Today’s concert explores plagiarism, piracy and, not to put too fine a point on it, the generally fraudulent behaviour of music publishers, their agents, and some composers. One thing all the works we hear this evening have in common is that they are based on, or are surrounded by, falsehoods. In the world of music, however, such behaviour, far from being regarded as reprehensible, has been welcomed, often encouraged.

Stravinsky certainly approved of copying other people’s work; “The one true comment on a piece of music is another piece of music”. Percy Grainger went some way further when he suggested; “I should like to see every man tinkering with every other man’s art - what kaleidoscopic multitudinous results we should see!” He was right. At least one of these falsehoods directly resulted in a masterpiece and set in motion a new “ism” in 20th century music.

It seems appropriate, therefore, to open the concert with music by a composer who was more plagiarised, copied and pirated in his lifetime than most - Arcangelo Corelli. The reason for this lies in what the English period-instrument specialist, Simon Murphy, identifies as Corelli’s “star status”, suggesting that in his day he was “a cult figure with a cult following, much like Dizzy Gillespie, Charlie Parker and Jimi Hendrix”. There is some contemporary evidence to justify Murphy’s astonishing comparison of an 18th century violinist with a 20th century rock guitarist - an 18th century visitor to Rome saw Corelli play the violin and described what he saw; “His eyes will sometimes turn as red as fire, his countenance will be distorted, his eyeballs roll as in agony, and he gives in so much to what he is doing that he doth not look like the same man”. Certainly his music was phenomenally popular in his time, and the combination of cult figure and immense international popularity led to many others unscrupulously grabbing a slice of the cake.

Showing early musical aptitude Corelli went to a local priest for music lessons before, at the age of 13, being sent to Bologna to further his skills. Bologna then boasted the largest Christian church in the world which employed a staff of some 33 full-time musicians, and it was there that Corelli developed a real flair for the violin. He moved on to Rome where he established a reputation, first as a violinist in Queen Christina of Sweden’s personal orchestra, and later as the director of a 150-piece string orchestra set up to honour the ambassador of King James II of England who had been sent to Rome to negotiate (unsuccessfully as it turned out) the return of the English to the Roman Catholic faith. He appears to have spent his entire adult life in Rome, living in considerable comfort and amassing a substantial art collection, comprising over 150 canvasses.
The popularity of Corelli’s music, however, cannot be explained simply because he was immensely wealthy and had a flair for showmanship (on one occasion in 1689 he directed an orchestra of 39 violins, 10 violas, 17 cellos, 10 double basses, lute, two trumpets and keyboard – immense by the standards of the day). He was writing more original and adventurous music than anyone else at the time, and he did so with the express purpose of showcasing the violin. At a time when Italian music was focused on vocal works, he established purely instrumental forms and harmonic progressions which have been the mainstay of musical composition ever since. He was the first composer to achieve fame purely through instrumental music and one of the many innovations he made was the cadenza, which Corelli himself described as a chance to “show off” the violin. And we must not overlook the fact that in the closing years of the 17th century, most of northern Europe was obsessed with an admiration for Rome. Corelli was by no means a prolific composer – publishing just six sets of instrumental pieces – but his music encapsulated the true wonders of Rome (Murphy suggests that it “inspired visions of the palazzo, churches, frescoes, sculptures and paintings of that ultimate city of magnificence”).

Although grouped together and published posthumously in Amsterdam in 1714 the 12 Concerti Grossi which comprise Corelli’s Op.6 and his last published music, were written at various times over the previous 30 years. And not all of them were originally intended for a concertante group dominated by the violin; the Concerto we hear this evening (no.7) appears to have been conceived for the trumpet. It opens with a slow and stately introduction with the characteristic French double-dotted Ouverture rhythm before launching into an energetic romp with plenty of rapid-fire violin writing. The second movement is brisk and breathless, the incisive chords from the orchestra countered by lively responses from the small concertante group. A lyrical violin solo follows over a typical walking bass. The fourth movement opens fugally, and the Concerto ends with a bright, optimistic conversation between ripieno and concertante groups.
Domenico Gallo (ca.1730-ca.1768)

Sonata No.1 in G
Moderato
Andante
Presto

Between 1939 and 1942 publication took place in Rome of 26 authoritative volumes which claimed to comprise the “complete works” of Giovanni Battista Pergolesi. These 26 volumes contained 148 individual works many reprinted from much earlier editions, including a collection of 12 Trio Sonatas for two violins and continuo published in London in 1780, the first of which we hear in today’s concert. The title page of the 1780 edition suggests they were brought to London “by a curious Gentleman of Fortune during his travels through Italy”.

