

Introduction

In the nineteenth century, operas experienced constant revision, translation, alteration and variation. Librettists often adapted plays or novels, composers revised their scores and singers ornamented their lines and inserted favourite substitute arias. Operatic excerpts headlined concerts and publishers' catalogues overflowed with arrangements of popular opera tunes. When operas travelled to new countries, changes could be particularly exhaustive. Perhaps the best example is in early nineteenth-century London. Numerous operas were adapted for the London playhouses, where audiences heard them alongside Shakespeare, melodrama and pantomime (see Appendix 1). Operas by composers such as Mozart, Rossini, Weber, Auber, Boieldieu, Meyerbeer and Bellini appeared in English, with spoken dialogue instead of recitative. British adapters often radically transformed libretti and freely cut, recomposed and replaced musical numbers.

Negative rhetoric has hampered scholarly exploration of these adaptations.¹ The primary reason for distaste stems from a competing strand of nineteenth-century musical life: canon formation. Scholars such as Lydia Goehr and William Weber argue that the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw the rise of the 'fixed work', reproduced faithfully to create a canon of masterpieces.² As new ideals of canonicity emerged, change drew condemnation. Contemporary critics such as Leigh Hunt, William Ayrton and Richard Mackenzie Bacon began to refer to operatic adaptations as defacing, mutilating and vulgarising the original. Such attitudes continue to influence scholarship. *Grove music online* refers to the adaptations of one of the most prominent British composers, Sir Henry Rowley Bishop, as 'mutilations', while *An Oxford companion to the Romantic age* states that the original operas were 'ferociously hacked about'.³

Scholars have, however, begun to recognise the centrality of change to opera. Mark Everist, Philip Gossett, David Levin, Roger Parker and Hilary Poriss have explored adaptation, revision, substitution and re-staging.⁴ Literary scholars have conducted theoretical studies of adaptation.⁵ The vast source materials for British theatre music have also begun to receive more attention, both from theatre historians such as Tracy C. Davis and Jane Moody and from musicologists such as Rachel Cowgill, Gabriella Dideriksen, Alison Mero and Deborah Rohr.⁶ Finally, exploration of British adaptations is aided by work on operatic life in the United States, where many London adaptations were exported.⁷

Such work invites a return to these adaptations with a fresh perspective. Past disparagement has obscured the central role they played in London musical and

2 | *Foreign Opera at the London Playhouses*

theatrical life. They intertwined with debates about repertoire, class and nationalism. They both arose from the lack of laws governing international copyright and helped accelerate efforts by composers and publishers to control the pan-European distribution of opera. And, although these adaptations are often seen as opposed to canonisation, they in fact contributed to the move towards fidelity – the term contemporaries most often used for adherence to the original work. The early decades of the nineteenth century represent a crucial transition between the late eighteenth century, when pastiche prevailed, and the Victorian era, when translation largely replaced adaptation.⁸ During this brief window of time, adaptations were important catalysts of change. They helped foster the ubiquity necessary for canonical status, since they were the first and sometimes only way in which many listeners came to know foreign operas. They gradually helped to bridge aesthetic divides between native and continental opera, as London audiences became more familiar with the latter. Finally, adaptations were a locus for critical debates about the nature and desirability of fidelity, which helped to shape the rhetoric of canonicity.

THE CONTEXT FOR ADAPTATION

Adaptation dominated London theatre in the early 1800s.⁹ Many stage works reworked or revised pre-existent stories. The adapted foreign operas discussed here appeared alongside adaptations of French and German plays, dramatisations of novels by favourite authors such as Sir Walter Scott and ‘updated’ versions of older plays. Even Shakespeare’s plays were altered. Thomas Bowdler’s infamously censored *The family Shakespeare* was published in 1818, giving rise to the term ‘bowdlerisation’, and stage productions rarely followed Shakespeare’s original text without change.¹⁰ Contemporaries most commonly referred to these practices as ‘adaptation’, although they also used ‘translation’, particularly if the original was followed closely. Terminology was by no means fixed, however, and contemporaries used many expressions, including ‘version’, ‘selection’, ‘arrangement’ and ‘olio’. Sometimes they simply referred to a ‘production’ or ‘opera’, which obscured distinctions between original and reworking.

