

geförderten Gattung der ‘tragédie en musique’). Letztlich stellen die Epen des 17. Jahrhunderts mit ihrer Vertextung von Geschichte(n) des christlichen Mittelalters einen problematischen Versuch dar, angesichts dieses Grundproblems einen Ausweg zu nehmen.

Giorgetto Giorgi ist ein sehr verdienstvoller Band gelungen, der in umfassender Weise einen Textverbund leicht zugänglich macht, der bislang sehr disparat ediert war. Die Kommentierung ist nützlich, fällt allerdings an manchen Stellen etwas uneinheitlich aus: Manche Seiten werden nur sparsam kommentiert, während einigen Einzelproblem vergleichsweise lange Anmerkungen gewidmet sind. Die fachwissenschaftliche Auswahlbibliographie und ein Sachindex zu Grundbegriffen der historischen Poetologie, die den Band abschließen, sind überaus nützlich und hilfreich. Giorgis neue Ausgabe bietet für jede zukünftige Beschäftigung mit der Epik und Epentheorie der französischen Klassik eine unverzichtbare Basis.

Bernhard Huss (Berlin)

Edward Milton Anderson: *Ariosto, Opera, and the 17th Century: Evolution in the Poetics of Delight*. Ed. by Nicola Badolato in collaboration with Amyrose McCue Gill. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2017. XII+280 pp., plates, CD, € 32.–

If performances of operas such as Vivaldi’s *Orlando furioso* and Händel’s *Alcina* or *Ariodante* are nowadays fairly popular in operatic seasons worldwide, the average operagoer likely ignores that those titles are but a few in an extraordinarily large corpus of operas based on Ludovico Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso*. Indeed, dozens of operatic adaptations throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries contributed to the afterlife of one of the most acclaimed and widely read masterworks of the European Renaissance. As a matter of fact, it is not only operagoers who neglect the existence of such an extensive repertoire, but also most students of Ariosto’s poetry. Despite the renewed interest in the study of the reception of the *Orlando Furioso* that has characterised recent scholarship on Ariosto, musical adaptations of the poem – particularly the operatic ones – remain largely unexplored.

The two main reasons for this lack of scholarly attention are convincingly outlined in what is now to become a major contribution in the field and one that substantially (re) writes the history of the operatic adaptations of Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso* in seventeenth-century Italy. *Ariosto, Opera, and the 17th Century: Evolution in the Poetics of Delight* – authored by the late Edward Milton Anderson and edited by Nicola Badolato in collaboration with Amyrose McCue Guill – departs from a twofold assumption: on the one hand, long-lasting prejudice about the literary quality of opera libretti led to limited interest in the genre on the part of scholars in Italian studies; on the other hand, the loss of the musical scores for most of the extant early opera libretti has not encouraged in-depth analysis of the sources. Concurrently, the number of scholars who have attempted to study them in a truly interdisciplinary way is scant. Aiming to fill a gap in both literary and musicological studies, Anderson’s book does much more. Not only does it provide a detailed account of the ways in which Ariosto’s poem was adapted for the operatic stage in the seventeenth century, but it also raises questions about the development of early opera going beyond the specific case of works inspired by the *Orlando furioso*.

As the subtitle of the book suggests, Anderson’s study identifies the poetics of delight as pivotal to the evolution of the operatic genre throughout the seventeenth century. Needless to say, the operatic reception of Ariosto’s poem provides the author with a most fruitful lens through which to disentangle the various factors involved in the process. By focusing on aspects that are at the same time embedded in Ariosto’s own poetics and crucial to the establishment and canonisation of opera as a genre, Anderson enlightens the ways in which the operatic reception of the *Orlando furioso* was, so to speak, fuelled from within. After introducing the study by means of an informed discussion of the “status

quaestionis”, which provides a detailed account of previous bibliography and outlines the scope of the volume, Anderson focuses on three main clusters that, in a way, inform the three chronological sections into which the book is divided: the dynamics entailed by the notions of “autorità” (authority) and “meraviglia” (wonder) are at the core of Chapter 2, which discusses Ariostean musical poetics in the *primo Seicento* (1609–1635); in Chapter 3, the progressive development of the “arioso” style along with the taste for narrative complication – Anderson uses here the pregnant notion of “farraginoso” – are the features that inform the presence of Ariosto in the musical drama of the mid-century (1642–1675); finally, in Chapter 4, narrative “ricorso” and the codification of the aria capitalises on the entrance of Ariosto’s poem into the classicising universe promoted by the Arcadia movement (1682–1699).

As indicated in the introductory chapter, the chronological structure of the monograph does a double service: first, it lets the author outline for the first time an exhaustive survey of operas based on the *Orlando furioso* composed between 1600 and 1699; second, by following the progressive transformation of the ways in which the poem was adapted for the operatic stage, the chronological survey offers the opportunity to measure it against evolving approaches to the *Furioso* in the period (including the madrigal tradition, which had been particularly receptive to the charms of Ariosto’s poetry and which, in a way, proved foundational to the interest of opera composers in the *Furioso*). From this point of view, a consequential move in Anderson’s argument is to consider the musical afterlife of the *Orlando furioso* as one of the many ways in which the poem was read. Interestingly enough, while the number of editions of the *Furioso* decreased in the seventeenth century, the number of operas based on the poem rapidly increased. In a way, based on Anderson’s factual premises, one could argue that the successful reception of the *Furioso*, which had been constant in the sixteenth century, did continue on the opera stage. Within this new musical space, the poem acquired a new status combining Ariosto’s poetical inspiration and the Baroque taste for the contamination of genres and poetical forms. As such, the musical reception of the *Orlando furioso* is deeply affected by concurrent developments in theatre and drama, particularly the newly born pastoral as was codified by the groundbreaking innovations of Tasso’s *Aminta* and Guarini’s *Pastor fido*. From this point of view, the author’s discussion of metrical structures in opera is particularly remarkable, an aspect that – as Anderson shows – goes hand in hand with the elaboration of the new operatic forms that paved the way to following developments in the genre.

Finally, the thorough discussion of the sources – too many to be summarised here – is accompanied by two most useful bibliographical appendices: “Orlando Furioso in Seventeenth-Century Musical Drama” (which includes 43 libretti based on the *Furioso* and published between 1609 and 1699) and “Orlando Furioso in Eighteenth-Century Musical Drama” (a list of 96 libretti published between 1702 and 1800). The book is also provided with a CD-ROM of documents, including transcriptions of previously unexplored sources. As is, Anderson’s book puts scholars interested in the musical reception of Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso* in the ideal condition to pursue further research in the field.

Eugenio Refini (Baltimore)

„Theologisch-polemisch-poetische Sachen“. *Gelehrte Polemik im 18. Jahrhundert*. Hg. von Kai Bremer und Carlos Spoerhase (zugleich: *Zeitsprünge. Forschungen zur Frühen Neuzeit* 19 (2015), Heft 1–4). Frankfurt/M.: Klostermann, 2015. 363 S., kart., Abb., € 94.–

Gelehrte Polemik im 18. Jahrhundert ist der Fortsetzungsband des *Zeitsprünge*-Themenheftes *Gelehrte Polemik. Intellektuelle Konfliktverschärfungen um 1700* (2011).¹ Beide Bände prä-

¹ Vgl. meine ausführliche Besprechung in GRM 65 (2015), S. 245–252.