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French accompanied keyboard music published between the late 1730s and early 1760s generally contains a written-out keyboard part with one or more accompanying instruments. In this genre we find, for the first time, that the keyboard plays an equal, if not the more dominant, role in ensemble chamber music. This repertory has been largely misunderstood and underappreciated because it has frequently been evaluated, not on its own terms, but in terms of accompanied collections from other regions and also in terms of the substantial and substantially different repertories of keyboard music with optional accompanying instrument(s) that flooded the market during the second half of the eighteenth century.

My study attempts to illustrate the distinctive qualities of this early French accompanied repertory and to highlight its relationship to the fascination with mixed style by French composers, the public, critics, and philosophers. Together, these groups
formulated an aesthetic of *goûts réunis*, which encouraged composers to adhere chiefly to the French tradition, while experimenting with the tasteful incorporation of Italianate virtuosity, bold harmonic language, and form. This ideal of style mixture made French accompanied keyboard music distinctively French, characterized by a rich variety of internal details, elegant restraints, noble simplicity and clarity, a tasteful blend of French delicateness and sweetness with Italianate learnedness and boldness, never taken to excess.

Two early examples of this repertory by Mondonville and Rameau provided important prototypes for subsequent French accompanied sets. Mondonville’s Op. 3 illustrates a strong leaning toward the Italian sonata tradition, while Rameau’s *Concerts* show greater affinity to the French *pièces de clavecin* tradition. The surprising invocation of *la belle nature* in Mondonville’s dedicatory note to his Op. 3 established, as I suggest, an intriguing link between the important new aesthetic theory and the fashionable musical concept of *goûts réunis*. My study shows that composers of this repertory conveyed the notion of *goûts réunis* by skillfully utilizing all the elements of the aural, the visual (verbal markings), and the intellectual (structural organization) to create a unified ensemble appealing both to the senses and to the mind: an artistic objective that was quintessentially French.
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FRENCH ACCOMPANIED KEYBOARD MUSIC (1738 – 1760): A STUDY OF TEXTURE AND STYLE MIXTURE

Introduction

Important Issues Concerning French Accompanied Keyboard Music

French accompanied keyboard music, which began around the third decade of the eighteenth century, generally contains a written-out keyboard part with one or more accompanying instruments. In this genre we find, for the first time, that the keyboard plays an equal, if not a dominant, role in ensemble chamber music. The significance of this genre lies in its strong connection with the development of eighteenth-century solo and ensemble music and its relation with the emerging fascination with style mixture in France after 1700.

The development of this genre is complicated by its highly varied repertory and by its cultivation in different European regions. Its multifaceted origins can be traced to two main traditions: the tradition of accompanying solo harpsichord or lute pieces with melody instruments and the tradition of replacing one violin part in a trio sonata with the right hand of the keyboard part.1

In recent years, various studies have led to a better understanding of accompanied keyboard music. Though these studies significantly advance our knowledge of the genre, they have also generated confusion by proposing misleading generalizations. One of the

---

confusions relevant to this study, which David Fuller qualifies as “one of the puzzles of music history,” involves the issue of obligato/optional accompaniment. There is no disagreement among scholars that the violin accompaniment for Mondonville's Op. 3 (the first collection of French accompanied keyboard music, published around 1738) belongs to the obligato type—that is, it is independently conceived and it forms an integral part of the total texture. Disputes about this issue only concern pieces composed immediately after Mondonville's set, such as those by Rameau and Dupuits. The source of this dispute undoubtedly arises from several highly quotable prefaces by Rameau, Guillemain, and Corrette. According to Rameau, “These pieces [his own Pièces de clavecin en concert], played on the harpsichord alone, leave nothing to be desired; one would not even suspect that they were capable of any further embellishment.”

Modern commentators offer various opinions concerning this matter. Fuller and Girdlestone find Rameau’s suggestion of dispensable accompaniment puzzling; they both strongly believe that Rameau's own arrangements for harpsichord solo paled by comparison to the originals from the concerted set. Indeed, the wide sweeping texture

---


4 Trans. by Fuller from Rameau's preface to his Pièces de clavecin en concert in Fuller, Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music, 167.

5 See ibid., 167; Cuthbert Morton Girdlestone, Jean-Philippe Rameau, his life and work (London: Cassell, 1957), 44. The solo harpsichord arrangements include only five pieces: La Livr, L'Agaçante, La Timide (1st rondeau and 2nd. rondeau), and L'Indiscrète.
and the remarkable concertante writing in the ensemble setting make it difficult to agree with Rameau that his own solo arrangements “lose nothing.”

Richard Neher, who argues that Rameau's concerted set is an extension of his solo harpsichord pieces, uses Rameau's statement as evidence showing the composer's intention “to make the clavécin serve as the compositional focal point of the ensemble.”

Newman agrees with Rameau, suggesting that “the two [accompanying] parts in Rameau’s set often only fill out the clavécin part and sometimes simply double it.”

While Newman’s observation is accurate for certain passages from the *Pièces en concert*, a detailed study of the entire collection will show that the string doubling of harpsichord parts is merely one of Rameau's many ways of creating textural contrast.

Newman's evaluation of the nature of the accompanying parts in Rameau's set is problematic because it focuses only on the kind of texture rather than on how a certain texture is used within the context of the entire piece. Newman’s statement regarding the accompanied keyboard music of Rameau and Guillemain further illustrates how the non-contextual approach can lead to erroneous conclusions. He writes: “Actually, in the mere eleven years since Mondonville's Op. 3 had appeared, one can detect an evolution toward the optional, dispensable accompaniment.”

A careful study of the French repertory published between 1738 and 1760 calls this statement into question and reveals that the


7 Newman, *The sonata in the classic era*, 622.

8 Ibid., 622.
early composers of this genre constantly vacillate between the obligato and optional types of accompaniment. Hence, the claim that the optionally-accompanied style, which became the predominant style after the 1760s, evolved from Rameau and Guillemain is misleading. One of the aims of textural study in this dissertation is to show the wide variety of instrumental scorings and to reveal that the relationship among the various instruments remains a primary concern of French composers throughout this early period.

The second goal of this study is to examine comprehensively the imaginative manner in which the composers of accompanied keyboard repertory experimented with the possibilities of combining the plethora of contemporary national style features and genres. How these French composers deal with opposing French and Italian styles and how they synthesize or juxtapose them is fascinating and deserves a systematic, detailed investigation. The contentious debates among the public, aestheticians, music critics, and musicians over the merits of French and Italian music and their combinations provided a fertile ground for mixed-genre experimentation in music such as accompanied keyboard music, whose origin was based in part on a deliberate attempt to merge the essence of two national styles.

The major debates in France during the first half of the eighteenth century were the famous quarrels of Raguenet and Lecerf (1702-1706), the arguments of the Lullists and Ramistes (1730s-1740s) and the war of the buffoons (1752-54). To be sure, literary debates do not necessarily prescribe the directions of musical trends, but such quarrels—which "grew to the proportions of a national pastime, providing an opportunity for passionate debate and occupying the finest minds of the Enlightenment as well as the
fashionable *gens du monde*—“shed light on the cultural background from which these pieces sprang. Although most of the arguments center on operatic music, the participants’ attitudes, ranging from polemical to reconciliatory, are of immediate relevance. The concept of style mixture as a symbol of modern progress and a new French identity became an important motivation for composers who experimented with style mixture.

Two Important Early Examples of French Accompanied Keyboard Music

The earliest concrete example of accompanied keyboard music in France is the well-known set by Jean-Joseph Cassanéa de Mondonville, *Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon*, Op. 3, published between 1737 or 1738 (not 1734-1738).¹⁰ This set was the first of its kind in France in which the accompanying instrument was indispensable and on equal footing with the keyboard part. While fully aware of the overabundance of sonata writing of all sorts in Paris during the early decades of the eighteenth century (mainly solo and trio sonatas with continuo accompaniment), Mondonville claimed in his dedicatory note that he had sought to find something new.¹¹ Modern scholars, however, offer different evaluations of the

---


¹⁰ The publication date of Mondonville’s Op. 3 collection had been problematic. It was widely accepted as 1734-1740 until David Fuller offered a new estimate date of 1738-1740 in Bruce Gustafson and David R. Fuller, *A catalogue of French harpsichord music, 1699-1780* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1990), 179. Fuller has since moved up the estimate date to 1737 or 1738, convinced by the argument offered in Denis Herlin and Davitt Moroney, eds., *Jean-Philippe Rameau, Opera Omnia* (Paris: Gérard Billaudot, 1996), XXXII, fn. 8; see David Fuller, “Reviews: Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Opera Omnia*, ser. 1, vol. 2, *Pièces de clavecin en concerts*,” *JAMS* 51/1 (Spring 1998), 185, fn. 7.

“innovative” nature of Mondonville's Op. 3. Newman, for example, points out that the texture used in Op. 3 resembles that of Bach’s earlier violin sonatas with obligato keyboard. On the other hand, Fuller thinks that Mondonville's collection is “a genuinely original achievement—one of the rare instances of the creation in one stroke of a new and fully developed genre.” He also points out that French accompanied keyboard music developed independently from Bach’s sonatas, which were unlikely to have been known in France before 1750.

Aside from being ‘something new,’ Mondonville's Op. 3 has historical significance due to its immediate success and its impact on later composers. First, Op. 3 is Mondonville's only instrumental music that was re-published twice during his lifetime, and it was frequently performed ‘en grand concerto’ at the Concert Spirituel (a public concert series established in Paris in 1724). Second, Rameau implicitly referred to Mondonville’s pioneering set in the preface to his Pièces de clavecin en concert (1741): “The success of the 'Sonates' which recently appeared as ‘Pièces de Clavecin avec un Violon’ has induced me to follow more or less the same plan in the new

12 Ibid., 618-19.
13 Fuller, Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music, 160.
14 Ibid., 158.
15 Six Sonates or Lessons for the Harpsichord which may be accompanied with a Violin or German Flute (London, Walsh, [1750]); Sei Sonatte de cembalo Acompagnate dal Violino composte del Sigr Mondonville maestro de Capella di Verssagles del re di Francia (n.p., n.d.).
16 Gustafson and Fuller, Catalogue of French harpsichord music, 1699-1780, 179.
harpsichord pieces that I venture to publish at this time.”17 Moreover, the impact of
accompanied keyboard music continued to be felt by later composers such as Guillemain
and Simon, who were compelled to compose in this medium in order to “conform to the
present taste.”18 Guillemain even modeled the title for his own accompanied sonatas
after Mondonville. Between 1741 and 1760, there were at least eighteen more
publications of accompanied keyboard music in Paris, of which three are lost (see
Appendix A).