Why was adaptation so prominent? Linda Hutcheon has theorised various reasons, several of which apply to this context. First was simply the ‘enormous demand for all kinds of stories’.¹¹ London playhouses employed the repertory system, which featured a large number of new and revived pieces, all on double or triple bills. A theatre might produce as many as ninety separate works during a nine-month season. Even given that many of these were revivals, there was a huge need for new productions. Second was the ‘obvious financial appeal’.¹² With no official government subsidy and no ‘tryout’ venues, London theatre managers preferred proven successes to untested new works. Since copyright law was far from solidified, adaptation was frequently the cheapest, speediest way to find new productions. This prompted many

theatres to produce competing adaptations of the same original, which increased the importance of adaptation; changes were necessary to differentiate one version from the next and to entice audiences to yet another manifestation of the same story. Finally, adaptation could ‘expand the audience’ of each theatre.¹³ At its heart, operatic adaptation stemmed from a desire to capitalise on the elite lure of opera in theatres that were not exclusively devoted to the genre.

In some ways, however, these adaptations do not fit current theories. Today, Hutcheon writes, adapters often wish to ‘interpret [the] work’ and ‘take a position on it’.¹⁴ This tends to be the current preferred view of the adapter, as a kind of author redefining the original in artistically driven ways. David Levin, for example, urges opera directors to embrace ‘strong readings’ of opera, which are ‘surprising ... asserting some distance from prevailing and predictable accounts. A weak reading fails to do so, tending instead to ... reproduce the work’s prevailing aesthetic identity.’¹⁵ While much recent scholarship urges a move away from a sacrosanct work, the ideal of authorial vision – located in adapter if not author – still seems too important to relinquish. Nineteenth-century adapters do not fit this aesthetic. They did wish to ‘reproduce the work’s prevailing aesthetic identity’, as this identity was novel and potentially profitable. Their changes stemmed more from a need to suit the work to its new context, to bridge divides of taste and practicalities of performance, than to stamp it with their own vision. This divergence helps to explain why nineteenth-century adaptations have suffered from a kind of double jeopardy. Modern detractors of adaptation find the practice disturbing in all time periods, while modern supporters value adaptation for reasons removed from nineteenth-century values.

Different views of adaptation primarily stem from different relationships to the canon. In the early nineteenth century, adaptation was one of many fluid practices that assisted the relatively new process of canonisation. In the early twenty-first century, fidelity is the norm and original works have been heard thousands of times. Rather than helping to establish a canon, adaptation is now often intended to disestablish it, to refresh long-canonised works. Speaking of the most common modern type of operatic adaptation, *Regieoper*, in which visual elements are typically altered while the score is retained intact, Richard Taruskin observes, ‘The boredom of endlessly reproducing fetishized texts is what invites, and even demands, the compensatory excesses of *Regieoper*.’¹⁶ Although the same word is used for adaptation both then and now, these practices’ divergent contexts and motivations make it problematic to equate them.

Adaptation was not, however, a universally accepted practice in the nineteenth century. On the contrary, it received severe contemporary criticism, as it intertwined with some of the most contested aspects of London theatrical culture: repertoire laws and conventions; the perceived decline of the native drama; and the rise of interest in fidelity and its legal sister, copyright. The very existence of adapted opera at the playhouses stemmed from a complex and antiquated set of repertoire regulations.¹⁷

In 1662, Charles II issued patents to Sir William Davenant and Thomas Killigrew for the exclusive right to produce drama. Until 1843, these patents resided with Covent Garden and Drury Lane – the ‘patent theatres’ – located a few steps away from each other in a densely populated theatrical district, near the Strand and across from Waterloo Bridge. These theatres possessed the exclusive privilege of performing ‘legitimate’ drama, which essentially meant spoken drama in English. Opera, meanwhile, was the preserve of a theatre founded in 1705 and known variously as the Queen’s Theatre, the King’s Theatre and Her Majesty’s Theatre, depending on the monarch. This theatre, located farther west than the patent theatres, in Pall Mall, primarily performed opera in Italian and French ballets. It was often known as ‘the opera house’ or ‘the Italian opera house’. Licences and agreements in 1707 and 1792 prevented the patent theatres from encroaching on this house’s repertoire and vice versa.