These 12 Trio Sonatas became so popular that they were reprinted several times during the 18th century, but even then doubts as to the music’s authenticity were raised, not least by the English music historian, Charles Burney, who, in 1789, wrote that if these Sonatas “are genuine, which is much to be doubted, it will not enhance their worth sufficiently to make them interesting to modern ears”. Nevertheless neither Burney nor anyone else could come up with alternative composers, so they remained attributed to Pergolesi until 1977 when a team of American scholars began the process of identifying the true composers behind many of these works attributed to Pergolesi. They identified that only 15 could at that stage definitely be attributed to Pergolesi. Of the others, they quickly identified the authorship of the 12 Trio Sonatas as being the work of a Venetian violinist/composer called Domenico Gallo, about whom we know virtually nothing.

Mention of the name Domenico Gallo crops up not just in Venice but in Parma as well. There was also a family of musicians named Gallo based in Naples, Pergolesi’s birthplace, and it is possible that Domenico was connected to them. But while we might see in Gallo’s obscurity and the Neapolitan connection justification for the misattribution of his works to Pergolesi, the sad fact is the evidence has been there all along – some early Italian editions of the Sonatas clearly state them to be the work of Domenico Gallo. To understand why publishers would be so keen to pass off the work of one obscure Italian composer as that of another, whose active career lasted barely six years, we need to look at events in Paris in 1752.

That was the year in which Pergolesi’s two-part Intermezzo La serva padrona was staged in the French capital. It created much controversy, dividing the Parisian musical community into two; one camp keen to hold on to the ideals of serious, stylized French opera celebrating mythology and heroic deeds, the other keen to attract a wider public to opera through light-hearted Italian stories of ordinary people. (La serva padrona tells of a scheming housemaid who cheats her gullible master into marrying her.) “The fight was waged with wit and vitriol in hundreds of pamphlets and in dozens of Parisian salons”, writes Barry Brook. “Whatever the merits of the opposing aesthetic views, the name of Pergolesi, standard-bearer of the Italian camp, became almost overnight a household word throughout Europe. This extraordinary posthumous renown created an enormous demand for his music, a demand that could not be satisfied. Very few of Pergolesi’s works were available at
the time, even in Italy; and the composer, dead at 26, could hardly produce new ones. It was an ideal set of circumstances for unscrupulous copyists and publishers who, responding to the time-honoured law of the market place, did not hesitate to place Pergolesi's name on other composers' works in order to make a sale. This type of piracy occurred hundreds of times throughout the 18th century, and Pergolesi's supposed output was expanded tenfold.

Possibly the first movement of Gallo’s Sonata is the most immediately recognisable theme “by Pergolesi” that Stravinsky, blissfully unaware of the music’s true composer, incorporated into Pulcinella. And with it we also get the reason why the false claim as to authorship was able to pass unchallenged so long; Gallo may have been an unremarkable composer in some respects, but he had a fine gift for melody; something we know he shared with Pergolesi.
Alessandro Parisotti (1853-1913)

Se tu m’ami

It was not just in the 18th century when Pergolesi-mania was at its height that those of less scrupulous bent passed off works by otherwise unknown composers as his. In the latter half of the 19th century an Italian scholar, Alessandro Parisotti, devoted his energies to unearthing and reviving lost and forgotten songs and arranging them for voice and piano in his three-volume *Arie antiche* published in Milan between 1885 and 1888. If there are any singers in this hall – especially sopranos – they will certainly have encountered Parisotti’s work, and almost certainly will know the most famous song in that collection, *Se tu m’ami*, which he attributed to Pergolesi. It has become a staple of the soprano repertory.

But it was not by Pergolesi, and extensive researches have failed to identify any 18th century composer who might have written it. Scholars have been forced to the ghastly, horrific conclusion that Parisotti wrote it himself and passed it off as Pergolesi’s. While we may shudder and quake at the very idea that an academic could possibly indulge in such discreditable antics, it was certainly not the first time such musical deception was carried out, and it most certainly has not been the last. And, regardless of its origins, *Se tu m’ami* is a particularly fine song.