Mondonville's selection of the title for Op. 3 (Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec
accompagnement de violon) suggests a deliberate effort to combine the indigenous
French and Italian styles. His decision to open with a French ouverture and close with an
Italian Concerto is obviously consistent with his intention to fuse the two national styles.
The hybrid nature of his Op. 3, with a strong leaning toward the Italian sonata tradition,
provides an important model of style mixture for subsequent composers in the genre.

Despite Rameau’s indebtedness to Mondonville’s innovative set, his pièces de
clavcin en concerts significantly depart from Mondonville’s model in that they show
more affinity to the French pièces de clavcin tradition in their use of dance movements,
programmatic titles, and idiomatic keyboard writing. Rameau’s set, therefore, provides an
alternative prototype for subsequent French accompanied keyboard music. Appendix B
reveals a general splintering of the accompanied collections into three groups: sonata
settings, pièces de clavcin settings, and hybrid settings. In general, the works in sonata

Fuller, Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music, 165.

18 Their prefaces are translated and quoted by Newman, The sonata in the classic era, 622, 625.
setting are more Italianate, characterized by a considerable uniformity in formal organization. On the other hand, collections in pièces de clavecin setting generally are programmatic, have a variable number of movements sharing the same tonic, and some accompanied pieces intrude amid solo harpsichord pieces in suite collections. These subsequent accompanied sets took their cue in one way or another from either Mondonville or Rameau, or from both. I will sort out the contributions Mondonville and Rameau made to the development of this flexible genre characterized by its diversity.

Previous Studies Concerning French Accompanied Keyboard Music

Before I review previous studies directly related to this dissertation, it would be useful to mention briefly important research on similar repertories in Germany, Italy, and England. Among dissertations on accompanied keyboard music, Ronald Kidd's dissertation titled “The Sonata for Keyboard with Violin Accompaniment in England (1750-1790)” has been most influential.19 The terminologies he uses for different types of texture in this genre have been adopted by recent writers and will be used in this study as well.20 More importantly, his systematic survey of a large body of music challenges the traditional view that chamber music with piano of Mozart and Beethoven “evolved”


directly from earlier optionally accompanied keyboard music. He convincingly demonstrated that English accompanied keyboard music frequently vacillated between the optionally accompanied type and the concertante type—the scoring typical of mature duos and trios of Mozart and Beethoven.

The numerous studies concerning the development of this genre in Austro-German countries include dissertations by Hans Mersmann, Roderich Fuhrmann, and Wilhelm Fischer, which concentrate on the genre’s origin in Germany, and by Michelle Fillion on Viennese early Classical chamber music with obligato keyboard. Fillion's research has provided valuable information on the milieu in which Haydn's early keyboard trios arose.

The review of published works directly related to French accompanied keyboard music will begin with broad surveys and end with specialized studies that focus on a single composer. The four monumental works that laid bibliographical groundwork for research in this genre are William Newman’s *The Sonata in the Classic Era*, Lionel La Laurencie’s *L’École française de violon de Lully à Viotti*, David Fuller’s *Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music*, and Eduard Reeser’s *De Klaviersonate met Vioolbegeleiding in het parijsche Muziekleven ten Tijde van Mozart*. Each approaches the topic from a different angle.

---


Newman includes this genre as part of his comprehensive survey of Baroque and Classical sonatas. As I mentioned earlier, his conclusions, based on overly generalized observations, are misleading. Because of the broad scope of his study, he tends to draw tenuous stylistic connections between repertories that developed independently from each other.

La Laurencie examines this genre in reference to the history of eighteenth-century French violin music. His three-volume book provides valuable biographical materials as well as selected contemporary comments and reviews of this genre. His discussion of the music, however, remains superficial.

Fuller’s dissertation studies the accompanied music within the context of French harpsichord music. He provides valuable bibliographic information on many harpsichord works that are not readily accessible. His section on accompanied keyboard music is necessarily broad and can be enriched with further detailed study on this topic.23

Reeser’s dissertation in Dutch is the first comprehensive study devoted entirely to accompanied keyboard music. It covers the French accompanied clavier sonatas from the first example (Mondonville) up to 1790, including the works of twelve French composers and eight German émigrés. One significant aspect of this dissertation is that it makes available in a scholarly edition twelve complete sonatas, most of which are still not otherwise readily accessible. But the scope of his study is too wide to allow much detailed discussion. Reeser’s principal focus is on the formal construction of the sonatas. Other aspects of the sonatas such as textural treatment and style mixture are treated

\[\text{harpsichord music}, \text{ 2 v}; \text{ Eduard Reeser, } \text{De klaviersonate met vioolbegeleiding in het Parijsche muziekleven ten tijde van Mozart} \text{ (Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse's uitgeversmaatschappij n.v., 1939)}\]

\[\text{23 Fuller, } \text{Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music}, \text{ 149-69.}\]
haphazardly. Reeser’s selection of composers for his study is based largely on the landmark works that demonstrate the development of the sonata form, thus neglecting other fine examples of accompanied keyboard music such as those by Rameau, Boismortier, Dupuits and Noblet. Furthermore, the balance of material discussed leans heavily toward works composed after 1760.

Two other broad studies of French accompanied keyboard music are Graham McPhail’s master’s thesis from New Zealand and Yumi Patterson’s D.M.A. document. McPhail’s thesis appears to cover the accompanied keyboard sonatas from 1734 to 1778, ending with Mozart’s duo sonatas (K. 301-K. 306). The period covered is very similar to Reeser’s Dutch dissertation and the author seems to concentrate only on the sonatas. Patterson’s document focuses on 8 of the 15 collections covered in this dissertation. Her brief analyses mainly focus on how each composer of an accompanied set dealt with the accompanying instruments in their music.

Research that focuses on works published in France by a specific composer includes Hugo Riemann’s early research on Schobert's sonatas (composed ca. 1760-


26 Information taken from “BiblioLine. RILM abstracts of music literature,” in National Information Services Corp. (Accessed Oct 8, 2002), <http://biblioline.nisc.com/scripts/login.dll>. I have not been able to access this thesis despite several attempts to obtain a copy via interlibrary loan or direct communication with Victoria University.
1767). His overly enthusiastic attempt to place Schobert within the Mannheim school has prompted considerable skepticism from later scholars. Herbert Turrentine's research challenges Riemann's thesis by demonstrating that Schobert's style incorporates a variety of influences stemming from German, Austrian, French and Italian sources. Although the title of Turrentine's dissertation indicates a coverage from 1700 to the French revolution, all the information on the music before that of Schobert is largely based upon the previous research of Newman and Reeser. Turrentine may not have consulted the music of the Parisian composers before Schobert. He writes: “It is to Schobert's credit that he transferred [minuets] to the Parisian keyboard sonata.”

There are, however, several examples of minuets in earlier French accompanied sonatas that Schobert might have known. (See Dupuits, Op. 3/6, Clément, Op. 1/3, and Corrette, Op. 25/3.)

Edith Borroff's dissertation on Mondonville’s instrumental music is the only extended scholarly study on a major composer of this genre before 1760. While her stylistic analyses of the pieces ably demonstrated Mondonville’s ingenious resourcefulness in integrating the French *Pièces de clavecin* tradition with the Italian


30 Ibid., 310.

sonata tradition, there is much left to be done on Mondonville’s fascination with generic hybrids and his influence on later French accompanied keyboard music, specifically in the way he applied the notion of style mixture to the overall organization of his collection.

Considering the tremendous success of Mondonville's accompanied sonatas and the fact that later composers were compelled to experiment with this new genre, Mondonville's role in the development of this genre deserves a thorough investigation. Furthermore, the new dating of Mondonville's Op. 3 (1737-38 instead of 1734) may strengthen the notion of its ‘immediate’ impact on subsequent compositions, for it significantly shortens the time lag between Mondonville’s publication and the next accompanied keyboard music—Rameau’s Pièces de clavecin en concert (Paris, 1741).

Three other smaller studies, devoted to Rameau's set, are Richard Neher, “The Interrelationships of Clavecin and Accompanying Instruments in the Pièces de clavecin en concerts,”32 Paul Torgrimson, “A Practical Edition of Pièces de clavecin en concerts by Jean-Philippe Rameau,”33 and Sandra Mangsen, “Rameau’s Pièces en concerts.”34 Although Neher's lucid comparison of Rameau’s varied texture used in the solo and en concert pieces is well conceived, the document is unfortunately rather brief—much of its total forty-eight pages is also devoted to background information. Torgrimson’s D.M.A.

32 Neher, The interrelationships of clavecin and accompanying instruments in the Pièces de clavecin en concerts by Jean Philippe Rameau; and A critical evaluation of the Etudes de perfectionnement in the Méthode des méthodes de piano, 2 v. in 1.


34 Mangsen, Rameau's Pièces en concerts, 21-40.
thesis chiefly concerns issues related to his arrangement of Rameau's *Pièces en concert* for modern instruments, and therefore is not directly related to this study. Mangsen uses an interesting quantitative method to place the movements in Rameau’s collection on a continuum based on the violin’s role in the texture of the movement, ranging from essential—when violin plays the main melody—to optional—when violin mostly doubles the keyboard part. By doing so, she could show that in all but three movements, the violin has independent or quasi-independent material in at least one-third of the bars, hence refuting Newman’s claim that the violin plays a non-essential role in Rameau’s *concerts*.35

This review of the relevant literature devoted to French accompanied keyboard music reveals that there has been no detailed study of the pre-1760 repertory as a whole to demonstrate the spirit of stylistic and generic experimentation that is central to this repertory. In addition, despite the considerable variety found in this music, several aspects tie these pieces together as a group. No writer has thoroughly and systematically examined the common threads that connect these seemingly disparate collections, especially the generic conventions set by the two early examples by Mondonville and Rameau. Furthermore, the diversity in instrumental treatment in this repertory cannot be fully appreciated unless we examine them using a contextual approach, which takes into account where a certain texture is used, how it is combined with other textures, and whether there is an overarching pattern that governs the concentration upon a certain texture within a collection.