Numerous other theatres tried to challenge these three houses’ supremacy, but only the Haymarket or ‘Little Haymarket’ succeeded in obtaining a patent, in 1766, for summer performances, when the other theatres were closed.¹⁸ Theatres without such patents, known as the ‘minor’ theatres, were spread throughout the city, both near the patent theatres and in less salubrious locales, and operated on yearly licences regulated by acts of 1737 and 1755.¹⁹ These ‘minor’ theatres – as opposed to the ‘major’ theatres, Covent Garden and Drury Lane – were allowed to perform only ‘illegitimate’ drama. This was an ambiguous term that essentially meant productions focused on music and spectacle rather than speech.

London theatre may therefore seem to fall into neat packages of legitimate drama, illegitimate drama and opera, with music a crucial definer among these types. In fact, music played an ambiguous role, at once maligned and desired. Long-held prejudices fashioned music as effeminate, irrational and opposed to the British character. James Boaden mourned that ‘music triumphantly reigns over the subject reason of the country’ and Henry Redhead Yorke railed against music as ‘corruption, effeminacy, execrable fooleries and sing-song lullabies’.²⁰ Richard Lepert explains that ‘the musical gentleman by his interests and actions semiotically deconstructed ... the definition of gender upon which both the society and the culture ultimately depended. It is this, I believe, which justified the phenomenal attention devoted to the control of music in English society.’²¹ London’s theatrical system was in a sense built on these prejudices. The most prized houses of the national drama, the major theatres, had a patented right to speech, while music was relegated either to the foreign productions at the King’s Theatre or to the realm of spectacle and show at the minor theatres.

In reality, however, music fascinated theatre audiences and pervaded every venue and virtually every performance. All three types of theatre envied their neighbours and made increasingly bold incursions across repertoire lines. The minor theatres

tried numerous inventive methods to outwit repertoire restrictions, with few legal repercussions, while major theatres frequently turned to ‘illegitimate’ genres filled with music in order to stay solvent. Opera was a particularly desirable commodity. In 1832, for example, William Dunn, secretary and treasurer to the committee that owned Drury Lane, asserted that they would have been able to ask £4000 or £5000 a year more in rent had they been able to perform Italian opera.²² The operatic adaptations studied here stemmed from the desire of the major and minor theatres – the playhouses – to challenge the King’s Theatre’s operatic domain. By the late 1820s and 1830s, foreign operas regularly appeared at all three types of theatre.

Music thus pervaded playhouse productions, but in a distinctive shape born of these circumstances.²³ Despite music’s popularity, speech remained central. Many pieces featured only isolated musical numbers or, like melodrama, focused on instrumental accompaniment rather than vocal music.²⁴ Even operas mixed song and speech; with the exception of Arne’s *Artaxerxes*, few British operas were sung throughout. Furthermore, while native operas featured plentiful music, they still tended to privilege speech. Leading male characters frequently did not sing at all and vocal music functioned primarily as an ornament, not as a participant in the action.²⁵ Only a handful of native singers received the training and encouragement necessary to compete with the foreign stars at the King’s Theatre, although this changed in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Playhouses’ orchestras and choruses received mixed reviews and additional musicians and rehearsals were often needed to tackle challenging works.²⁶ Adapters of foreign opera thus had to reconcile a chasm between the typical shape of continental opera and its form on the playhouse stage. Still, the effort seemed worthwhile in order to capitalise on the popularity of foreign opera without breaking repertoire laws.

While some contemporaries struggled to maintain rapidly collapsing repertoire distinctions, others wished to abolish the theatrical patents altogether. Anti-patent rhetoric drew much of its force from larger economic and political issues. Davis describes the patent monopoly as ‘directly analogous’ to monopolies granted to companies such as the English East India Company and the theatre became an important site for advocating a laissez-faire policy.²⁷ The patent theatres also seemed to hoard power and use it unwisely, much like the government and the unpopular King George IV. Eugene Macarthy linked theatrical and political oppression, claiming ‘the arrogant and despotic edicts of a Theatrical Oligarchy have roused the honest and indignant feelings of the English heart, which swells with a natural and instinctive hatred of tyranny and oppression’.²⁸ It is no coincidence that the first bill to eliminate the theatrical monopoly reached Parliament in 1831–2, at precisely the same time as the Reform Bill, which advocated less corrupt and more widespread political representation. The Reform Bill passed, but theatrical reform failed in the House of Lords. For some, this solidified the idea of an entrenched aristocracy resisting the change

6 | *Foreign Opera at the London Playhouses*

demanding by the broader populace. Repertoire restrictions were not lifted until 1843, as part of a larger shift towards free trade that included the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846.²⁹ By that point, however, generic boundaries had become so contested that theatrical reform was almost a formality.

