 89, the André edition adds two 8th notes that the manuscript does not have; the manuscript has rests (See Figures 13 and 14). These notes from the André edition have been included in the performance edition as they make the overall texture more homogeneous.

Several cases exist in which both editions contain the same musical material, but the material is questionable. In measure 115 of the first movement, both editions agree that the solo viola has F-sharp on the 4th beat while the cello plays F-natural throughout the measure, as is shown in Figure 15. Because the viola is an independent voice, the

Figure 13: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 88-89, 1st violin part, manuscript
false relation does not clash but rather sounds like a note that stands out from the soft texture of the strings sustaining the chord. In the performance edition, the note has been left alone.\textsuperscript{84} In measure 28 of the 3rd movement, all orchestral parts except for the viola contain an eighth note on the downbeat. The viola part has a quarter note in both editions, as is shown in Figure 16 and 17. Because there is no musical reason for the orchestral viola to sustain the note longer, the value has been changed to an eighth note to

\textsuperscript{84} However, if a piano part were to be made, the last beat in the accompaniment should be made F-sharp. Because of the percussive nature of the piano, an F-natural in the piano would clash too much against the viola part.
match the other parts (see Figure 18). Finally, the second theme of the first movement contains the same musical material in both editions in the exposition and recapitulation. However, the melody is not consistent throughout the movement, raising the question of whether or not the inconsistencies are intentional. In measure 42 of the first occurrence of the melody in the opening ritornello (see Figure 19), the melodic phrase drops to the leading tone, then raises up a
sixth to the highest note (hereby called Fragment $a$), but in the consequent phrase in measure 46, the line drops to the second scale degree of the melody and raises up a 4th (hereby called Fragment $b$). In the statement of the 2nd theme going to the dominant in the solo viola in measures 91-98, the melodic line uses

Figure 19: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, 1st violin part, mm. 41-47, manuscript

Fragment $a$ in both the antecedent and consequent phrase (see Figure 20). In the recapitulation in measures 239-246, the line uses Fragment $b$ in both the antecedent and consequent phrase (see Figure 21).

Figure 20: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, solo viola part, mm. 91-93, manuscript (treble clef), Fragment $a$

Figure 21: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, solo viola part, mm. 239-241, manuscript (treble clef), Fragment $b$

A possible solution to the discrepancy in the melody of the second theme would be to make the melody the same in all occurrences. If this solution were applied, then Fragment $a$ would be used because the leading tone of the melody provides more melodic balance in contour and avoids the redundancy of repeating the second scale degree. In this edition, however, the melody has been left as is from the two sources for the following reasons: 1) It is possible Rolla intended for the symmetry between the contrasting versions of the melody, as foreshadowed in the opening ritornello, 2) The statement of the second theme in the recapitulation is in a much
higher register, and the diminished range of the melody in Fragment b gives the melody a charming miniature quality, and 3) Both sources, the manuscript and the André edition, are consistent, and not enough evidence exists to change what was written.

Ornamentation

The ornaments in the two sources of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) are subject to a wide degree of interpretation owing to the general notation of the manuscript, inconsistencies between sources, and the common practices of the time in applying ornaments. Though many treatises were written at this time in different parts of Europe attempting to define, codify, and standardize ornament notation and practice, no universal standard was established. In addition, the haste and negligence of composers and copyists compounded the challenge of interpretation for less experienced musicians, as well as for musicians today. Theorists often disagreed among themselves, and even when their treatises agreed with each other, they did not necessarily agree with the practices of composer and performers. In many cases, theorists and composers deferred to experienced performers to follow their own taste in interpreting ornaments. Treatises at the time are therefore valuable for studying trends but are not wholly reliable to apply as a rule to all music. Frederick Neumann advocates basing interpretive choices of Classical-era works on musical context in addition to the literal notation of the composer and scholarly knowledge of the theorists of the time.

This tenuous relationship between treatises and performance practice is especially present in Italian music from this time. Most of the treatises written in the latter half of the eighteenth century

86 Brown, 467.
87 Brown, 462, 497.
century were written in France and modern-day Germany; Italy had comparatively few. Robin Stowell writes, “Italians were expected to use their own judgment in using, adding, and interpreting ornaments.”