Scope and Limits of the Present Study of French Accompanied Keyboard Music

With the recent publication of *A Catalogue of French Harpsichord Music, 1699-1780*,36 which contains the most up-to-date bibliographical information for sources and, significantly, new datings, the time is ripe for a detailed study of the French repertory. Furthermore, the music for this repertory has recently become more accessible with three collections published in modern edition (Mondonville's Op. 3, Rameau's *Pièces en concert* and Boismortier's sonatas) and seven reprints to-date in facsimile edition (collections by Mondonville (Op. 5), Michel Corrette, Jacques Duphly and Charles Noblet).

The present study is limited to the accompanied keyboard music published in France from its beginnings around 1738 through the year 1760. I chose 1760 as the *terminus ad quem* because this date marked the beginning of the German-Alsatian influence in this genre, thus changing the elements of style mixture in the French repertory. In addition, the appearance of the forte-piano around the 1760s in some ways affected keyboard writing and the interrelationship among the instruments. Finally, keyboard sonatas with truly optional accompaniment became the prevailing type of accompanied keyboard music after 1760. A change in publishing practice after that time, when the accompaniments frequently were no longer included in the scores, reflected the accompaniments’ dispensable nature.37

______________

36 Gustafson and Fuller, *Catalogue of French harpsichord music, 1699-1780*, 446.

37 See Reeser, *De klaviersonate met vioolbegeleiding in het Parijsche muziekleven ten tijde van Mozart*, 151-52.
Although the publications of French accompanied music before 1760 are not so numerous as those of solo harpsichord music, the accompanied repertory still consists of a significant number of works. Fifteen sets of pieces by fourteen composers have been identified as the main repertory for this study (see Appendix A). These fifteen collections include 66 multi-movement sonatas or pièces and 27 single-movement pieces.

This study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter examines the textural types found in French accompanied keyboard music. Textural observations in this study will cover all aspects of the interactions between the keyboard and the accompanying instruments, including the degree of prominence of the accompanying instruments, idiomatic treatment of each instrument, and the process in which textures are used to clarify and expand the form. In addition, comments on textural similarities with other musical genres such as Italian sonatas, Italian concertos, French overtures, and French pièces de clavecin will be incorporated into the discussion.

As pointed out earlier, there are problems in using a non-contextual approach in a textural analysis. Consequently, I will emphasize textural changes within the structural context of a piece. Such a contextually-oriented approach will provide a clear picture of the multiplicity and malleability of textural effects exhibited in most of the pieces under consideration. It will also allow a clear discussion of the pacing of overall textural changes within a piece. A lack of a consistent, widely accepted terminology for clear discussion of texture in accompanied keyboard music is problematic. I will adopt the textural classifications developed by Ronald Kidd, modified to reflect some specific

38 This excludes the three lost collections by Papavoine, Clément (1755), and Maucourt (1758).
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peculiarities of early French accompanied music. All textural terminologies used in the dissertation will be thoroughly explained at the beginning of Chapter one.

Chapter two discusses the aesthetics of style mixture in France. Views from sociological and philosophical perspectives about mixed style provide a fertile cultural background for the cultivation of French accompanied keyboard music. I examine the issues of *goûts réunis* (united taste) and *le bon goût* that grew out of various quarrels over the merits of French and Italian music and trace the changing taste for music in mixed style from negative to positive. This chapter also focuses on the promotion of mixed style by influential patrons.

Chapter three discusses the concept of style mixture as manifested in French accompanied keyboard music. This portion of the dissertation focuses on aspects such as title, tempo marking, instrumentation, melodic and harmonic styles, and formal structure that allude to national styles and genres. These parameters help us identify a composer’s method of exploring the possibilities afforded by French and Italian styles and genres. I give special attention to the various strategies of organizing the national styles in a collection in order to draw conclusions about possible influence among various publications from the accompanied repertory.

Chapter four deals with instrumental choices in the repertory as they pertain to national genres and descriptive titles. I will suggest ways in which composers may have chosen certain instrumental combinations to create a complex web of references to national genres and to the social status of the instruments as constructed by seventeenth and eighteenth-century artists of the *fête champêtre* style. I will also suggest ways composers’ compositional decisions may relate to contemporary aristocratic fads and fascinations.
Chapter five links the French aesthetics of *la belle nature* with Mondonville’s Op. 3 collection. By making a specific reference to the imitation of *la belle nature* in his dedicatory note to Op. 3, Mondonville provides a rare instance of a composer’s musical response to an important eighteenth-century French aesthetic theory. This chapter traces the meanings of *la belle nature* in French aesthetics from Charles Perrault (end of the seventeenth century) to Charles Batteux (around mid-eighteenth century) and presents interesting features in Op. 3 that may have been influenced by this aesthetic concept.
Chapter 1

Textural Issues in Accompanied Keyboard Music

The birth of accompanied keyboard music in France was motivated in part by composers’ desire to find something new (je me suis appliqué à chercher du nouveau).39 Central to such an exploration was the incorporation of textural processes found in other genres such as French solo pièces de clavecin and Italian sonatas and concertos. The resulting synthesis combines various national elements, as well as instrumental colors, to form a distinctive category of music with its own identity. The affinity of early French accompanied keyboard music to other important musical genres guides the organization of this chapter. It classifies movements into four broad textural types: (1) trio sonata texture; (2) concerto texture; (3) idiomatic keyboard texture (associated with the solo pièces de clavecin and the solo Italian keyboard sonata); and (4) “ad libitum” texture (associated with post-1760 accompanied keyboard music with optional, rather than obbligato accompaniment).

This categorization by no means aims to cast ensemble music into rigid molds. My goal is precisely the opposite. Classifying movements into different textural categories not only allows me to show the influence of other genres, but also provides an opportunity to discuss the varied manners of incorporating and mixing the textural elements from these models. That some movements fit two categories does not pose a

problem, but rather helps to illustrate my point. Since most of the movements do not continue in a single, continuous texture from beginning to end, the method of classification remains flexible by including discussion of textural deviations from their prototypes. I hope to show the multiplicity of instrumental deployments, and how new textures emerge from mixing musical models of French or Italian origin.

**Methodology**

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the keyboard’s relationship to other instruments is an important element, which defines and identifies the types of accompanied keyboard music developed in different geographical areas during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Modern studies of this highly varied repertory use different analytical approaches to describe the relationship, resulting in very different conclusions. I have adopted an approach that examines texture in a contextual manner, which focuses on the process of change and the interaction of different textural events within a movement as well as within entire, individual collections.

Wallace Berry, who advocates this analytical approach, defines musical texture as a total sonority, which “is conditioned in part by the number of those components sounding in simultaneity or concurrence, its qualities determined by the interactions, interrelations, and relative projections and substances of component lines or other component sounding factors.”

---

the melodic relation among musical lines in a qualitative manner (polyphony or homophony) or a quantitative manner (density or sparcity), but includes such other musical parameters as rhythm, dynamics, instrumental color, and registral spacing. This concern with textural structure is crucial in shaping my thinking about musical texture in general. It particularly helps me to broaden my approach, which incorporates the important element of style mixture to my textural analysis as it relates to the texture of various national genres.41

Trio Sonata Texture

The Baroque trio sonata was one of the prototypes that composers of accompanied keyboard music could draw upon for instrumental balance. I use the term “trio sonata texture” to draw attention to the textural affinity of the movements to the Baroque trio sonata, which features more or less continuous, three-part writing, consisting of two upper melodies and bass. The two upper voices interact with each other

in various ways: they imitate in a quasi-canonic manner or they pass a short melodic figure from one voice to another; they form a pair by moving in parallel thirds or sixths; they exchange melodic and rhythmic material (voice exchange); or they proceed independently from each other in non-imitative polyphony. The bass line occasionally gets involved in the imitation of the upper lines, or becomes part of the alternating voice pairs (for example, S1+S2, S1+bass, S2+bass). 42

I classify movements of accompanied keyboard music that employ these devices under two main categories: Imitative trio texture (see Appendix C.1) and non-imitative trio texture (Appendix C.2). Because of the wide variety in the handling of non-imitative texture, I have made further distinctions by subcategorizing Appendix C.2 into the melody instrument dominated type (Appendix C.2a), the keyboard dominated type (Appendix C.2b), and the equal voice type (Appendix C.2c).

Imitative trio texture (Appendix C.1)

Movements in this texture typically open with imitative voices, which enter either at the unison or a fifth above, and then proceed to other types of texture. With the exception of Noblet, all the composers in this study use this procedure as a means of equalizing the role of the keyboard and the melody instruments. Occasionally, this imitative dovetailing does occur in the middle of a movement for contrast. It is surprising that so much imitative writing appears in this repertory, even up to the 1750s (Legrand, ________________

42 S denotes soprano line.
Polyphony had generally gone out of fashion by the 1740s in favor of the homophonic texture of the gallant style, with slower harmonic rhythm. Such extensive use of imitative texture, especially between the keyboard and another instrument, emphasizes the importance of the other instrument to the total fabric of the music.

Different kinds of imitative technique appear in accompanied keyboard music. Generally, movements marked “fugue” or “canon” (Rameau, Dupuits, and Marchand) use stricter imitative procedures. We can also expect the fast sections of movements labeled *ouverture* to begin imitatively. These range from the stricter type, which involves long entries of subject and answer (Mondonville, Marchand, Duphly, and Simon), to loose imitation, which imitates a short head motif for about two measures and then dissolves into free counterpoint (Damoreau, Legrand).

As in trio sonatas, imitative texture is most frequently employed in the fast movements of French accompanied keyboard music. When imitative technique is applied in slow movements, it deviates from the trio sonata prototype most significantly. In the case of Mondonville (Op. 3/no.3/II), and Boismortier (sonata 4/II),

43 imitative procedure is used only in the keyboard part, which forms a foundation supporting the cantabile melody given to the obbligato instrument (Ex. 1.1, Op. 3/no. 3/II).