The man who effectively set in motion the movement to identify the true origins of so many pieces credited to Pergolesi, Frank Walker (who published an article “Two Centuries of Pergolesi Forgeries and Misattributions” in *Music and Letters* in October 1949), was the first to suggest that “*Se tu m’ami*” was probably “a nineteenth-century forgery”. But he added; “If so, it is a clever one, and the unknown forger deserves hearty congratulations”. The text is taken from Paolo Rolli’s *Canzonette e cantate*, published in London in 1727 (Rolli provided a setting of his own) and which was unlikely ever to have found its way into Pergolesi’s hands.

Se tu m’ami, se tu sospiro
sol per me, gentil pastor,
ho dolor de’tuoi martiri,
ho diletto del tuo amor.
Ma se pensi che soletto
io ti debba riamar,
Pastorello, sei soggetto,
facilmente a t’ingannar,
Bella rosa porporina oggi Silvia sceglierà,
con la scusa della spina
doman poi la sprezzerà.
Ma degli uomini il consiglio
io per me non seguirò.
Non perchè mi piace il giglio
Gli altri fiori sprezzerò.

If you love me, if you sigh
for me alone, gentle shepherd,
I have pain in your suffering,
I have pleasure in your love.
But if you think that you alone
deserve my love,
Shepherd, you are easily
deceived and misled,
A fair red rose today Silvia picks,
But pleading its thorn
tomorrow she spurns it.
But the plans of men
I will not follow.
Because the lily please me
I will not spurn other flowers.
Carlo Ignazio Monza (d.1739)

Suite No.3 in D
Gavotta con variazioni

In 1735 Carlo Ignazio Monza was appointed Director of Music at Vercelli Cathedral. That was to be a turning point in his life, not least because we simply know nothing about him or his activities before then. We have no idea when he was born (possibly as early as 1680, possibly as late as 1696) nor where; he was referred to as Milanese, but there is nothing to show that he was actually born in Milan. All we know of pre-1735 Monza is that he wrote operas which were performed throughout Italy, and a body of instrumental music including several suites for solo harpsichord. Unfortunately, just a year after Monza comes up on the radar with his appointment at Vercelli Cathedral, he takes holy orders, gives up composing and a short time later, dies.

We do not know when Monza’s Pièces modernes pour le Clavecin were written, but they presumably date back to long before he settled at Vercelli. Manuscripts and early editions of some of them have been unearthed since (notably in Bologna and Turin), proving his authorship of several of them. However, the main source for these is the publication of a set of in London in 1771 in which they were credited to - yes, you’ve guessed it – Giovanni Pergolesi. It appears that Pergolesi never wrote any keyboard works, but that did not stop the false attribution remaining largely unchallenged until 1986.

There is some suggestion that on a visit to Turin, Monza met Couperin who introduced him to the joys of the French keyboard Suite with its stylized dances. Certainly Monza’s travels brought him into contact with a wider range of international musicians than might have been expected from an Italian opera composer of the day, and the influence of Handel in the Gavotta with Variations we hear today is so obvious, it seems more than likely that the two met possibly in Rome.
Giovanni Battista Pergolesi (1710-1736)

Sinfonia in F for Cello

Comodo
Allegro
Adagio
Presto.

In his General History of Music published in London in 1789, Charles Burney wrote approvingly of Pergolesi’s music; “the clearness, simplicity, truth and sweetness of expression [of his authentic vocal works] justly entitle him to supremacy over all his predecessors and contemporary rivals, and to a niche in the Temple of Fame among the great improvers of the art”. Such adulation from respected sources led to the name of Pergolesi becoming almost a synonym for old music of particularly notable quality. Frank Walker wrote; “All over Europe…publishers who came into possession of manuscripts attributed [to Pergolesi] were not always inclined to question their authenticity, [but] to put them on the market and reap the profits”. Evidence to support this apparent slur on the ethics of European publishers comes in a satirical publication called Il Teatro alla Moda written by Benedetto Marcello (1686-1736) in which he advised copyists not to be too scrupulous when attributing works to their rightful composers; “They will sell to foreigners, who want good arias, any old papers, under the names of the best masters”.