Several issues complicate the interpretation and notation of appoggiaturas and grace notes, or what Neumann refers to as the German term Vorschläge. The first is the adaptation of the acciaccatura to signify a grace note. The acciaccatura originally was a special ornament that was “crushed together” with the principal note and was marked with a diagonal slash through the flag. By the end of the eighteenth century, the acciaccatura came to mean the same as the short appoggiatura. Some confusion exists in notating a slashed note, however, because Italian music also marked short appoggiaturas as 16th notes with a perpendicular slash (see Figure 22). The second issue is differentiating between a grace note, a short appoggiatura, and a long appoggiatura. Leopold Mozart, who studied largely in Italy, recommends that the short appoggiatura be played as rapidly as possible, suggesting that his concept of the short appoggiatura is that of a grace note. Leopold Mozart had two categories for the “long appoggiatura,” one of which is synonymous with the definitions by Türk, C. P. E. Bach, and others as the short appoggiatura, which takes up half the value of the following principal note in a binary rhythm. The other category, defined by others as a “long appoggiatura” and characterized as an ornamental note longer than half the value of the following principal note, is not used in the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549).

---

89 Stowell, The Early Violin and Viola, 85.
90 Neumann, Performance Practices, 313.
92 Leopold Mozart, 171.
93 Ibid, 167.
Italian trills from this time period have several tendencies that differentiate them from those advocated by northern Germans such as C. P. E. Bach. They were historically main-note trills from early trill models to Padre Martini. Conditions exist, however, when these trills would begin on the auxiliary note, most commonly at cadences. In some cases, a vorschlag was added to specify the trill beginning on the auxiliary note, as Padre Martini likely conceived. Neumann suggests that trills be chosen to start on the main note or the auxiliary based on which note doesn’t impede the melodic line. Many musicians employed the use of nachschläge (or turn) at the end of a trill, and many theorists called for a turn as a matter of course. In Italy, the use of a turn or nachschläge at the end of the trill may stem from the gruppo, an early Italian trill whose alternations were slower and more sharply articulated and ended with a turn of four notes.

Italian music at this time did not have a symbol for a mordent; the use of the mordent sign has therefore been avoided in the performance edition. The Italian theorists and composers seem to differ over the use and notation of a mordent. Tartini uses the term for two different ornaments: the turn, and the common mordent. Scarlatti used both the mordent and the trill

---

95 Ibid, 400.
98 Neuman, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart*, 113.
99 Brown, 498.
101 Ibid, 314, 462.
102 Ibid, 462.
symbol interchangeably. Mozart occasionally used a *chevron* with two “waggles,” as Neumann describes them. This sign looks like the mordent symbol and was a sign for a short trill. Mozart uses a “tr” symbol followed by a wavy line indicating sustained alternations for a long trill. These two symbols, shown in Figures 23 and 24, are similar to the symbols found in the manuscript of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). The term “Italian mordent” is used to describe a written out figure with a lower neighbor, usually two sixteenth notes followed by an eighth note, preceded by a grace-note upper neighbor.

Figure 23: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, m. 117, solo viola, manuscript

Figure 24: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, m. 3, solo viola, manuscript

In this performance edition, grace notes will be marked with a slash and appoggiaturas will be without. An example showing the difference in notation and execution between grace notes and appoggiaturas from the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) is measures 27 to 29 in the 1st Violin part (see Figure 25). In measure 27, the violins are playing an Italian mordent described in the previous paragraph, so the ornamental notes must be pre-beat grace notes marked with a slash. In measure 28, the ornament on the fourth beat is an appoggiatura taking one-half the value of the following eighth note, equalizing the notes in the figure. This note has no slash.

103 Ibid, 463.
104 Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart*, 113.
The trills used in the performance edition of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) will be main-note trills unless otherwise specified by a grace note. Upper-note trills with the added grace note will be cadential or cadential-type trills, usually occurring at the end of the exposition or recapitulation. An example is in passage between measures 116 and 124 in the solo viola (see Figure 26). Both are cadential-type trills though the first one is formally deceptive and does not provide a final ending of the section; the second trill does. In both the manuscript and the André edition, the trills are marked but without a *vorschlag* of any kind. A grace note has been added in the performance edition to begin the trill on the upper note, or even with an appoggiatura according the wishes of the performer.

In the same example, *nachschläge* have been added to the trill in measure 123. As with the grace note at the beginning of the trill, the turn is not included in the manuscript or the André edition but has been included in the performance edition so as to avoid ambiguity. However, no *nachschläge* have been added to the trill in measure 117. The trill is part of a formally deceptive cadence and resolves not on the tonic but on the mediant. An
added turn would distract from the gesture of the next measure, and the absence of the turn sustains the trill, maintaining a feeling of suspense that is deserved because of the deceptive nature of the trill. The turn at the end of the trill in measure 123 provides more of a sense of finality.