In an imitative slow movement by Rameau (concert 5/II), we see a sort of textural combination different from that of Mondonville and Boismortier. Whereas the latter

---

43 Perhaps enchanted by the differentiated texture created by such combination, Boismortier used this combined texture again later in a fast movement (Op.91/no. 5/I).
Ex. 1.1 Mondonville, Op. 3 (Paris, ca. 1738) Sonata no.3/II (mm. 1-9)
composers combine two differentiated textures (violin solo melody and imitative keyboard setting) from the beginning of the movement and maintain it more or less to the end, Rameau introduces imitative writing progressively through melodic transformation (see Ex. 1.2 and 1.2a) The piece begins with a melody/accompaniment texture similar to a solo violin sonata. After the first phrase concludes in a half cadence at m. 7, the entire phrase is essentially repeated with variation. The violin melody, now an octave lower, is given to the viol with the violin playing a sixth above it. The next phrase (m. 15) begins with the keyboard accompaniment alone for one measure. Then the violin (m.16) and viol (m.17) enter in point of imitation one measure apart, amidst a long process of modulation toward the relative major. The introduction of the imitative texture in m. 16 seems tentative due to its short, fragmentary phrasing. Such tentativeness disappears when we arrive at a full-fledged imitation at the beginning of the reprise (m. 33). Here, the viol, always a follower before, now asserts itself as the leader in the dialogue with the violin. Ex. 1.2a illustrates how the three melodies (mm.1-4, 16-19, 33-35) are motivically related. Each begins with A and then moves to G. Rameau varies the resolution of the melodic fragments in mm.16-19 by going up stepwise rather than down, as in mm.1-4 and mm. 33-35.

This movement’s textural variety is notable. We hear the melody and its variants first in melody/accompaniment texture (phrase 1, m.1), then repeated with a parallel sixth added to the melody (phrase 2, m.8), followed by brief imitative exchanges (phrase 3, m.16), and finally in a full-fledged imitation (Reprise, m.33).
Ex. 1.2a Comparison of melodic fragments: mm.1-4, mm.16-19, and mm.33-35
Concert 5/II is the only slow movement in the Rameau collection to use imitative technique. Rameau’s other six instances of imitative writing occur in fast movements. The pacing with which imitative texture unfolds in this slow movement offers a microcosmic illustration of how imitative setting is used in the whole collection.

Imitative counterpoint occurs with increasing frequency in the later part of Rameau’s collection, culminating to the last Concert (Concert 5), which opens with a “fugue.” (see Appendix C.1). Rameau first adopts imitative writing only in the third movements of Concerts 2 and 3. Then he increases its use in the first and third movements of Concert 4. Finally in Concert 5, Rameau puts his Italianate contrapuntal prowess on display in all three movements, which end the collection.

A similar progressive use of imitative texture can be found in the accompanied sets of Clément and Legrand, where imitative procedure becomes stricter in the later movements of each set. Guillemain, whose accompanied sonatas are set predominantly in a non-imitative trio texture, also adopts this procedure in the last two sonatas of his Op. 13 collection.

Clément’s use of imitative technique in Sonata 5/II and III is unusual for his collection. The appearance of this texture in movements 2 (Aria I and Aria II) and 3 (Allegro) in this sonata may reflect Clément’s desire to maintain equal partnership between the violin and the harpsichord in a different manner than the first movement, which is subtitled “Concerto,” where the violin and keyboard customarily alternate roles in tutti/solo sections. The paired Arias in Sonata 5 are especially Italianate when
compared to other Arias in the same collection by their unique choices of imitative
texture (instead of a suave, homophonic texture), the Italianate time-signature (6/8
instead of the French 2 or 3 that happens in arias from Sonatas no. 1, 4, 6), and the use of
binary form (instead of French rondeau form). The appearances of brief imitative texture
in parts of the third movement (marked Allegro) in Sonata 5 provide additional Italian
flavor to this sonata. Certainly, the subtitle of “Concerto” in the first movement supplied
the cue to its Italianate affinity.

In general, we thus observe a tendency for composers of French accompanied sets
to use more imitative counterpoint toward the end of their collections (Rameau, Clément,
Legrand, and Guillemain). This suggests that there may have been a common
organizational strategy in preparing the collections for publication. Since the function of
imitative writing is to distribute melodies equally among parts, these composers may
have wanted to achieve such balance at the end of a collection after various other textures
had been explored earlier.

Non-imitative trio texture

**Melody instrument dominated type (Appendix C.2a)**

In many slow movements of accompanied keyboard music, composers make full
use of the sustaining quality of the wind or stringed instruments by giving them
expressive cantabile melodies. These melodies are accompanied by the keyboard in
various ways: (1) The slow-moving melodies can be accompanied by florid discant
melodies in the harpsichord’s right-hand part (e.g. Dupuits, Damoreau). This type of keyboard accompaniment is quite rare. (2) The melody instrument and keyboard may combine to create a melody/accompaniment texture similar to that in the solo violin sonatas, in which the keyboard either has figured bass notation (e.g. Dupuits, Marchand), or the accompaniment has written out figuration resembling a realized figured bass (e.g. Mondonville Op. 3/4/II). This type of accompaniment, which proceeds in the unchanging three-part texture of the Baroque trio sonata style, is the most prevalent. (3) The melodies can also be accompanied by the keyboard in a homophonic or nearly homophonic texture, in which the right-hand part at times doubles the melody a third below, and at other times briefly breaks away from the melody instrument and moves independently (e.g. Boismortier). This type is just the opposite of the first, in that textural change frequently occurs.

Besides these three ways of accompanying the melody instrument, two other kinds of keyboard accompaniment combine features of other textural types. The first combines melody/accompaniment texture with imitative polyphony in the keyboard (already mentioned in the previous section, see Ex.1.1). The second texture combines a melody with idiomatic keyboard accompaniment. This latter type will be discussed fully later (see section titled “Idiomatic Keyboard Texture”).

Keyboard dominated type (Appendix C.2b)

Because of the harpsichord’s inability to sustain, it is not surprising that very few examples of a texture with melody plus simple accompaniment occur in this category. To
counter the harpsichord’s disjointed tone production, the keyboard usually dominates the texture by either playing fast, brilliant figuration, or by presenting a more distinct melodic shape than the other instrument.

The other instrument in movements from this category frequently enriches the texture by doubling the keyboard part, either at the unison or in thirds. This kind of occasional doubling creates contrast within the context of the whole movement, and is therefore structurally indispensable.

**Equal-voice type (Appendix C.2c)**

This textural category is by far the most prevalent in French accompanied keyboard music before 1760. It incorporates many textural elements found in trio sonatas, such as voice exchange between parts and alternating voice pairings involving all three parts. The two upper melodies can either move in parallel motion, creating a homophonic texture, or move independently, creating non-imitative polyphony. Constant textural change within a movement is most characteristic of pieces in this category. Ex. 1.3 (Clément, Sonata no. 2/I) exemplifies the typical relationship of the keyboard and violin. Here we see plenty of voice exchange and alternation of short melodic fragments between upper voices. Unlike the melody instrument dominated type, which figures most prevalently in slow movements, or the keyboard dominated type, which occurs mainly in fast movements, the equal-voice type is used quite evenly in all three movements.
Ex. 1.4 Clément’ Sonates en Trio (Paris, 1743) Sonata no.4/II (Aria I)
Clément’s Sonata no. 4/II (Aria I, see Ex. 1.4) offers a different example, where sudden textural change from the prevailing equal-voice type to imitative texture tells an interesting story. The ubiquitous slurred eighth-note accompaniment, which shifts among all three parts (see Table 1.1 below), provides a constant background to this movement. The right-hand and violin take turns playing the melody against this constant eighth-note accompaniment. As the movement proceeds in a leisurely, homogenous sound, each reprise gets longer. In the 2nd reprise, the chain of double suspensions (mm. 34-37) enhances the harmonic drive toward a cadence in the relative minor. The energy gathered by this rush to the cadence at m. 38 sets up the rapid melodic alternation between right hand and violin (imitation at the unison), which is drastically shortened, compared to the rate of change in the previous sections: from 8 measures (rondeau) to 10 measures (1st reprise) to 8 measures (rondeau) to 12 measures (2nd reprise, mm. 26-38) to 4 measures (2nd reprise, mm. 38-42). The sudden switch from the mostly equal-voice texture to imitative writing at the end of the 2nd reprise provides a contrast to the textural homogeneity of the previous sections. This produces an effect of compression, in which the pacing of melodic presentation between the right hand and the violin quickens drastically in the final phrase, as compared to the previous sections (see Table 1.1).
Table 1.1 Clément, Sonata no. 4/II, Pace of Textural Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Rondeau</th>
<th>$1^{st}$ Reprise</th>
<th>Rondeau</th>
<th>$2^{nd}$ Reprise (mm.26-38)</th>
<th>$2^{nd}$ Reprise (mm.38-42)</th>
<th>Da Capo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomp-paniment</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Left hand</td>
<td>Left hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody</td>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>[vlin/r.h]</td>
<td>Right hand then violin (imitation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above examples illustrate only two of the many ways in which composers of this repertoire mix the textural procedures inherited from the trio sonata. The quality shown in the handling of such instrumental interactions ranges from the most interesting and skillful (as exemplified in most of the pieces by Mondonville, Rameau, Guillemain, and Clément) to the most mechanical and unimaginative (as exemplified in most of Noblet’s sonatas).

Concertante Texture (Appendix C.3)

In his study of English accompanied keyboard music published in London between 1750 and 1770, Ronald Kidd uses the term “concertante” to mean the type of sonata “in which instruments share more or less equally the thematic material, as in Beethoven's "Spring" Sonata, Op. 24, where the instruments alternate roles in the double statement of the first period.”

---

keyboard and the other instrument in which they take turns presenting the entire melodic phrase in a homophonic texture. Such a compositional device projects even more prominently the principle of equal partnership between two instruments. This relationship differs from the equal-voice type in the extent of its melodic exchange, which involves the entire phrase of a distinct melody, usually at the beginning of a movement, as opposed to brief exchanges of figuration or motives.

The development of concertante writing may have come as a natural extension of the brief exchanges frequently used in Baroque trio sonatas. But we cannot ignore the important influence of the concerto, where two groups exchange roles in a cooperative opposition. Mondonville’s Sonata no. 6, labeled “Concerto,” offers the prototype for this. The two “soloists” (violin and keyboard) exchange their roles of melody or accompaniment figuration in subsequent solo sections of the ritornello structure.

The excerpts in Example 1.5 illustrate the varied treatments of concertante setting from Mondonville to D’Herbain. The contexts in which this texture appears within a collection suggest possible reasons why composers chose this texture.