Pergolesi was certainly one of the best masters there was, and at various times somewhere in the region of 300 works have been attributed to him – over 10 times what we now believe he actually did write. He wrote regularly for the Teatro S Bartolomeo from the moment he left school, his comic works in minor theatres were enormously popular, he was appointed vice-maestro to the royal chapel at the age of 22, and was offered the protection of and commissions from Naples’ most important royal families. The almost universal fame he attained posthumously represented a new phenomenon in music history. Little wonder then that one of the first musical “stars” should achieve a status in death he never had in life; and the fact that he died so young only added to the legends which surrounded him. But while his operas and sacred music support that reputation, according to Groves Dictionary; “Most of the instrumental music under Pergolesi’s name is wrongly attributed; his few authentic pieces are insignificant by comparison with his vocal music”.

So what are the true origins of the Sinfonia in F for cello which we hear now? In this case, a manuscript survives and scientific analysis of the paper and handwriting seems pretty conclusive in attributing it to Pergolesi. If Pergolesi did indeed write it, the most likely recipient was Domenico Marzio Caraffa, the Duke of Maddaloni, for whom Pergolesi served as maestro di capella from June 1734 until his death a little under two years later from tuberculosis. The sinfonia is in essence a sonata di chiesa for cello comprising four contrasting movements, the last of which Stravinsky incorporated into Pulcinella.
Wilhelm van Wassenaer (1692-1766)

Concerto Armonico No.2 in B flat
Largo andante
Da capella presto
Largo affettuoso
Allegro moderato

If other music in this programme has shown how unscrupulous publishers were with attributing works to their proper composers, here we have a case where the composer himself tried to obscure his own involvement by creating the impression that it was composed by one Carlo Ricciotti. When Ricciotti’s hand was questioned, it was a short step for the music to find itself attributed to (who else?) Pergolesi.

In 1946, as the Dutch city of Den Haag cleared up in the aftermath of the Second World War and started the process of cataloguing all its art treasures as a prelude to seeking the restitution of the countless priceless artefacts plundered during the Nazi occupation, an engraving of six Concerti Armonici was unearthed. The date of the engraving was important - published in Den Haag in 1740 - but more important still was its dedication; to a certain Count Bentinck to whom was offered these Concertos as “the work of an illustrious hand”. With such high musical quality, such originality and such self-assurance it would seem fair to assume that the “illustrious hand” belonged to a composer of somewhat greater stature than the name given on the engraving, Carlo Ricciotti, an Italian born in 1681 who settled in Den Haag and died there in 1756. But while Handel has been suggested as a possible composer, the general consensus of opinion as recently as 1980 held that this was most likely the work of Pergolesi. However in 1979 an English music scholar, Albert Dunning, was prompted by a casual remark from a Dutch musicologist, to check out the contents of the library at Twickel Castle, and from what he unearthed there he has conclusively shown that the “illustrious hand” in question belonged to a Dutch nobleman who was also an amateur musician, Count Unico Wilhelm van Wassenaer.

Wassenaer was born into one of the oldest noble families of the Province of Holland, his father serving as Dutch ambassador first in Berlin and then Dusseldorf. A close family friend was the Elector of Hanover (subsequently King George I of England). Wassenaer himself was appointed Dutch ambassador to Paris and Cologne and became personally acquainted with, among others, both Handel and Corelli. But while music featured largely in his life – he employed his own orchestra at his ancestral home of Twickel Castle – he clearly felt it inappropriate for a man of such high rank and with such strong associations with the leading courts of Europe, to be seen actually writing music, so he went out of his way to obscure his authorship of the six Concerti Armonici. He asked Ricciotti to write the dedication on the manuscript, and before long it was assumed that Ricciotti was the actual composer. Once doubts arose over his ability to produce such exquisite music, the obvious conclusion was to ascribe them to Pergolesi.

The gentle, and stately opening is a classic example of the elegance and refinement of Wassenaer’s work, but it was the delicately dancing finale which attracted Stravinsky’s attention for Pulcinella.
Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971)

Pulcinella

If Pergolesi’s name had resonated amongst European society in the 18th century for reasons which were not entirely of his own making, and if it had become little more than a convenient peg on which to hang attributions for music which for one reason or another could not be attributed to the real composers, in the 20th century his name once more was thrust into the limelight for reasons with which he was entirely unconnected.