The example in measure 162 (see Figures 27-29) is another instance for adding nachschläge, albeit for different reasons. The ornamented note is marked in the manuscript with a short trill; in the André there is no marking. Because the ornamented note is repeated from the previous note and is going to the same note as the auxiliary of the trill, the added turn with the lower neighbor adds some variety. The turn also creates more energy leading to the following note, which is held longer in a dotted rhythm before resolution. The trill symbol is used in the performance edition in accordance with the concept that a trill may have as few as one or two alternations, or what Neumann calls the Schneller. Brown points out, however, that a short trill with nachschläge and a note marked with a turn symbol will sound the same, and the symbols are used interchangeably. Because Rolla did not employ the sign of the turn in his music, the trill sign is used in this performance edition.

Figure 27: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 162-163, solo viola, manuscript

Figure 28: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 162-163, solo viola, André edition

106 Neumann, Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart, 129.
107 Brown, 509.
The opening melody of the last movement of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) offers more examples of discerning whether or not to add *nachschläge* (see Figures 30-32). Trills in the manuscript have been marked with a short trill symbol in measures 3, 6, and 7. In the André edition, the trills in measures 3 and 7 have been marked with a trill symbol; the downbeat of measure 6 has no ornament. The performance edition has included all three of the trills. Turns have been added to the ends of the trills in measures 3 and 7, but not in measure 6.

The reasoning for the trill in measure 3 is similar to the earlier example of measure 162 from the first movement: the note is repeated from the previous note, leading up a step to the following note. The *nachschläge* in measure 7 provide a sense of finality at the end of the phrase. Because the trill in measure 6 is followed by two sixteenth notes, any added notes would distract from melody and create unnecessary motion.
Articulation and Bowing

Articulation, like other aspects of musicality and notation from the end of the eighteenth century, was often not notated very specifically. According to Clive Brown, articulation was largely expected “to be provided by the performer on the basis of experience and musicality.” Brown identifies two functions: structural, in articulating phrases and sections; and expressive, to “vivify” a musical idea. An example where a performer’s judgment might be applied in the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) to fulfill these functions of articulation is the opening viola solo in measures mm. 66-73 (see Figure 33). The eighth notes in measure 67 are not marked with dots, yet a staccato stroke would be appropriate here for articulation and character. The quarter notes in measure 68 are slightly separated to articulate the change of register. In measure 69, the eighth notes, while still separated, are a little longer and more connected. In measures 70 and 71, the second note of the slur is short and released. The eighth notes at the end

---

of measure are short, but the analogous eighth notes in the next measure are longer and legato to announce the coming of the end of the phrase. All of these articulations are according to the taste and judgment of the performer.

Figure 33: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), mm. 66-73, solo viola, performance edition

Instances of dots marked in the manuscript of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) are rare: three passages in the exposition and their counterparts in the recapitulation. In the passage from mm. 91-96, the second theme (see Figure 34, also shown in Figure 20), dots are marked at the beginning of the melody at the end of measure 91 leading to the downbeat, but are not marked again until measure 95 in the analogous part of the phrase. Brown gives two possible explanations for this notation: 1) In some cases, staccato marks were made simply to discourage the use of slurs, and 2) Composers from this time period sometimes included a few staccato marks at the beginning of the passage implying that the rest of the passage would be played likewise, though this practice was more often used for passages of relatively fast-moving notes. It is possible that if the staccato marks were made to discourage the use of slurs then the notes might have been intended to be played longer; however, the editor recommends the staccato notes be played short to give the second theme a contrasting character from the opening viola melody, and that the marked dots be applied in some degree to the rest of the passage,

110 In the exposition, the measures containing notes with dots in the manuscript are m. 82, 84; mm. 91, 95, mm. 110, 112, and 114. In the recapitulation, the passages are mm. 230, 232; 239 (slur with dots); and mm. 258, 260, and 262.
when appropriate.