Mondonville (Ex. 1.5a) explores a different coloristic effect by repeating the opening phrase, using the violin to present the top part of the parallel third melody. This new instrumental combination turns the violin from playing the role of a bass at the beginning to becoming one of the “soloists” in phrase 2. Even though the violin part is not really independent from the keyboard, the role exchange with the keyboard recalls role exchange in concertos. It is interesting that Mondonville chooses to use concertant
Ex. 1.5a Mondonville, Op. 3 (Paris, ca. 1738) Sonata no.4/I (mm. 1-16)
writing at the beginning of Sonata no. 4, which marks the halfway point in the collection. A complementary relationship to other parts of the collection emerges: Mondonville begins his Op. 3 collection with a sonata subtitled Ouverture and ends with a sonata subtitled Concerto.45 He may employ a similar idea of internal symmetries by pairing Sonata no. 4 (1st movement) with Sonata no. 6 (Concerto) since they both exploit the concertante principle, though to different degrees.

In Ex. 1.5b, Rameau applies concertante writing to the violin and the viol. The opening melody is first presented by the violin; then the same melody is repeated an octave lower on the viol. As in Mondonville’s example, the viol does not function as a truly equal partner in this concertante exchange because the violin plays in parallel motion a sixth above it. As suggested above (see Ex. 1.2), this texture is part of a larger textural plan for the strings, which moves from a concertante opening to a passage with brief imitative exchange to full-blown imitation.

Ex. 1.5c (Concert 5/III) illustrates Rameau’s sophisticated handling of concertante exchange in the third movement of Concert no. 5. Here, the violin and harpsichord right hand are treated as two soloists in a concerto. They switch parts in the second phrase, which moves immediately to the dominant key. Their parts are treated imitatively and also homophonically when they join together to play at the unison. The

45 The subtitle Ouverture only applies to the first movement of Sonata I. On the other hand, the subtitle Concerto applies to the whole Sonata VI, featuring the characteristic three movement (F-S-F) overall structure and the internal alternation of Tutti and Solo (so marked in some places) sections.
Ex. 1.5b Rameau, *Pièces en Concerts* (Paris, 1741), Concert no.5/II (mm. 1-14)
Ex. 1.5c Rameau, *Pièces en Concerts* (Paris, 1741), Concert no.5/III (mm. 1-7, 16-24, 35-43)
Ex. 1.5c - continued
concertante theme returns near the end (m.35), with the right hand playing the ascending melody. The violin and the right hand then switch parts in the next phrase, which offers an exact repetition of the opening phrase (m.1) with all instruments reassigned to their original parts. The double exchange of parts between the violin and harpsichord right hand in Mondonville’s Concerto (Op. 3, Sonata 6/I) may have been the prototype for Rameau’s similar use of concertante exchange.\footnote{In the preface to Rameau’s \textit{Concerts}, he acknowledges being inspired to compose this collection in response to the popularity of Mondonville’s publication.}

The introduction of concertante writing in the second and third movements of the final \textit{Concert} in Rameau’s collection complements his general strategy of providing the most instrumental balance at the end of the set, with an increased use of imitative counterpoint—the first movement is a fugue. The two different concertante settings in the second and third movements of \textit{Concert} no. 5 add to the varied ways Rameau increases the instrumental balance.

In Ex. 1.5d (Sonata no. 1/II), Dupuits uses the concertante principle explicitly in the context of a concerto: the second movement of Sonata no. 1, subtitled “concerto.” The principle of alternating soloists in a double concerto naturally provides the impetus for the use of a concertante relationship between the viéle and the harpsichord. The differentiated accompaniment figure in the viéle shows a departure from the homogenous kind of concertante texture found in Mondonville’s Sonata 4/I and Rameau’s Concert...
Ex. 1.5d Dupuits, Op. 3 (Paris, 1743) Sonata no. 1/II (mm. 1-17)
When the vièle has the melody, the use of figured bass notation clarifies the keyboard’s accompanimental role.

Another Duphly example, published in 1756, shows a newer type of concertante setting (Ex. 1.5e Suite 1/III). For the first time, the harpsichord presents the opening melody alone, making the instrumental contrast all the more prominent when the violin plays the same melody in the second phrase. At m.19, we see highly differentiated idiomatic writing for the violin and harpsichord in a free-voiced texture, taking us further away from the trio sonata prototype.

Simon’s concertante writing in Suite no. 2/II/Air I (Ex. 1.5f) is very similar to Dupuits’ (Sonata 1/II). The harpsichord right hand presents the lyrical melody in the opening phrase, followed by the violin, which subsequently plays the melody, with keyboard figured bass accompaniment. One significant difference between Simon and Dupuits is that Simon lets the keyboard be the soloist first, reflecting a characteristic preference for a keyboard-led concertante relationship in the accompanied sets of the 1750s. After the first appearance of concertante texture in Mondonville’s Sonata 4/I (ca. 1738), which begins with a keyboard melody, composers of accompanied sets published in the 1740s had abandoned this prototype. In the publications of the 1750s, we see a consistent return to the type of concertante exchange where the keyboard presents the opening melody. This is part of the trend where the keyboard increasingly predominates, resulting in a new type of accompanied keyboard music, in which the other instrument plays a subordinate role.
Ex. 1.5e Duphly, *Pièces de clavecin*, Bk. 3 (Paris, ca. 1756) Suite I/III (mm. 1-20)
Ex. 1.5f Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no.3/II/Air I (mm. 1-19)
The other three occurrences of concertante exchange in Simon’s collection (Suite no. 2/II/Aria II, Suite no. 2/I, Suite no. 4/II) belong to the double voice-exchange type, similar to Rameau’s *Concert* no. 5/III. While the exchange of roles between violin and harpsichord is invariable, the contexts in which these concertante examples appear are highly varied.

Suite no. 2/II/Air II (Ex. 1.5g) follows the first Air (previously discussed in Ex. 1.5f). The generic model for Air I appears to be the Italian sonata, characterized by bold melodic writing with expressive, wide leaps and by an abundance of suspended dissonance. The type of concertante technique used in the first Air involves a melody and accompaniment style, where the violin and harpsichord take turns playing the cantabile melody, as in Italian arias. By contrast, the second Air alludes to the French airs of the Lullian tradition, characterized by two finely wrought melodic lines of similar character, which move mostly stepwise, adorned by delicate ornaments. The two upper voices, which switch parts in the second phrase, move mostly in parallel thirds. This handling of the concertante exchange contrasts with that of the Italianate Air I.

The concertante treatment in Suite no. IV/II is very similar to that of the French air (Suite no.2/II/Air II). But the movement’s dark, somber mood, painted by the chromatic, descending bass line in the opening period and the persistent, dotted sixteenth and thirty-second rhythmic figure, is drastically different from the light and airy French air. The Italian tempo marking “Andante” and time-signature of 2/4 instead of “2” further highlights the difference in national style between these two slow movements.
Ex. 1.5g Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no.3/II/Air II (mm. 1-22)
The first movement of Simon’s Suite no. 2 offers a different context in which a similar double concertante exchange appears. This suite is dedicated to a French violinist (La Saint Saire). The violin has its moment to shine with idiomatic writing, in the tradition of a solo violin sonata, while the keyboard receives a figured bass accompaniment. This concertante setting occurs in a fast movement, as opposed to the other slow movements employing concertante exchange. Concertante switching of parts occurs, not at the beginning of the movement, but in the middle and near the end of each half of the large binary structure. Simon took great care to mark the violin part with “très Doux” when the harpsichord right hand has the melody.

Simon’s four instances of concertante texture show the composer’s delight in casting the same concertante texture in very different generic contexts, probably motivated by his title for the collection—Pièces de clavecin dans tous le Genres avec et sans accompagnement de violon. The use of the same type of concertante exchange for these drastically different movements highlights the variety of references to other genres in Simon’s collection.47

D’Herbain’s extensive use of concertante setting (Ex. 1.5h) in his Sonates de clavecin avec accompagnement de violon ou flûte d’accompagnement en forme de dialogue (1756) sets him apart from other composers. Ten out of fifteen movements in his collection begin in a concertante manner (see Appendix C.3). Certainly the title of the

47 See Chapter 3 for detailed discussion of how these generic references are organized in the collection to inform us about Simon’s notion of style mixture.
Ex. 1.5h D'Herbain, Sonates (Paris, 1756) Sonata no.2/I (mm. 1-21)
set, “en forme de dialogue” highlights such an extensive and consistent use of this texture. He always begins the movement with the harpsichord alone. When the violin takes over the melody, the right hand usually joins it a third below, very much like Mondonville’s example. The unimaginative violin writing, often playing a third above the keyboard right hand through the entire movement, renders the violin part almost dispensable even in the context of concertante setting. The lack of textural variety and an independent violin part in D’Herbain’s collection do not consign his collection to the type of accompanied keyboard music with ad libitum violin part, however. It appears that D’Herbain took the characterization of the violin accompaniment as “en forme de dialogue” a little too literally.

It should be emphasized that other than D’Herbain’s accompanied set, the concertante texture is still not a predominant textural type in the accompanied music published during the 1750s. This instrumental relationship between the violin and the keyboard, however, becomes one of the most important features of mature Classical chamber music. How this texture is used and where it is placed in a collection give us clues to the composers’ ideas about instrumental balance. Sometimes composers may have used its association with Baroque sonatas and concertos to express their notions of style mixture.

Although it is tempting to link these early French examples of concertante writing to the later examples found in the mature duo sonatas of Mozart and Beethoven and present them as stage by stage events in a teleological process, such is not the case here.
The concertante texture is only one of many options that the pre-classical composers used in order to present two instruments on an equal or nearly equal basis. The first instance of concertante writing by Mozart did not occur until KV301 (published in 1778), which is preceded by ten of his own sonatas that do not follow the concertante procedure. One can conclude that the French examples do not lead inexorably to the development of the mature duo sonata of Mozart.

Concerto Texture (Appendix C.4)

Features of the Italian concerto found their way into accompanied music in terms of the concerto’s overall three-movement structure of fast/slow/fast, and its internal alternation of tutti and solo sections. The keyboard and the other instrument alternately assume the role of soloist in the solo sections and play together like an orchestra in the tutti sections. Movements that demonstrate such an instrumental relationship are listed in Appendix C.4. The solo sections are usually marked in the score in most of these concerto movements. In the case of Dupuits (sonata 1) and Simon (suite 6/III), the accompanying role of the keyboard in the solo section, where the melody instrument is the featured soloist, is made even clearer by using figured bass notation in the keyboard part.