Whether they supported the patent system or not, most contemporaries agreed that the national drama was declining. A pervasive rhetoric described Shakespearean drama as a height from which theatres had fallen. The stage no longer attracted the greatest writers of the day, such as Wordsworth or Byron.³⁰ Instead, the foreign, musical and spectacular seemed to overrun theatres. Thomas James Mathias mourned:

When Novels die, and rise again in plays:
 No Congress props our Drama's falling state,
 The modern ultimatum is, 'Translate'.³¹

Contemporaries most often blamed decline on the large size of the patent theatres, which had rebuilt on a grander scale both in the late eighteenth century and then again after fire destroyed both houses in 1808–9. John Payne Collier summarised the prevailing view:

I think the great theatres have owed their present condition partly to their magnitude, partly to the representations that have taken place at them, and partly to the difficulty of hearing, understanding and enjoying representations of a more regular and legitimate character. In fact it all resolves itself into magnitude.³²

These houses were not necessarily larger than other London and continental theatres.³³ Nonetheless, the size argument proved pervasive because it aptly symbolised the complex factors implicated in decline. The image of a huge theatre, dependent on large receipts for its survival, mirrored the gradual move from aristocratic to public patronage. While this freed artists in some respects, it dangerously equated artistic and financial worth. Patrick Brantlinger summarises: 'Literature and the other arts, emancipated ... from aristocratic patronage and repression, were emancipated through the processes of commodification.'³⁴ Greed seemed the catalyst of decline. Some drew parallels between managers' focus on whatever would earn the most money and the prostitutes who solicited clients in the audience. One of Drury Lane's proprietors exclaimed, 'What would a theatre be without the girls? ... morality and profit can't go hand in hand in our Theatres.'³⁵ Some contemporaries feared he could as easily have said artistic worth and profit.

Class issues lay at the root of these concerns. London theatres were divided into three sections: boxes, pit and galleries. At the patent theatres, prices for these sections remained fairly constant through the first few decades of the nineteenth century: seven shillings for a box; three shillings sixpence for the pit; two shillings for the gallery; and one shilling for the upper gallery. Patrons could enter later in the evening for half

price tickets. Contemporaries viewed these regions as strictly stratified, as James Robinson Planché described:

Ye belles and ye beaux
Who adorn our low rows,
Ye gods, who preside in the high ones;
Ye critics who sit
All so snug in the pit
An assemblage of clever and sly ones.³⁶

Although audiences of the period still await systematic study, Jim Davis confirms these basic divisions: 'Audiences comprised a cross section of society: the more aristocratic, fashionable and affluent patrons in the boxes; intellectuals, less affluent gentlemen and professionals in the pit; tradesmen and their wives in the middle gallery and servants, footmen and sailors among the inhabitants of the upper gallery.'³⁷

These classes jostled uneasily together. One writer complained in 1821, 'Half a century ago . . . the prosperity of a theatre depended mainly on people of rank, and a critical Pit . . . All this is swept away by the enlargement of the theatres, and the immense alteration produced by the commercial intoxication of the last thirty years.'³⁸ As the playhouses began to spiral out of the control of the educated elite, wealthy patrons retreated.³⁹ Actor and manager Charles Mathews noted: 'if [the fashionable] are asked whether they have been at Covent Garden or Drury Lane, they say, "Oh dear, no! I never go there, it is too low!"'⁴⁰ Playhouse managers tried to lure these patrons back, and adaptations of the same operas that played at the opera house – seen as an upper-class preserve – were clearly meant to attract them. Yet, such appeals had to be subtle. When John Philip Kemble re-opened Covent Garden in 1809 after it had been destroyed by fire, he deliberately tried to attract the elite; he raised prices, erected more private boxes and hired foreign opera star Angelica Catalani. The violent 'old price riots' that erupted forced Kemble to retract these changes and showed managers that they could not cater so blatantly to a moneyed clientele.⁴¹