Figure 34: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), mm. 91-96, solo viola, manuscript

The second theme’s appearance in the recapitulation poses a different problem (see Figure 35). In this case, the eighth notes leading into measure 240 are marked slurred and staccato, the difference from the previous instance being the slur. It is inherent in the notation that Rolla is intending a different sound in the recapitulation than in the exposition, and the use of the slur seems to suggest that the notes will be slightly more connected, if still articulated. The contrasting character of this passage in the recapitulation from the one in the exposition has already been discussed earlier in this chapter. The miniature range of this passage, along with the higher register, suggests a character that is gentler and more innocent, rather than the more boisterous character of the second theme in the exposition. The performance edition will retain the slurred staccato of measure 239 and apply the same articulation to the last three eighth notes of measure 243. The editor suggests more of a portato than a lifted or sharply articulated stroke for the slurred staccato.

Figure 35: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), mm. 239-244, solo viola, manuscript

In applying bowings to this edition, the editor will follow the general down-bow principle advocated by Leopold Mozart and Lully for feasibility. 112 In some cases, slurs must be added to

---

112 Leopold Mozart, 74, 83. The down-bow principle is that downbeats generally begin with down-bows, upbeats with up-bows. Lully’s description is found in Frederick Neumann, *Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 209.
accommodate this principle, a practice that was done in the era of this composition. An example of adding slurs to accommodate this down-bow principle in the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) is in measures 247-250. The manuscript has slurs in measure 247 that shape the phrase of the passagework (see Figure 36), but they would cause the performer to play measure 248 and 249 with up-bows on strong beats. A slur has been added on the fourth beat of measure 247 with a dash signifying a slight articulation that is still feasible within the tempo. In measures 249 and 250, no slur was added on the fourth beat of measure 249, but a slur was added on the downbeat of measure 250, which both reflects the original articulation and adds variety to this repeated figure (see Figure 37).

Figure 36: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 247-250, solo viola, manuscript

![Figure 36: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 247-250, solo viola, manuscript](image)

Figure 37: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 247-250, solo viola, performance edition

![Figure 37: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 247-250, solo viola, performance edition](image)

In some instances, slurs will be added in the performance edition where there is no evidence that they were present from the manuscript or the André edition, for the sake of bowing feasibility. One example is the bariolage pattern found in numerous places in both the first and third movements. The passages from the manuscript and the André edition are shown in Figures 38 and 39. For each of these passages, slurs will be added on the first two and last two

---

notes of each pattern that begins with a bass note (see Figure 41). Precedence exists for this type of bowing in Mozart’s *Symphony Concertante*, K. 364. The example shown from measures 326-27 of the first movement in the solo viola part shows slurs on the first two notes of the pattern, though not the last two (see Figure 40).\(^{115}\) The slurs on the last two notes of each pattern are added in both the Peters and International editions of this piece.

**Figure 38:** Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 104-5, solo viola, manuscript

![Figure 38](image)

**Figure 39:** Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 104-5, solo viola, André edition

![Figure 39](image)

**Figure 40:** Mozart *Symphony Concertante*, K. 364, 1st movement, mm. 326-27, viola

![Figure 40](image)

**Figure 41:** Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 104-5, solo viola, performance edition

![Figure 41](image)

\(^{115}\) Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *Symphony Concertante, Neue Ausgabe Sämtliche Werke*, Series 5, Workgroup 14, Vol. 2 (Kassel: Bärenreiter 1964), 87. The slurs on the last two notes of each pattern are added in both the Peters and International editions of this piece.
The passages in the opening principal theme of the third movement rondo in measures 16-22 and its recurrence in the digression in measures 199-205, present challenges owing to the variety of slurs marked in a few of the parts. The parts that are marked with slurs and articulation markings are all listed below in Figures 42-47. The remainder of the parts that have this melody are unmarked. The articulation that is most

Figure 42: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 199-205, 1st Violin, manuscript

Figure 43: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 199-205, 2nd Violin, manuscript

Figure 44: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 16-22, 1st Oboe, manuscript

Figure 45: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 199-205, 1st Oboe, André edition

Figure 46: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 199-205, 1st Violin, André edition

Figure 47: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 199-205, 2nd Violin, André edition
consistently marked is in measures 16-18 in the 1st Oboe. It is quite possible that the longer slurs found in the 2nd Violin part in measures 199-201 were used or that a variety of slurs and articulations were used for contrast; however, the performance edition will employ the articulation of slurring two notes used in the 1st Oboe and apply this articulation to each similar passage (see Figure 48).