48 Some even earlier examples of concertante texture can be found in Corelli, Op. 3/8/IV, Op. 3/12/I (Rome, 1689), and in Couperin, Les Nations (Paris, 1726) (“Air” in the first ordre and several movements in other ordres in this collection of trio sonatas).
Besides internal and overall formal structure, the characteristic unison passage at the beginning and ending of tutti sections of Italian concertos is also adopted frequently in accompanied keyboard music. Examples of prominent unison passages at the beginning of a movement or at the end of a major section appear in Mondonville, Op. 5/8, Boismortier (sonate no. 2/I), Clément (sonata no. 1/I, sonata no. 3/I, and sonata no. 6/III), Damoreau (No. 11 “La Joyeuse,” No. 14, the end of Concert ouverture), Legrand (sonata no. 2/III, sonata no. 3/I, and sonata 3/III), and Simon (suite 4/III). Corrette, who was known for his Concertos comiques, interestingly reserves the use of this attention-catching texture only for the gigue of his fourth sonata. In this case, Corrette uses the unique sound effect of a unison passage, not at the beginning or the end of a section, but in the middle of a movement as a recurring refrain.

**Idiomatic Keyboard Texture (Appendix C.5)**

The incorporation of idiomatic keyboard writing borrowed from pièces de clavecin brings about a departure from the continuous three-part trio texture. Idiomatic keyboard style includes various sorts of hand-crossing techniques and rapid alternation of both hands (batterie). There is a tendency for this texture to be used not at the beginning of a movement but as a contrasting device in most movements where three-part texture otherwise prevails. For example, this textural device is used in all the episodic sections of a fugue in Rameau’s Concert no. 5/I (see Ex. 1.6). As Appendix C.5 shows, idiomatic keyboard texture occurs frequently in the reprise of a movement in Rondeau form or in
Ex. 1.6 Rameau, *Pièces en Concerts* (Paris, 1741), Concert no.5/1 (mm. 48-52)
the *double* of a dance movement. In movements in expanded binary form, this textural type frequently occurs in a tonally unstable section. This is especially true for Guillemain, who employs idiomatic keyboard writing almost exclusively at modulatory sections or as part of a sequential pattern. Occasionally, however, we do find this type of texture at the beginning of a movement. These include Concert 4/II of Rameau and several sonatas of Legrand (see Appendix C.5). Legrand’s predilection for the hand-crossing technique culminates in the Andante movement of his fourth sonata, which features a wonderfully amorphous musical fabric formed by the combined ensemble of the violin (*pincé*) and the keyboard (*petit clavier*) (see Ex. 1.7).

“Ad Libitum” Texture (Appendix C.6)

“Ad libitum” texture is a term used by Leonard Ratner to refer to the type of accompanied keyboard music prevalent during the second half of the 18th century, in which the accompanying instrument is generally optional, and may even have been provided later by someone other than the composer.49 I choose to apply this anachronistic term to the pre-1760 repertoire purposely to call attention to the notion held by many commentators that post-1760 accompanied keyboard music with optional accompaniment “evolved” from the earlier works by Rameau and his contemporaries. In fact, the source

Ex. 1.7 Legrand, *Pieces de clavecin en sonates*, Op. 1 (Paris, 1753) Sonata no.4/II (mm. 1-8)
of confusion may very well have come from the prefaces of the composers themselves. In his 1741 preface, Rameau writes: “These pieces [*Pièces de clavecin en concert*], played on the harpsichord alone, leave nothing to be desired; one would not even suspect that they were capable of any further embellishment.”\(^{50}\) Guillemain, a renown violin virtuoso, also offers a similar view on the accompaniment of his 1745 set of accompanied sonatas:

> When I composed these “pièces en Sonates” my first thought had been to make them only for the clavecin without putting in an accompaniment . . . If one wishes, one can play these sonatas with or without accompaniment. They will lose none of their melody, since it is all complete within the clavecin part, which [arrangement] will be [all the] more convenient for those who do not always have a violin[ist?] at hand when they wish to play some of these pieces.\(^{51}\)

Based on such authoritative statements and some cursory survey of the music, it is very easy to fall prey to offering the following sort of conclusion. Newman writes:

> Actually, in the mere eleven years since Mondonville's Op. 3 had appeared, one can detect an evolution toward the optional, dispensable accompaniment. Whereas the solo, *concertante* violin cannot be omitted throughout most of that pioneer set of 1734, the two parts in Rameau’s set often only fill out the clavecin part and sometimes simply double it, and now the violin part in Guillemain’s set proves, in fact, to be dispensable. Of course, whether it can be discarded with artistic impunity is more a matter of musical opinion. The clavecin part alone does make good sense throughout the six sonatas.”\(^{52}\)

This line of thought persists through later commentators such as Ronald Kidd who writes:

----

\(^{50}\) Trans. by Fuller, *Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music*, 167.

\(^{51}\) Trans. and quoted by Newman, *The sonata in the classic era*, 622.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 622.
The next Parisian contribution to the evolution of the accompanied sonata was the publication of Rameau’s *Pièces de clavecin en concert* in 1741. In the *avertissment* Rameau appears to acknowledge the precedent set by Mondonville, and professes to have written the works so that they could be played as keyboard solos, setting a precedent for the later predominance of optional accompaniments.  

Dolinzky, in an article published as recently as 1990, also echoes this view: “although their title does not feature the word “accompagnement”, the two stringed instruments act basically as ad libitum accompaniment. Nevertheless, they figure in a score and that is of crucial importance.” These remarks, no matter how carefully they are phrased with built-in caveats, essentially dismiss the importance of the accompanying instruments. I want to dispute this popular notion by presenting evidence to show that the accompanying parts in most of these pre-1760 repertoires are integral to the music. But first, let us consider what constitutes an ad libitum accompaniment for Newman by referring to the frequently cited summary in his important study of accompanied keyboard music:

> The subordinate accompaniment could contribute to the total texture in various ways. It could simply double any line or note in the keyboard texture. . . . It could move in 3rds or 6ths below or even above the top keyboard line, . . . It could fill in or fill out the harmony with sustained or shorter tones, somewhat like the horn tones in a Classic symphony, . . . or with figuration that often approximates the murky, Alberti, and other characteristic keyboard basses . . . It could outline the more elaborate melody or figuration of the upper keyboard part, “which,” in Simon’s words, “loses the smoothness of its contour in the disunited tones of the


clavecin, [but] will be sustained by the spun-out tones of the violin.” . . . It could engage in a bit of dialogue with the keyboard, though usually in imitative snatches that merely complement the keyboard rhythm without filling [feeling?] any decided break in the continuity. . . . And it could even take the lead in a modest phrase or two of its own, generally where some such novelty might be most appropriate, as in the trio of a minuet, an episode of a rondo, or a “minore” in a set of variations. 

Such old school commentators as Newman and Ratner were considering this music from a predominantly structuralist viewpoint and, therefore, missed much of what constitutes the essence of French ensemble music. In the following section, I examine the role of the accompanying instruments in relation to stylistic and programmatic objectives, and consider “ad libitum” texture within the context of whole movements and of collections’ overall organization. By doing so, I shall demonstrate that the “ad libitum” texture is indeed essential to the music in French accompanied collections and that it frequently appears side by side with the other textures as a contrasting device.

“Ad Libitum” texture in Guillemain’s Op. 13

We begin with the opening movement of Guillemain’s set, which demonstrates a sort of textural space manipulation used frequently by the composer at modulatory passages. (See Ex. 1.8) After a perfect authentic cadence in the tonic key at m. 13, the next phrase, a transition, leads us to a new key area, D major. As the dominant of D major unfolds at m. 15, Guillemain introduces a dramatic, quick opening up of the

55 Newman, The sonata in the classic era, 104; and Newman, Concerning the Accompanied Clavier Sonata, 342-45.
Ex. 1.8 Guillemain, Op. 13 (Paris, 1745) Sonata no.1/I (mm. 1-27)
registral space to three octaves and a fifth in the span of a single measure. This wide vertical span, created by arpeggios in contrary motion between the violin and the keyboard, creates a kind of unsettled energy that complements the harmonic tension that requires closure. The closure is suspended for the next eight measures, in which the violin and the keyboard engage in voice exchange, first in the upper register (mm. 16-19), then in expanded space (mm. 20-24). The resolution of the dominant harmony to tonic at m. 24 presents an abrupt thinning out of the texture, in which the keyboard part plays a hand-over-hand arpeggio, which quickly ascends from the bass register to high D. In the meantime, the high D in the violin at m. 26 connects aurally with the high E back in m. 15 and the high D in m. 8. The rapid descents of both the violin and keyboard at m. 26 eventually resolve the tension by leading the high pitches into the mid-register. Guillemain uses this compositional strategy to create drama at harmonically unstable places quite frequently (see sonata no. 1/III, mm. 4-6; sonata no. 3/II, mm. 20-21; and sonata no. 5/II, mm. 20-21). These passages all prolong a dominant harmony, and more importantly, all rely upon the presence of the violin to expand the vertical registral space by moving in contrary motion with the left hand.

Guillemain’s Sonata no. 2/I (Ex. 1.9) offers another interesting view of the constant struggle among the three parts in presenting the main melody. The first phrase opens with a three-part trio texture, with two independent upper melodies and a bass in sixteenth-note figuration. The right hand seems to have a more assured melodic shape, with a regular rhythmic pattern ascending purposefully toward the high C at m. 4. The
Ex. 1.9 Guillemain, Op. 13 (Paris, 1745) Sonata no.2/1 (mm. 1-20)
prominence of this melody is confirmed in its repetition in phrase three and four. In phrase three (m. 11), the melody is actually shared alternately by the left hand and the violin, while the right hand takes over the sixteenth-note figuration. The severely truncated melody is presented in its original form again in phrase four (m. 17), this time by the violin.

The manner in which the three voices compete for the role of presenting the main melody in the tonic key area distorts the usual articulation of the expanded binary form for Guillemain. This is the only time Guillemain states his first group material three times in Op. 8. Such a deviation from his normal way of unfolding the binary structure is motivated by a desire to provide equal opportunity to both instruments.

Guillemain’s sonatas are deeply entrenched in the phrase-oriented galant style of the pre-classical era. Using textural change as a way of delineating phrase structure is a common compositional strategy. In the case of Guillemain, changing textural configuration sometimes becomes an end in itself.