Swinging to the opposite extreme and gratifying gallery attendees, however, also drew criticism. Many contemporaries thought these patrons lowered the collective taste of the playhouses. Gallery audiences encored 'low, vulgar song[s]', and were 'at the beck of specious and showy charlatanism'.⁴² One author stated baldly, 'our dramatic public is always likely to be ignorant, whilst all classes are admitted to the same entertainment'.⁴³ Bringing such patrons into the fold of elevated taste took on an urgent tone in light of the riotous tendencies that lay uncomfortably close to the surface of Georgian life. Riots against the Corn Laws, attacks or planned attacks in the late 1810s and 1820s on the unpopular Prince Regent, later George IV, and agitation surrounding the Reform Bill in 1832 led to anxiety about the potential power of disaffected masses.

Who, then, was supposed to guide theatrical taste, and how could they do so? Jacky Bratton, Rachel Cowgill and Jennifer Hall-Witt have argued that the ‘middling’ classes – the ‘critical Pit’ – fought to assume this role.⁴⁴ They did so through a powerful public channel, for the critics of the expanding press were predominantly middle class.⁴⁵ Such critics possessed both considerable bias and influence, often through corrupt connections with theatre managers. Critic Leigh Hunt scoffed that ‘what the public took for a criticism on a play was a draft upon the box-office, or reminiscences of last Thursday’s salmon and lobster-sauce’.⁴⁶ Of course, Hunt here vaunted his own objectivity, which was hardly unassailable. Critics were not simply managers’ minions, however; they were individuals with strong views and an effective conduit for transmitting them. Although all reviews were anonymous, most critics’ identities were an ‘open secret’.⁴⁷ Men such as William Ayrton, Richard Mackenzie Bacon, John Payne Collier, William Hazlitt and Hunt both reflected and shaped public opinion. Some, such as Ayrton and Bacon, were prominent in London musical life and edited groundbreaking musical journals – *The Harmonicon* and the *Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review*, respectively – to promulgate their agenda of improving musical taste. Others, such as Hunt and Hazlitt, were part of the ‘Cockney’ writers, so named because of their radical politics and middle-class background, and utilised theatrical and literary criticism to effect social and political reform.⁴⁸ Still others approached opera from a primarily literary angle and even confessed ignorance of music. *The Athenaeum* explained, ‘Our duty is with theatrical, not operatic criticism, and music only comes to us incidentally, through the former medium.’⁴⁹ Literary-minded critics like Collier therefore focused on preserving legitimate drama and sometimes relegated music to a corrupting influence.⁵⁰

Despite often-conflicting views, the majority of these critics agreed that the national drama desperately needed rescuing from a state of decline. Bratton even suggests that they engendered this idea: “the decline of the drama” was a concept generated in the press and in critical writing of the period for the particular purposes of a newly ascendant hegemonic faction, the literate (and overwhelmingly male) middle classes, whose project was to recapture the stage ... for the exclusive transmission of their own voice’.⁵¹ They primarily sought to do this by undermining the ‘event-oriented’ theatrical model, in which the audience focused on favourite performers and the experience of attending the theatre. Instead, they advocated a ‘work-oriented’ model, in which the goal of attendance was to hear, with rapt attention, a specific piece.⁵² With this model, critics hoped to shield works from commercialism and mass judgment, to impose aesthetic and social control through theatrical taste. Such goals merged seamlessly with canonicity. Weber discerns that ‘Because the great master-works were thought to stand above the money-making side of musical life, they could help society transcend commercial culture.’⁵³ The battle against dramatic decline was therefore also the battle for fidelity.

In numerous respects, adaptation fell on the wrong side of these debates. On a practical level, it ran counter to expanding copyright law, the legal underpinning of the canon. In Britain, copyright laws began in 1710 for print culture, but only gradually expanded into the fluid sphere of performance. Only in the 1830s, for example, did authors win rights to performances beyond the original theatre and in the 1880s to performances beyond the original country, although attempts at establishing international copyright began in the 1830s.⁵⁴ While some foreign composers tried to control adaptations of their works, as shall be seen with Ries and Meyerbeer, adapters could still profit fairly freely from others' originals. In 1828, *The Athenaeum* bristled, '[adapters] talk with the utmost complacency of the success of *their* piece (!!) and remorselessly appropriate the profits arising from the disfigurement and destruction of a work'.⁵⁵ The financial motivation for copyright – and the challenge posed to it by adaptation – is clear.