Figure 48: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 3rd movement, mm. 199-205, 1st Violin, performance edition

In the performance edition, the bowings are marked for the modern performer to interpret according to modern practices in order to approximate the articulation and sound implied in the manuscript and André edition. When the bowing is hooked, two up-bows will be marked, with or without dots. This marking allows the performer to interpret the articulation according to musical context rather than by added dots not present in the original sources. Though performance editions often tend to leave some interpretive room for the performer as far as bowings are concerned, this performance edition has addressed any bowings in question according to the modern principle that bowing should be uniform.

The type of bow Rolla would have used has some bearing on what kind of sound and articulation Rolla would have expected to hear in his piece. However, it is unclear what type of bow Rolla used. His Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) was written during the time of transition to the Tourte bow, which, according to Stowell, occurred during the 1780s and 1790s and was
standardized by 1800. Stowell states, “the advent of the Tourte bow shifted the emphasis away from the articulated strokes, subtle nuances and delayed attack of most mid-eighteenth-century models to a more sonorous, smoother cantabile style advocated by Viotti and his school, with the added capability of… sforzando effects, accented bowings and off-the-string strokes.” There are several reasons to suppose that Rolla used a pre-Tourte bow. The first is the nature of his musical writing for strings and for solo viola. It should be noted that there are no accents or sforzandos in the piece. Stowell writes “the natural stroke of most pre-Tourte bows was of an articulated, non-legato character.” This kind of stroke matches the character of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). A second reason is found in Galeazzi’s treatise from 1796, three years before this concerto was published. A picture of a bow hold from this treatise clearly shows a pre-Tourte bow that is slightly convex in shape. One can only make assumptions as to the popularity and availability of Tourte bows in Italy in the late 1790s, but this photo suggests the possibility that the Tourte bow had not yet reached Italy. On the other hand, Galeazzi’s treatise may only suggest that most but not all players used Tourte bows by the late eighteenth century. Following Stowell’s recommendation that the Tourte bow was standardized by 1800, one can assume that Rolla used this type of bow by the time his Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) was published in 1799. In any case, André’s lack of markings may suggest that his edition was intended for string players who used more than one bow type.

Assuming a Tourte bow was used, considerable debate still exists over what type of bow strokes were used during this period when the Viotti School came to prominence. Brown argues

116 Stowell, 42, 46.
117 Ibid., 78-79.
118 Ibid., 94.
in regards to the development of the Tourte bow that the “principal factors in the bow’s evolution were a search for greater volume and power and the achievement of a more effective cantabile.” He also states that in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries “there is nothing in the literature of the period to suggest that springing or thrown strokes in the middle or lower half of the bow were normally used for faster-moving notes with staccato marks.” The types of bowings in question were first developed by William Cramer, both with his own type of pre-Tourte transitional bow and with Tourte bows. According to Brown, the style of playing with springing bowings spread rapidly in the 1770s and influenced many younger players but had become regarded as “unfashionable and tasteless” by the early years of the nineteenth century.

It is unclear whether or not Rolla was influenced by the Viotti school. As was stated in Chapter 3, no record exists or any meeting or correspondence between Rolla and Viotti, and Rolla did not travel outside of Italy during his lifetime. One of Viotti’s main proponents, Rodolphe Kreutzer, did travel to northern Italy from 1794-1796, where he is said to have impressed Paganini, and Vienna from 1796-1798. It is not known whether or not Rolla and Kreutzer had any contact, or whether Rolla was influenced by Kreutzer’s playing style in any way. According to Brown, Antonio Lulli (1730-1802) and other Italian violinists “evidently cultivated a lighter and more flexible bowing technique, though they still emphasized the singing qualities of the instrument and do not seem to have adopted the half-bouncing Cramer

120 Brown, Classical and Romantic Performing Practice, 262.
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bowstroke.” Rolla’s use of slurred staccato in measure 239 (see Figure 49) suggests either possible influence from Viotti and the Parisian school, or a common influence from Tartini.

Figure 49: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4, (BI 549) 1st movement, mm. 239-240, solo viola, manuscript