Our 20th century episode begins with the figure of Serge Diaghilev, a Russian impresario whose Parisian-based ballet corps – the “Ballets Ruses” – were all the rage in pre-First World War Europe. On a trip to Naples, Diaghilev came across some manuscripts which were sold to him as original works by Pergolesi (Frank Walker wryly observes “how they rubbed their hands when they saw him coming!”) and which so excited him that he decided to build a ballet around them. He envisaged a ballet based on the figure of Pulcinella, a character found in 18th century Neapolitan comic theatre. All the women have fallen in love with Pulcinella, while their jealous menfolk set out to murder him. Pulcinella fakes his own death and the men, thinking they have got rid of him, steal his costumes and attempt to recapture the love of their respective womenfolk. Pulcinella, in disguise, watches on.

Diaghilev’s plan was for someone to prepare a mock-18th century score from the Pergolesi manuscripts, and he sought the advice of the conductor, Ernest Ansermet. Knowing that Stravinsky had not done any major work for Diaghilev since The Rite of Spring in 1913, Ansermet approached him. Initially, Stravinsky was unenthusiastic about what appeared to be such a retrograde approach to composition, but after looking at the manuscripts hit on the idea of combining the melodies with distinctly 20th century harmonies and instrumentation; as he later wrote, “So far as I can see my attitude towards Pergolesi is the only one that can usefully be taken up with regard to the music of bygone times”. He selected several pieces from the manuscript and wove them into a score full of 18th century mannerisms – including setting the orchestra in much the same way as we saw it for the Corelli Concerto grosso - but equally full of 20th century spice and acerbic humour.

As Stravinsky later recalled; “I started to compose directly on Pergolesi’s manuscripts, as if I was correcting an old work of mine. I very well knew that I couldn’t produce a counterfeit. At most I could repeat Pergolesi with my personal accent”. Diaghilev, however, was not at all pleased. This was not the 18th century pastiche he had asked for, but it was too late to change and, in any case, Stravinsky’s name was certain to attract an audience. Pulcinella was first staged in Paris on 15th May 1920, and, while as a ballet it was a success, it was widely accepted that Stravinsky’s score was a masterpiece, and it set in motion an entirely new stylistic movement in 20th century which became known as Neo-Classicism.
As we now know, many of these works were not by Pergolesi himself, but that does not diminish the importance of Stravinsky’s score in its revitalising of earlier music. The jovial opening Sinfonia is a reworking of the 1st movement of the Trio Sonata No.1 in G by Domenico Gallo. Derived from Pergolesi’s opera Il Flaminio first staged in Naples in 1735, Stravinsky has added a drone accompaniment to the Serenata which is sung by a tenor to the original text (and which has nothing whatsoever to do with the story of Pulcinella).

Mentre l’erbetta pasce l’agnella, While on the grass the lamb grazes,
Sola, soletta la pastorella Alone the shepherdess
Tra fresche frasche Amid the green leaves
Per la forest cantando va. Through the forest goes singing.

The dancing Scherzino opens with an arrangement of the first movement of Gallo’s Trio Sonata No.2 in B flat before moving into a boisterous Allegro based on the same work’s third movement, and leading into a refined Andantino which is built around the 1st movement of Gallo’s Trio Sonata No.8 in in E flat. A jolly Allegro follows which is based on the overture to Pergolesi’s comic opera Lo frate ’nnamorato first staged in Naples in 1732. The soprano solo which follows – Ancora poco meno – is also taken from an authentic Pergolesi work, this time the opera Adriano in Siria which was the first of two Pergolesi operas presented in Naples on 25th October 1734.

Contento forse vivere Content perhaps to live
Nel mio martir potrei In my torment I might be
Se mai potessi credere If ever I could believe
Che, ancor ionta, tu sei That, yet far away, you remained
Fedele all’amor mio, Faithful to my love,
Fedele a question cor. Faithful to this heart.

The energetic Allegro assai with its insistently hammering rhythm is derived from the third movement of Gallo’s Trio Sonata no.3 in C minor, and for the Allegro Stravinsky returned to Pergolesi’s opera Il Flaminio, this time with a bass aria from the opera’s first act (Stravinsky’s rather comic orchestration clearly satirising the words).