Operatic adaptations also strayed from the purported repertoire of the patent theatres in all three of their most basic aspects: they were adaptations; they were musical; and they were foreign. Although adaptation pervaded virtually all theatres, it was often viewed as a specifically minor theatre activity. At the edge of the law, minor theatres frequently used adaptation to present popular major theatre pieces in new versions that could just barely escape legal repercussions. As Jane Moody argues, adaptation was tainted with illegitimacy: 'The spectre of adaptation rapidly became synonymous with the impossibility of curtailing illegitimate representation.'⁵⁶ Adaptations of operas were even more troublesome. When major theatre managers imported pieces that featured music, they abandoned their patented duty to maintain the legitimate, spoken tradition of native drama. Additionally, such adaptations drew the major theatres closer not only to musical, illegitimate fare, but also to the King's Theatre, with its foreign operas sung by foreign stars. This appeared inimical to theatres that were supposed to uphold native drama, as well as to native composers and any hope of a national operatic tradition. British composer and adapter Bishop spoke of the harsh personal and financial consequences of the culture of adaptation:

with the situation into which I have been thrown by the system now pursued by the Theatres (from the patronage of whatever is foreign only) it is with utmost difficulty we can manage to get together day after day the bare means to live! . . . Heaven knows I tried every nerve to [write an Opera for publisher Thomas Mackinlay], but foreign music, and all that was foreign, was the cry!⁵⁷

Adaptation also challenged burgeoning canonical ideals by testing the nature of fidelity. Most fundamentally, adaptation exposed the slippery nature of the original. Opera composers often created several versions and revisions, which derailed a sense of a fixed original. As Parker reasons, 'Considered at all closely, almost all operas become problem works so far as establishing a definitive text is concerned.'⁵⁸ The

original libretto was itself frequently an adaptation of a tale known in other forms. The story of the barber of Seville, for example, was not confined to Rossini and Sterbini's opera, but crowded alongside remembrances of Beaumarchais' play, its British adaptation and Paisiello's opera. Adaptations were therefore often part of a continuum of retellings, of which the opera was only one manifestation.

Compounding this issue was the fact that few listeners would have had access to a reliable original. Some heard these works performed abroad and retained vivid but not always accurate memories of them. Others first heard them at the King's Theatre, where music directors often made changes to the score, interpolated divertissements between acts or performed only individual acts of popular operas. Listeners could also consult published scores, but a full original orchestral score was less frequently available than piano-vocal arrangements, excerpts, variations and fantasias. Popular foreign works also frequently appeared in multiple adaptations in London – most memorably with eight separate productions of *Der Freischütz* in 1824 – which tended to obscure the original in a sometimes bewildering abundance of versions.

Even when critics felt confident in comparing original to adaptation, they often found that fidelity did not equal worth. When adapters significantly altered a revered original, critics could espouse a strict rejection of change. *The Atlas* exclaimed of Bishop's adaptation of *Le nozze di Figaro*, 'What has been gained by defacing, mutilating, and vulgarizing so perfect an opera?'⁵⁹ Usually, however, there was a considerable grey area. Few critics objected to or even remarked on the translation of foreign operas into English or the use of spoken dialogue in lieu of recitative. Many critics actively encouraged adapters to interpolate pieces from the same composer's other operas. Reviewing an adaptation of *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*, Ayrton suggested that 'It were much to be wished, that all the deficiencies had been supplied from Mozart's less known works'.⁶⁰ Still others thought changes were necessary to improve musical taste. *The Journal of Music and the Drama* applauded Bishop's adaptation of *Figaro*, citing his 'zealous and honourable ambition to enrich and improve the music of his native stage'.⁶¹ Assessments varied widely depending on the perceived worth of both original and adaptation. Outraged at Eugène Scribe's changes to Sir Walter Scott in *La dame blanche*, Collier protested that 'if the music were to be sacredly preserved, there is no reason why equal homage should be paid to the ignorance and incongruities of the French writer'.⁶² Change was often preferable to fidelity if it produced a better result. *The Times* suggested that an adaptation of Winter's *Das unterbrochene Opferfest* be curtailed, since 'Apple-pudding is an excellent thing; but a man might be fed with too large a quantity of it – especially, if he had to eat through a heavy crust before he came to the apples'.⁶³