Enough evidence exists to argue that Rolla may have used springing bowings and intended their use in his Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549); Brown’s statement that “there is nothing in the literature to suggest… springing or thrown strokes… were normally used” does leave room for argument and context. Rolla remained in Italy all his life; in being separate from the French or Parisian school, he may have been outside of their influence. One connection that suggests Rolla would have used springing bowstrokes in his compositions is his influence by Beethoven. Rolla very likely gained access to his Sonatas for Violin and Piano, Op. 12, which were published in 1798, around the time the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) was written. Although some players thought it unacceptable to use springing bowstrokes in any compositions from the Classical period, many passages in Beethoven’s sonatas (see Figure 50) and his Violin Concerto in D, Op. 61 seem to call for them. Indeed, the Beethoven violin concerto was written for and first performed by Franz Clement (1780-1842), who did not adopt the Parisian style of playing but continued to use springing bowstrokes. A look at Clement’s Concerto in
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124 Brown, Classical and Romantic Performing Practice, 278.
125 Prefumo, 161. Rolla later published his own set of three sonatas for violin and piano in 1811 which bear much influence from Beethoven, as do many of his later works.
126 Joachim had this notion after studying with Joseph Boehm, who had worked with Beethoven in the 1820s; although he saw no objection to their use in virtuoso music and mastered them after practicing Paganini’s caprices. See Brown, “Polarities of Virtuosity in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century.”
D (1805) reveals some striking similarities to Rolla’s Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), particularly in their use of virtuosic passagework (see Figure 48).¹²⁹

Figure 50: Beethoven Sonata no. 9 in A Major, Op. 47 "Kreutzer," 2nd movement, mm. 82-90

Though it is more likely that Clement would have been influenced by Rolla than *vice versa*, these similarities suggest that both composers had a similar style of the use of the bow in mind.

Figure 51: Franz Clement Violin Concerto in D (1805)

---

¹²⁹ Ibid, 35.
Perhaps most significant in exploring Rolla’s use of springing bowings is Rolla’s relationship to Paganini, discussed in Chapter 2. Paganini, like Rolla, spent much of his career in Italy; as a result, he was not under the influence of Viotti or the Parisian school, but was largely self-taught. When he first concertized abroad in 1828, Carl Guhr said of him, “He knows how to bring effects out of his instrument of which no-one had any notion until now, and for which words fail to give any idea of what one has heard.” As Stowell explains, “Paganini tapped the full extent of the contemporary repertory of bowings in his compositions, as the range of strokes, for example, in his caprices testifies.

While lacking the varied shadings of Viotti, he exploited the more virtuosic bowstrokes, especially ‘spring’ bowings, in far greater concentration than before.” Though many dispute that Rolla had any great influence on Paganini from or after their initial famed encounter, the meeting seems to have inspired Paganini. According to Cécile Reynaud, “The transition from the early works of Paganini, composed after his lessons in Parma with Alessandro Rolla, is of particular interest. Back in Genoa, Paganini wrote his first test for the violin: the music was so difficult, he had to solve problems unthinkable to other violinists.” This source of inspiration suggests the possibility that springing bowings were among the many techniques Paganini

---

132 Tatiana Berford in her article, “Alessandro Rolla e Niccolò Paganini : il maestro e l'allievo,” in Paganini divo e comunicatore: atti del convegno internazionale: Genova, 3-5 Dicembre 2004 (Genova: SerRI international, 2007) supports the accepted view of today that Rolla did not have much influence on Paganini, but suggests the idea that Paganini was interested in the playing of Viotti and calls for further discussion on this topic.
133 Cécile Reynaud, “François-Joseph Fétis et Paganini,” in Nicolò Paganini: Diabolus in Musica, ed. Andrea Barizza and Fulvia Morabito (Brepols: Publications of the Centro Studi Opera Omnia Luigi Boccherini, 2010), 333. The original text reads as follows: “Le passage sur les premières œuvres de Paganini composées après ses leçons à Parme avec Alessandro Rolla est d'un intérêt particulier: Retour à Gênes, Paganini a écrit son premier test pour le violon: la musique était si fort, qu'il avait à l'étude elle-même, et de faire des efforts constants pour résoudre inconnu à tous les autres problèmes de violonistes.”
looked to “solve” after his meeting with Rolla, and that Rolla himself employed these types of bowstrokes.\textsuperscript{134}

The editor recommends that a range of bowstrokes be used in the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). In some passages, springing bowstrokes such as spiccato or sautillé provide clear articulation and a lighter character. In other passages, a stroke that is more on the string gives a more flexible and singing character. Either kind would be appropriate to Italian tradition, and in keeping with both its lyrical and flexible character. As the performance edition will not specify what stroke is appropriate, the performer is free to choose different shadings of articulation and the bowstrokes to accomplish them, both in passages marked with staccato dots and without them.