Con queste paroline così saporitine With these little words so sweet
Il cor voi mi scippate dalla profondita. You rend my heart to the depths.
Bella, restate qua, Fair one, stay here,
che se più dite appresso io cesso morirò. Since if you say more I must die.
Così saporitine con queste paroline With such sweet little words
Il cor voi mi scippate, morirò, morirò. You must break my heart. I shall die.

A gently expressive Andante leads the way into a trio, an anguished tenor solo which in turns sets off an animated duet for soprano and tenor, and a rapid-fire tenor aria from Pergolesi’s Lo frate ’nnamorato.

Sento dire n’ncè pace, I hear it said there is no peace,
Sento dire no’ncè cor, I hear it said there is no heart,
Ma cchiù pe’tte, no, no For you, ah no, never,
no’ncè carma cchiù pe’tte There is no peace for you.
Chi disse c'à la femmena
Sacchiù de farfariello disse la verità.

Whoever says that a woman
Is more cunning than the devil is right.

Allegro

[Ncè sta quaccuna po’
Che a nullo vuole bene
E a cciento nfrisco tene.
Schitto pe’scorcoglia,
E a tant’ante malizie
Chi mai le ppo’conta’.

There are some women
Who care for none
And keep a hundred on a leash.
A shabby trick!
And have so many wiles
That none can count them.

[tenor]
Una te falan zemprece
Ed è malezosa,
‘n antra fa la schefosa
E bo’lo maretieilo.
Chi a chillo tene ‘ncore
E a tant’ante malizie
Chi mai le ppo’conta’.
E lo sta a rrepasa’.

One pretends to be innocent
And is cunning.
Another seems all modesty
Yet craves a husband.
One clings to one man
And have so many wiles
That none can count them.
None can number them.

Presto

[Ncè sta quaccuna po’
Che a nullo vuole bene
E a cciento nfrisco tene.
Schitto pe’scorcoglia,
E a tant’ante malizie
Chi mai le ppo’conta’.

There are some women
Who care – listen - to none
Yet craves a husband.
And who flirt with another
And keep a hundred on a leash.
A shabby trick!
And have so many wiles
That none can count them

A brief Larghetto for two oboes and two bassoons, also derived from Lo frate ‘nnamorato calms things down to be followed by a contrapuntal Allegro - alla breve taken from Gallo’s Trio Sonata No.7 in G minor.

The exhilarating Tarantella is an arrangement of the fourth movement of Wassenaer’s Concerto Armonico No. 2, and this is followed by an Andantino which is Stravinsky’s remodelling of the soprano song now thought to be the work of the 19th century scholar, Alessandro Parisotti.

Se tu m’ami, se tu sospiri
sol per me, gentil pastor,
ho dolor de’tuoi martiri,
ho diletto del tuo amor.
Ma se pensi che soletto
io ti debba rimar,
Pastorello, sei sogetto,
facilmente a t’ingannar,
Bella rosa porporina oggi Silvia sceglie,

If you love me, if you sigh
for me alone, gentle shepherd,
I have pain in your suffering,
I have pleasure in your love.
But if you think that you alone
deserve my love,
Shepherd, you are easily deceived and misled,
A fair red rose today Silvia picks,
con la scusa della spina doman poi la sprezerà.   But pleading its thorn
domani poi la sprezzerà. tomorrow she spurns it.
Ma degli uomini il consiglio io per me non seguirà.   But the plans of men
But the plans of men
Non perché mi piace il giglio         I will not follow.
I will not follow.
Gli altri fiori sprezerò.        Because the lily please me
I will not spurn other flowers.

The brassy, strutting Allegro is taken from Monza’s Harpsichord Suite No.1. Monza’s Harpsichord Suite No.3 is the basis of the Gavotte con due variazioni, which Stravinsky scores purely for wind instruments. The Vivo comes from Pergolesi’s Sinfonia for Cello. This has been described as “Stravinsky’s satire at its best”, with prominent solo roles given to both the double bass and the trombone. Horns in their lower register open the Tempo di minuetto, string add their voices followed by flutes and oboes, and then the three singers join in with an extract from Lo frate ’nnamorato.

Pupilette, fiammette d’amore,    Sweet eyes, bright with love,
Per voi il core struggendo si va. For you my heart languishes.

This it leads directly into the Allegro assai in which Stravinsky effectively hammers home the final chord with constant repetitions of a single rhythmic figure. This movement originates from the finale of Gallo’s Trio Sonata No.12 in E.