For instance, in the third movement of Sonata no. 2 (Ex. 1.10), the opening phrase begins with the violin and the keyboard right hand playing mostly in parallel motion. The violin always stays on top except at the cadence (mm. 7 - 8). The change from homophonic texture, with parallel upper lines, to non-imitative, three-part writing not only separates the second phrase from the previous one, but also creates a kind of tension when the right-hand part invades the violin’s space. Voice crossing becomes even more violent when all three parts get involved (mm. 13 -16). By the end of m. 16, modulation
Ex. 1.10  Guillemain, Op. 13 (Paris, 1745) Sonata no.2/III (mm. 1-24)
to the dominant key is complete. For the next five measures, Guillemain gives us two sets of V—I harmony to confirm the new key. The tension created by the voice crossing in the previous phrase is maintained here, with even more drama, in that the visual spectacle of a hand-over-hand arpeggio at the keyboard, starting with the right hand at the bass, simultaneously complements the sonic criss-crossing of two arpeggio lines of distinct timbre.

The startling textural change in m. 22 gives us the beginning of the second group in C major. Here, we are back to a homogenous sound of parallel thirds and sixths similar to that of the opening phrase, which moves mostly in parallel sixths, though all three voices switch roles. The melody in parallel thirds is distributed between the right hand and the left hand, and the violin provides the bass. The second melodic group also has a denser texture than the opening phrase because of the compressed registral space.

This kind of compositional strategy, using textural change to mark the dramatic events of the move away from the home key to the arrival of a temporary stable key area, is a device that Guillemain relies upon frequently in his Op. 8 collection. This device is in a way very similar to the contrasting textures found in the solo sections of concerto movements, which similarly introduce more idiomatic instrumental writing. Among many examples, two other movements that follow a similar procedure are sonata no. 3/II “altro”, and sonata no. 4/III. And the violin is unquestionably indispensable in the structural unfolding of these harmonic events in all instances.
“Ad Libitum” texture in Rameau’s *Concerts*

Let us now turn our attention to Rameau. Taken out of context, Rameau’s comments in his preface may have been correct regarding the subordinate nature of the accompanying instruments in his *Concerts*. As Newman pointed out, there are many instances where the strings merely double parts of the keyboard line. But they normally do not persist too long, or they serve as textural contrast to other parts of the movement where the strings, especially the violin, do present an independent melody. Furthermore, if we follow the viol part sequentially through the movements as they are arranged in the collection, we see a loose progression of increasing importance for the viol from mostly duplicating the left hand of the keyboard part in *La Coulicam* (No. 1/I) to having independence in a four-voice fugue in *La Forqueray* (Concert no. 5/I—the last set of *Concert* in the collection). It is no coincidence that the title of the opening movement of the last *Concert* is believed to refer to the famous viol composer and virtuoso, Jean-Baptiste Forqueray.56 Furthermore, this more frequent use of the viol as part of an imitative polyphony complements the increasingly concentrated use of imitative texture in the later movements in Rameau’s *Concerts*.57

---


57 See previous discussion under section “Imitative Trio Texture.”
La Boucon (Ex. 1.11) from the second Concert is one of the rare examples where both strings duplicate parts of the keyboard almost entirely. The care with which Rameau used the strings to weave through the inner and outer voices of the keyboard part greatly enhances the part writing, however. Playing this movement without the strings would certainly impoverish the total sonority of the piece. I would venture one step further, however, to suggest that there may be an extra musical motivation behind the choice of having the strings duplicate the keyboard almost entirely in this movement.

In his biography of Rameau, Girdlestone suggests that the title La Boucon refers to Anne-Jeanne Boucon, who “was ‘renowned for her musical talents’ and especially for her harpsichord playing.” In light of this information, I would speculate that Rameau may have alluded to Boucon’s reputation as a clavecinist by evoking the popular French tradition of accompanying the solo pièces de clavecin with a melody instrument. Borroff speaks of this tradition in the context of Elizabeth-Claude Jacquet de la Guerre’s suites:

Early in the eighteenth century, the professional harpsichord players, now playing in larger halls for audiences of increased numbers, frequently had the top line of the pieces reinforced by a violin or flute. These instruments did not have separate lines to play, but duplicated the keyboard treble. The assisting performer played carefully at a low dynamic level.

58 She later became Mondonville’s wife in 1747. See Girdlestone, Jean-Philippe Rameau, 600.

Ex. 1.11 Rameau, *Pièces en Concerts* (Paris, 1741), Concert no.2/II (mm. 1-8)
Of course this line of reasoning still does not negate the fact that the piece can be played without the strings. It does, however, illustrate that Rameau does not use this kind of extensive doubling indiscriminately, and that the subtle reference to the genre of pièces de clavecin might have been noticed by an eighteenth-century audience.

As mentioned earlier, some commentators have liked to think of Rameau as the “harbinger” of the “ad libitum” accompanied sonatas made popular by Schoberts in Paris from the mid-1760s onward.60 To offset this view, Fuller and Girdlestone find Rameau’s suggestion of dispensable accompaniment in his set puzzling. They both strongly believe that Rameau's own arrangements for harpsichord alone paled distinctly by comparison with the concerted versions.61

Richard Neher, on the other hand, argues in his doctoral document that Rameau's concerted set is an extension of his solo harpsichord pieces. He uses Rameau's statement as evidence showing the composer's intention “to make the clavecin serve as the compositional focal point of the ensemble.”62 Yet, he also notes the irony in Rameau’s preface:

[Rameau’s] ensemble keyboard parts are idiomatically consonant with the norms of his solo clavecin collections, yet it is often precisely these keyboard parts

---

60 See Newman, Kidd, and Drolinzky.

61 See Fuller, Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music, 167; Girdlestone, Jean-Philippe Rameau: his life and work, 44. The solo harpsichord arrangements include only five movements from the Pièces en concerts collection: La Livrì, L'Agaçante, La Timide (1st rondeau and 2nd rondeau), and L'Indiscrète.

62 Neher, The interrelationships of clavecin and accompanying instruments in the Pièces de clavecin en concerts by Jean Philippe Rameau, 2.
which must be partially or even entirely omitted if a structurally complete transcription is to be achieved by one player.63

Indeed, the wide sweeping texture and the remarkable concertante writing in the ensemble setting make it difficult for us to agree with Rameau that his own solo arrangements “lose nothing.”

Accompaniment in parallel thirds and sixths

The contribution of the accompanying instrument to the parallel third and sixth sonority in French accompanied keyboard music is significant in that it evokes the suave and sweet-sounding sonority of Lully’s style. The simple and unobtrusive homophonic texture found in Lully’s music was regarded as one of the important stylistic features that defined the French national style. It was only natural for Lully’s successors to continue using this texture in their music. For example, we can find many instances of extended passages of parallel thirds in Couperin’s trio sonatas. In some cases in the accompanied keyboard collections, we find the violin participating in the upper lines with the harpsichord right-hand part as parallel thirds against a pedal point to portray the rustic nature of pieces such as the Musette and the Tambourin (e.g. Legrand’s sonata 4/III—“Tambourin”).

63 Ibid., 39.
Accompanying instrument for coloristic effect

In movements where the other instruments do not have much independence from the keyboard, these instruments are there for the special coloristic effect that evokes the programmatic content of the piece. With respect to this, Marchand writes:

I propose an Hautbois to accompany the second suite because this rustic instrument is suitable to the character of la Chasse, or a violin if you will. . . I imagined that for the 3rd and 4th suite the tender and mellow sound of the celebrated cello of today or the pleasing melody of the viol would offer novelties in company with the harpsichord; but as one does not always have accompanists available, I have arranged these pieces so that one could play them [on keyboard] alone, which (however) will not be as good as with the three parts filled out.64

Although Marchand specifically mentions in the same avertissement that the third and fourth suites in his 1747 collection can be played without the accompaniment,65 he at least admits that his suites were composed with the total ensemble in mind, and that the accompanying instruments have the important function of evoking the mood associated with the programmatic scenes suggested by their titles.

64 From his Avertissement: Je propose un Hautbois pour accompagner la 2.e Suitte, parceque cet instrumen champêtre convient au caractere de la Chasse, ou un Violon si l’on veut. J’ay imaginé pour la 3.e et 4.e Suitte que le tendre et mœleux son des celebrea Violoncelle d’aujourd’hui ou la flateuse melodie de la Viole feroient nouvautés en les associant au Clavecin, mais comme on n’a pas toujours d’accompagnateurs, j’ay arrangé ces pièces pour qu’on puisse les executer seul, ce qui (cependant) ne sera pas si bien qu’avec les trois parties remplies.

65 La 3.e et 4.e Suitte sont tout a fait independantes de leurs accompagnemens, si l’on veut.
“Ad libitum” texture in Marchand’s Op. 1

In the second suite, Marchand added oboe accompaniment to depict various hunting scenes. After the end of the hunting event, marked “fin de la Chasse,” there is an additional movement titled Les Petits Doits ou La Croxmar, which is a theme with two variations based on a vaudeville song. Here, Marchand gives detailed instructions for the instrumentation: For the theme, oboe or violin plays the melody, accompanied by the keyboard, realizing figured bass; for variation no. 1, oboe or harpsichord plays the melody, accompanied by a written out keyboard bass; for the second variation, Marchand instructs that the ornamented melody should be played by the harpsichord and violin, if one wishes (Clavecin et Violon si l’on veut). Technically, this movement could be played by the harpsichord alone, rendering the oboe or the violin optional. The varied instrumental choices, painstakingly marked by the composer, in this movement, however, may allude to the orchestral convention associated with the popular Théâtre de la Foire, which would sometimes play the vaudeville tune before it was sung by the actors.66

In the third suite, which consists of a series of short pieces depicting peasant scenes (La Fête Champêtre), Marchand has the cello play a counter-melody in most movements—sometimes briefly, other times throughout the whole movement. There are

---

66 Clifford Barnes, “Instruments and Instrumental Music at the ‘Théâtres de la Foire’ (1697–1762),” in Recherches sur la musique française classique V (1965): 157. Due to a Royal privilege restriction by the Comédie-Française, earlier fair theatre plays, frequently called the “écriteaux play,” were prohibited from having spoken dialogues. These plays would circumvent such restriction by enlisting the audience to sing the text displayed on large placards (‘écriteaux’) set to popular vaudeville tunes, played by the small orchestra. See especially ibid, p. 145, 156-57.
two movements where the cello completely duplicates the harpsichord right-hand part (no. 8, *L’Adieu DES Villageois* and no. 9, Premiere Badine). *L’Adieu DES Villageois* is the last movement of the *Fête* (marked *Fin de la Fête*). The melody played by harpsichord right hand and cello evokes a simple, unified ending for the pastoral festivities. The doubling of the cello and harpsichord right hand in the next movement (*Premiere Badine*) creates a nice contrast to the three-part texture in the second Badine.