The relatively few passages where dots have been added in the performance edition fall into two main categories. The first is that of dotted rhythms; in order to call for hooked bowings, the editor has added a dash on the dotted eighth notes and a dot on the sixteenth notes (for example in measure 98 of the solo viola; see Figure 52). The

Figure 52: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, m. 98, solo viola, performance edition

second category is in the aforementioned melody from measures 91-98. Dots have been added in measure 94 (see Figure 53) because of the printed dots in measure 91, implying dots for the entire passage. The analogous passage in the recapitulation where dots have also been added is in measure 242.

\textsuperscript{134} A more detailed discussion of the relationship between Rolla and Paganini in playing technique and composition for the viola is found in Luigi Alberto Bianchi, “Il Virtuosismo Violistico nell’opera di Rolla e Paganini,” \textit{Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana} 9 (1975): 10-34.
Dashes have also been added with slurs to call for a portato style of bowing, mainly for feasibility and to keep bowings in accordance with the down-bow principle. The passage in the development from measures 156 to 184 has many examples of added portatos because of the lyrical character and exotic key centers of this section of the piece. When two dashes are present within a slur as in measure 166 (see Figure 54), the notes are slightly more disconnected than when only one dash is present, as in measures 168 and 169 (see Figure 55).

Dynamics

The dynamics used in Rolla’s time are a slightly different system than the modern system of dynamics used today. The manuscript includes such dynamics as forte, fortissimo, piano, pianissimo, sforzando, fortepiano, rinforzando, and in a few instances, crescendo. No transitional dynamics such as mezzo piano or mezzo forte are used, nor are any accents used for
articulation. The following examples are instances of a written crescendo in the Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). In measures 139-141 of the first movement, during the orchestral tutti following the exposition, the solo viola and first violin part has what appears to be “cre[„]” or “crescendo” (see Figures 56-58). In the André edition, the part is simply marked with a standard “cresc” (see Figure 59).

Figure 56: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 139-142, solo viola, manuscript

Figure 57: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) 1st movement, mm. 140-142, 1st violin, manuscript

Figure 58: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), enlarged "crescendo" sign, manuscript

Figure 59: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 1st movement, mm. 139-142, solo viola, André edition

In addition to the crescendo sign to indicate an increase in volume, the manuscript also
employed the use of the term *rinforzando*. The term is shown in Figure 60 and 61 in its full and abbreviated form. According to violist and Rolla scholar Carlo Barato, *rinforzando* means “reinforcing or strengthening.”¹³⁵ A look at the second movement

Figure 60: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 2nd movement, m. 18, 1st violin, *rinforzando* marking, manuscript

Figure 61: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 2nd movement, m. 18, 1st violin, more abbreviated *rinforzando* marking, manuscript

reveals two ways this term is applied in the manuscript. In measures 9 and 10, the term implies a crescendo. The first violin part is marked pianissimo in measure 9 followed by a *rinforzando* (see Figure 62); the viola and violoncello parts are marked simply piano in measure 9 and forte in measure 10. In measure 18, the term is used in the first violin part, which has a one-measure interlude between the solo viola phrases (see Figure 63); the purpose is that the first violins will play a little stronger in this measure to fill the gap. In

Figure 62: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 2nd movement, mm. 9-10, 1st violin, manuscript

¹³⁵ Carlo Barato, Facebook conversation with author, September 12, 2014.
this case, the interpretation might be simply playing the passage somewhat louder, or playing
with a slight crescendo and diminuendo over the course of the measure. The performance edition
will use the term “crescendo” in measure 10 in all parts, in order to make the dynamics uniform
(see Figure 64). In measure 18, the term *rinforzando* will be retained, but applied to all parts
(see Figure 65).
Figure 65: Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), 2nd movement, mm. 17-19, score, performance edition
Dynamics in the solo viola part of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) are marked sparingly for several reasons. According to Brown, they were largely left to the discretion of the performer.\footnote{Brown, \textit{Classical and Romantic Performing Practice}, 59.} The performer’s execution of dynamics and dynamic shading “depended on their recognition of the phrase structure of the music, its character, and so on.”\footnote{Ibid, 59.} For soloists of this time, additional dynamics and shading “in accordance with well established traditions” was an important element in how playing was judged.\footnote{Ibid, 60.}

The wind parts of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) are also missing dynamics in a few places. One reason dynamics are left out of the wind parts may be that considerations were given to the performance space; in other words, the performance space may have determined how loud the wind players were to play to balance the rest of the orchestra.\footnote{Neumann, \textit{Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries}, 173.}

