

andra: exempelvis skriver Peter Hallberg och Jouko Nurmiainen inte om partipolitisk mobilisering och legitimering utan om historiesyn och historiebruk, medan undertecknad använt Pockocks machiavelliska krismetamor som en infallsvinkel på adlig politisk självförståelse. All forskning har begränsningar, och resultaten är beroende av hurdana källor och forskningsfrågor som använts som utgångspunkt.

Snarare än att studera "avgörande brott" eller krismoment i den frihetstida politiska utvecklingen ser Bodensten frihetstiden som en process. Icke desto mindre är hans egen undersökning begränsad till några få år. De långtgående generaliseringar och paralleller som han gör kan vara alldeles riktiga, men med en så kort period har vi inte möjlighet att verifiera dem. Gustav III:s kröning, som finns på pärmen i form av en detalj ur Carl Gustaf Pilos målning, ligger en generation längre fram i tiden, och mycket hinner hända i svensk historia däremellan. Det är väl bara att önska att fler forskare empiriskt kommer att ta sig an den moralpolitiska logikens *moyenne durée* och *longue durée* på det empiriska planet. Många av de moralpolitiska skiljelinjerna är pikant nog ännu idag fortfarande de samma som på 1730- och 1740-talet, inom exempelvis försvars- och allianspolitisk opinionsdebatt, åtminstone i Finland. I detta avseende är de mer övergripande frågor arbetet väcker om begreppshistoriska trösklar och förmoderna respektive moderna förväntningshorisonter särskilt fascinerande och relevanta.

Charlotta Wolff

Jens Dufner, '*Aeneas i Carthago*' von Joseph Martin Kraus: *Oper als Spiegelbild der schwedischen Hofkultur, Perspektiven der Opernforschung* 23 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015). 287 pp.

On 18 November 1799 the monumental *magnum opus* by Joseph Martin Kraus, his opera *Aeneas*

*i Cartago*, was performed at the Royal Spectacles in Stockholm. On this occasion, this mammoth work was heavily edited by the acting conductor, *Kapellmästare* Johann Christian Friedrich Haeffner, and though truncated, it achieved a marginal success, being performed over the next two years a total of seven times. The work, which was originally intended to inaugurate the Royal Opera House back in 1782, had a tortuous history, and even this premiere was caught up in the perilous state that the theatre found itself in. Kraus had died in 1792, seven years earlier, and the librettist, Johan Henrik Kellgren, too had passed away. Carl Stenborg's private theatre had gone bankrupt, leaving the Spectacles without opposition in terms of opera, and the main stage had not presented a new work of substance since the death of Gustav III seven years earlier. The only going concern was the Royal Dramatic Theatre, which survived on a main diet of August von Kotzebue's popular dramas. The impetus for the revival of the opera may have been the memorial speech lionizing Kraus in 1798, where *Aeneas* was regarded as an unperformed masterpiece. Haeffner, unpopular with his subordinates and cast, was supremely jealous of the renewed popularity of Kraus and aware of his own shortcomings as an opera composer. He had produced only one work, *Electra*, back in 1787 and although it was well received, no further commissions had been forthcoming. Therefore, he saw this premiere as a way both to link his own future with that of his predecessor and to solidify the status of the Royal Opera at a time when the new young ruler, Gustav IV Adolph, had little interest in the cultural establishment. Thus began a saga that not only created controversy regarding the work itself, but also placed what can be seen as one of two great Gustavian operas (the other being the patriotic *Gustaf Wasa* by Johann Gottlieb Naumann) in a sort of historical limbo.

There is little doubt that modern resurrections of the work have been faced with daunting odds; the lack of a complete 'au-

thetic' score, a sprawling performance (about six hours in total), and nightmare logistics. A concert version was given back in 1980 by Newell Jenkins with Elisabeth Söderström, and an edited version was presented one season in 2006 by the Württembergische Staatsoper in Stuttgart (as well as an ancillary production of a so-called 'Berlin' version a few years later in concert format). Although a complete score was produced for the latter, the long and twisting story of its genesis and the controversies surrounding it practically begged for a more scholarly approach. For his dissertation in 2012 at the University of Köln, Jens Dufner attempted to fill this gap. As with most dissertations issued by subsidy publisher Peter Lang, it is voluminous in its content. After an introductory chapter on Gustavian opera (and locating *Aeneas* therein), he discusses Kraus as the composer of opera, following the assorted works the composer wrote over his lifespan. Thereafter comes the history of its inception, replete with an evaluation of the biographical documentation, a brief excursus into a tenuous competing project on the same subject, a lengthy discussion of the musical and libretto sources, another evaluation of Gustav III's own fragmentary drafts, and a brief discussion of the musical content. As one might imagine, the dissertation loads virtually everything one might conceive into a single package of under 300 pages (typeset by Lang), with the intent that, like most dissertations, it be completely and exhaustively comprehensive.