Consideration to the practices of adding dynamics in both “Urtext” and non-Urtext performance editions of today has been given in order to determine the method in the performance edition of the Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549). A comparison to Bärenreiter editions of Mozart violin concertos, in which the solo part was also marked sparingly with dynamics, reveals that the edition only very rarely added any in parentheses, though there are likely places in the score in which the soloist would add dynamic shadings and contrasts in performance. In editions that do not profess to be “Urtext” such as the International edition, dynamics are added more frequently, including transitional dynamics, but still in parentheses. In the performance edition, dynamics will be added in parentheses when necessary in the orchestra parts for the purpose of uniformity, especially in passages in which the dynamics may have been different between parts or dynamics are missing. In the solo viola part, dynamics in parentheses

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item Brown, \textit{Classical and Romantic Performing Practice}, 59.
  \item Ibid, 59.
  \item Ibid, 60.
  \item Neumann, \textit{Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries}, 173.
\end{itemize}
will be added in places that are structurally important, such as the beginning of the exposition or of the development.

Cadenzas and Eingänge

The performance edition will follow the standard procedure for cadenzas within the classical period. Fermatas are marked in measure 280 of the first movement and measure 41 of the second movement where a cadenza is appropriate. A cadenza for the first movement has been written out by the editor and will be performed with the concerto and included in Appendix C. In the third movement rondo, a short eingang is suggested in measure 215 to retransition to the rondo theme.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, the purpose of this study is to create a performance edition of the Concerto in F, op. 4 (BI 549) by Alessandro Rolla to add to the standard viola repertoire. A background study of Rolla’s life, historical importance, and stylistic influences was conducted. The two sources used were a manuscript provided by the Verdi Library in Milan and an edition by Johann André from Offenbach in 1799, provided by Westfälische Wilhelms University in Münster, Germany. The solo and orchestral parts from these sources have been compiled to create a full score. The performance edition was made using the musical notation Finale®.

Rolla’s historical importance lies in his career as a violinist, violist, teacher, conductor, and composer. At the time Rolla composed his Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549), he served as concertmaster in the court orchestra of Maria Amalia, one of the descendants of the Habsburg family. He was one of the first conductors of the Orchestra of La Scala as well as one of the founding teachers of the Milan Conservatory. Rolla is credited as being an influence in the life of Paganini, Bazzini, and Giuseppe Verdi. In studying the stylistic influences of Rolla’s music, it is found that Rolla’s music was influenced not only by the Viennese composers Mozart and Haydn, but also by Johann Christian Bach, G.B. Sammartini, the Milanese tradition, the Italian solo concerto tradition, and the Italian opera tradition.

The Rolla Concerto in F, Op. 4 (BI 549) first movement functions both with a full orchestra and with a chamber orchestra with two violins and cello accompanying the solo viola. Both versions have been included in the performance edition. Differences between the manuscript and the André edition in terms of pitch and rhythmic values have been arbitrated by reasons of musical context. As the notational and performance practice of the time left more
freedom for the performer, markings have been added when necessary for clarity for ornamentation, articulation and bowing, and dynamics.

This performance edition is intended for modern instruments. It does not contain a critical report and is not intended to reflect Rolla’s original or intended markings. The choices made in editing the performance edition were to a degree subjective; however, the edition was created after careful study of the two existing sources of the Rolla Concerto from the time it was written, and was intended to approximate the style and character of the piece. This concerto is an important addition to the viola repertoire because of the era in which it was written as well as the technical and stylistic demands on the soloist. It is my hope this concerto will obtain a place in the standard viola repertoire and will be used by teachers, students, soloists, and professionals worldwide.
APPENDIX A

PERFORMANCE EDITION OF ROLLA CONCERTO IN F, OP. 4 (BI 549)
III. Allegretto

III.
APPENDIX B

CHAMBER CONCERTO VERSION OF ROLLA CONCERTO IN F, OP. 4 (BI 549), 1ST MOVEMENT
Concerto in F, op. 4 (Bl. 549)

195
Vla.  
Vln. I  
Vln. II  
Vc.

197
Vla.  
Vln. I  
Vln. II  
Vc.

FOR REVIEW ONLY

FOR REVIEW ONLY
Concerto in F, op. 4 (Bl 549)
APPENDIX C

CADENZA FOR ROLLA CONCERTO IN F, OP. 4 (BI 549), 1ST MOVEMENT
Rolla Concerto, op. 4, 1st mvt.
Cadenza
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