The work itself is therefore daunting to plough through, as the information contained is vast and varied. This being said, the myriad of subjects under the opera rubric means that relatively little room can be allotted to each one. For example, Dufner devotes only four pages (115–119) to 'foreign interventions' into the opera, which given the rather comprehensive changes undertaken by Haeffner in 1799 barely touches the surface of his interventions and alterations. The bibliography is

extensive, however, and I find his discussion of the various libretto sources quite interesting and illuminating. The bibliography is quite extensive, though one might note that my article on the conclusion of the opera published in the *Årsbok* of the Royal Music Academy is lacking; this would have undoubtedly contributed towards an accurate portrayal of the concluding numbers.

As with most dissertations, there are a plethora of small items that are either quirky or inaccurate, and it would be a bit churlish to point out each and every one in a review, given the enormous scope and pertinent discussions of all aspects of this monumental opera that Dufner has done. A few mentions, however, should be made. First, his overview of Gustavian opera in the introduction is cursory and largely superficial. This complicates his comments concerning the cessation of the early stages of work on *Aeneas* in 1782. Noting that Naumann's *Cora och Alonzo* was substituted, he postulates the following: 'Der Ausfall der Sängerin allein kann die Absage nicht ausreichend erklären, auch wenn er neben anderen Faktoren durchaus zu den Startschwierigkeiten der Oper beigetragen haben mag. Möglicherweise waren selbst für Komponist und Librettist die Gründe nicht vollkommen durchschaubar.' Perhaps so, but Dufner fails to notice several factors: (1) that Naumann's opera itself had been commissioned several years earlier after the success of his *Amphion* but had been delayed or scuttled – so much so that Naumann expressed his disgust and had it published in a German edition for Dresden; (2) there is no reason to doubt Kraus's own comment, made in a letter dated 17 February 1782, some nine months before the house opened on September 30; and (3) the work was well-advanced with the prologue and two acts finished in the short time between his appointment as *Vize-Kapellmästare* and the date of the letter, implying that enough time remained for the opera's completion with the libretto

that Kraus had at hand at the time. As he notes, this provided an opportunity for both Kraus and Kellgren to do some extensive and serious polishing over the next years, and this in turn led to continual tinkering with the material. In truth, Naumann's opera was the only one available that would have been appropriate, since it is loaded with the sort of stage effects, including earthquakes, battles, etc. that would have shown off the new opera house at its best. He misses the point that both Müller and her husband, a principal violinist, did leave abruptly, and the sort of musical writing specifically for her voice would have been affected; the remaining singers Lovisa Augusti and Franziska Stading were neither appropriate cast members for her role in *Aeneas*, but they could perform well those of Zulma and Cora. Moreover, it was clear from early sketches for the sets that the technical production issues were well-advancing in February when Kraus wrote his parents. In other words, both composer and librettist were well-aware of the 'reasons,' even though it gave them enough time to revisit the work. Second, his discussion of Kraus as an opera composer is rather superficial at times, with barely a page devoted to companion pieces. For example, he doubts that any of the duodrama *Zélie* was even set. Maybe and maybe not, but the surviving text, complete in its entirety, is clearly a fair copy intended for printing. This Dufner notes, although he errs in thinking it comes from the Handbibliothek of Gustav; the documentation itself notes that it was purchased in the early twentieth century from an auction house, whereas the Handbibliothek itself remains more or less intact in Uppsala and the Riksarkiv. The fact that it appears as a *Druckvorlage* fair copy is implication enough that the work would have been at the very least underway and intended for performance, but as it was in French, the French troupe would have been the appropriate venue, like Kraus's indisputable one-act *Le bon Seigneur*. Finally, in terms of the musical sources for Act V, the

Illustration V.2 clearly shows the insertion of Haeffner's 1799 finale in the handwriting of Friedrich Ficker, but Dufner does not seem to note at the margins there and later that an entire choir of manuscript pages has been excised (further indicated by the cross-outs on the left hand page of the illustration. Going back to the original parts probably copied out around 1791–1792, the missing pages are easy to reconstruct. Contrary to Dufner's comment that 'die originale, kurze Chorfassung kann trotz der nicht überlieferten Gesangsstimmen recht gut erschlossen werden,' the vocal parts do in fact exist, as do all but the viola and bass parts of the original finale. Moreover, from the missing recitative of Jupiter and the final chorus 'Ljusets magter af er lag' are note-for-note glosses on the final movements from *Proserpin*, allowing a full reconstruction to be done without resorting to 'hinzukomponieren,' as Dufner states.

Such issues abound in this dissertation, and for the most part those that are debatable are ones that are equally as subjective and opinionated. This does not, however, detract from the value of this book. It is a first comprehensive overview of a monumental and yet problematic work by Kraus, one that in many ways defines him and his style. Dufner has done an admirable job in outlining the many facets of this opera, and because there is still much to discover about this, including the unfolding information about its inception and transmission, it can serve as a useful step for further research.

Bertil van Boer

Daniel Johansen, *Da makten fikk et ansikt: Den offentlige iscenesettelsen av kongemakten i det tidlige dansk-norske eneveldet 1660–1746*, NTNU - Norges teknisk-naturvitenskaplige universitet (Trondheim: NTNU-trykk, 2014). 357 s.