In Suite no. 4, movement 6 (*L’Affectueux* Menuet), the sentimental cello melody plays mostly parallel sixths and tenths below the right hand in section A of the simple binary form. This homophonic texture changes into loose imitative counterpoint in section B, providing a nice contrast in texture and sonority for this movement.

The sixth and final suite in the collection is written for harpsichord alone except for the final theme and variation “*Les Folies Françöises.*” Here the theme marked “*Douloureusement*” is given to the cello. The keyboard part has figured bass notation. The variations themselves consist of different types of solo variations to be played by each instrument alone (the third and sixth variations are harpsichord variations; the second is for cello alone), and the rest (second, fourth, fifth, and seventh variations) are for both. The strings are necessary in the last variation to play the theme while the harpsichord performs fanciful, hand-over-hand arpeggios befitting the title of this variation “*Le Spectacle des Mains.*”
When is “ad libitum” not “ad libitum?”

Let us now turn our attention to the handful of movements in which the accompanying instrument primarily doubles the keyboard (see Appendix C.6). In the case of Marchand (suite 2/8, suite 3/9 & 10) discussed earlier, the doubling by the cello is used to create contrast and to evoke the extra-musical theme of the piece.

For Damoreau ‘s Pièces de clavecin avec Accompagnement de Violon et Sans Accomplagnement, two, out of a total of 18, movements, have the instruction “le violon peut joüer á l’unisson” (no. 12, L’Angelique, and no. 16, first Menuet). The unison writing for the violin in the first menuet (no. 16) is clearly presented as a contrasting texture to the second menuet, in which the violin has the melody part. While we do not know who or what L’Angelique Damoreau was depicting in movement no. 12, we can only assume that this rare use of violin unison writing is for a descriptive purpose.

In Mondonville’s Op. 5 (Pièces de Clavecin avec voix ou violon), the voice part that duplicates the right hand is, of course, not dispensable since it carries the text. The duplication of the harpsichord right hand and the voice appears to refer to the Italianate nature of this movement, imitating the Italian practice of doubling a solo singer with the keyboard right hand.68

---

67 The few French overture movements in which the violon plays at unison with the right hand in the Grave section (Mondonville, Op. 3/1, Duphly, no.1, Legrand, no. 1) are not considered here because the violin is absolutely indispensable in the imitative Allegro section that follows.

68 See Michel Corrette, Prototipes : contenant des leçons d'accompagnement pour servir d'addition au livre intitulé Le maître de clavecin (Paris, 1753) translated by Gordon Samuel Rowley, Le maître de
With regard to the number of minuets that appear on Appendix C.6 (Rameau, Clément, Damoreau, and Noblet), we see a preference for having the strings double the keyboard part, especially in the first of the paired minuets. One can only speculate that the popularity of the minuet as a ballroom dance may have prompted composers to add the violin part that doubles the harpsichord right hand to recreate the sound of the orchestra at the ballroom, very much the same way violin was used to double the harpsichord right hand in the opening phrases of all the French overtures in this repertory. The string doublings in the first minuets may also be viewed as composers’ desire to create a thicker sound effect to contrast with a more thinly scored second minuet.

Compared with the 66 multi-movement sonatas or pièces and 27 single-movement pieces that I have examined, these examples of the “true” ad libitum type are quite rare. They are used either for descriptive purpose, for contrast, or to emulate an orchestral genre such as the French overture and the ballroom menuet, where the stringed instrument gives the harpsichord piece an added, noble grandiosity.

By addressing the stylistic, coloristic, and descriptive aspects of the accompanied repertory and considering the role of “ad libitum” textural type within the context of

---

*clavecin pour l'accompagnement : Michel Corrette's method for learning to accompany from a thoroughbass : a translation and commentary* (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1984), 466-67.: “Most Italian women singers accompany themselves on the harpsichord when singing in a concert. . . . With regard to pretty passages of figured melody, they most often play the same vocal line on the harpsichord with the right hand.”

69 For detailed discussion of the French overtures in French accompanied keyboard music, see Chapter 3.
entire collections, it is evident that composers of early French accompanied collections used the “ad libitum” texture deliberately and sparingly. The fact that these movements with subordinate accompaniment appear among other movements with obbligato instrumentation in the same collection illustrates that composers of this early French repertoire vacillate between the obbligato and optional types of accompaniment. The musical examples presented in this section show that the relationship among the various instruments is still a main concern of the French composers throughout this early period despite their misleading claims to the contrary in some avertissements. To answer the question “when is ‘ad libitum’ not ‘ad libitum?’” we can safely say that virtually none of the French repertoire published before 1760 truly belongs to the ad libitum type.
Chapter 2

Aesthetics of French les Goûts Réunis

The novel genre of French accompanied keyboard music displays an almost dizzying variety of forms, styles, textures, and titles. Individual works may be called “sonate,” “concert,” “suite,” “pièces de clavecin,” with individual movements labeled “ouverture,” “introduction,” “fuga,” “aria,” “canone,” “musette,” “rondeau,” “giga,” “concerto,” “fanfare,” and interpretive headings contrasting French and Italian within a single piece (“Moderement” versus “Andante”), not to mention a bewildering array of descriptive titles for individual movements (“Carillon,” “Marche des Villageous,” “Marche des Orientaux,” “Le Spectacle des Mains” etc.). The repertory thus offers a striking musical demonstration of French preoccupations with national styles, their virtues and vices, and what might be gained aesthetically by combining them tastefully.

Simon Simon alludes specifically to this controversial preoccupation with style mixture in his Avertissement for Pièces de clavecin dans tous les genres avec et sans accompagnement de violon, Op. 1 (ca. 1755, published 1761):

I tried to gather here the two kinds of Music which usually divide and sometimes unite the votes of the Amateurs; I mean the French style and the Italian style. It is not for me to judge if I had the fortune to succeed. In vain would I say that I did my best, since rarely does the Public indulge those, who, like me, seek their approval and only desire to please them.70

70 J’ai tâché de rassembler ici les deux genres de Musique qui partagent ordinairement et qui réunissent quelquefois les suffrages des Amateurs; je veux dire, le goût François et le goût Italien. Il ne m’appartient pas de juger si j’ai eu le bonheur de réussir. En vain dirais-je que l’ai fait de mon mieux, que c’est un
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By the time Mondonville’s *Pièces de clavecin en sonates*, Op. 3 inaugurated the genre around 1738, the French, of various social and intellectual levels, had been discussing French versus Italian music for almost a century. Italian Baroque music, which swept all of Europe after 1675, initially encountered significant resistance in France. Many factors contributed to this late acceptance of Italian music. The political control of Louis XIV, who dictated the taste of his courtiers, and the absolute monopoly of all theater performances by Lully for nearly 30 years played a large part in stifling, or at least slowing, musical innovation, including exposure to new music from the south. After Lully’s death in 1687 and the King’s weakening control during the 1690s, the French public was ready for something different.\(^7^1\)

Not everyone in France was happy about the invasion of Italian music, however. It sparked a series of vehement debates between supporters of French or Italian styles, and thus affords us a glimpse of the complex relationship among critics, musicians, and the public. The extreme conservatism evident in most more learned music commentaries stands in sharp contrast to the musical interests of the public, who favored Italian music and Italianate music composed by French composers. The emergence of the notion of *goûts réunis*, practiced by composers and eventually endorsed by most critics, served all rarement le Public honore-t-il de son indulgence, ceux qui pour rechercher son approbation, peuvent n’avoir comme moi, que le seul désir de lui plaire.

three social groups well as an attractive middle ground. Conservative critics were pleased by the retention of the few uniquely French musical genres (operas and ballets, suites for harpsichord and viol); performance practices (French ornaments, rhythmic subtleties unique to French performances); melodic style perceived as simple, natural, connected, melodious, sweet, and free-flowing; and the French predilection for attaching a program to music, following the Classicist principle of mimesis. To conservatives, French identity and tradition, together with the ideals associated with these genres, had been preserved. On the other hand, the public, which had grown bored with the same, old kind of music, was happy with the tasteful incorporation of novel features from Italian genres. Couperin, who coined the term *goûts réunis* in 1724, articulated his conciliatory attitude toward the two national styles amidst the battle waged between the supporters of French and Italian music. The birth of French accompanied keyboard music at the end of 1730s as a new genre owed a great deal to this favorable climate, in which all social parties found something to admire in mixed style.

This chapter traces the development of the aesthetics of *goûts réunis* from both the sociological and philosophical perspectives in order to provide a framework to understand the development of accompanied keyboard music, which is based on the concept of *goûts réunis*. 72 Several forces contributed to the development of *goûts réunis*

---

72 For studies based on the philosophical perspective, see Lionel de La Laurencie, *Le goût musical en France* (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), 359; see especially Chapter four, “L’influence italienne et l’esprit classique,” 119-52; Jules Ecorcheville, *De Lulli à Rameau, 1690-1730: L’Esthétique Musicale*…
as a broader musical phenomenon in France from the end of the seventeenth century to about 1760: 1) wealthy and powerful patrons such as Phillipe II d’Orleans (who later became the Regent to Louis XV), the Crozats, and la Pouplinière, whose concerts were well attended by the elite upper classes, the wealthy bourgeoisie, as well as musicians; 2) the social movement called honnêteté, which governed the codes of conduct of the French aristocracy, whose social influence in cultural matters further promoted the cultivation of the wider public’s taste for goûts réunis; 3) the musicians who composed mostly for their patrons and the public; and 4) the connoisseurs, including aestheticians, who received Classical educations, general writers, who contributed to the various journals and newspapers, and also publicists, who included the philosophes.

The quarrel over the merits of French and Italian music, which grew out of a larger quarrel between conservatives and modernists, was waged mostly by the connoisseurs, providing a rich source of information about French cultural history during this period. The writers’ comments were frequently ultra conservative, however, and did not reflect the reality of the broader musical culture of the time. Hence, we should consider their role within a wider social hierarchy in order to situate their opinions in an appropriately broad perspective. This is especially important because in the early

eighteenth century, commentators frequently judged the merit of musical composition by using the imprecise, general term “good taste” (le bon goût) to justify their arguments. But debates continued about what constituted good taste and who represented the authority in matters of good taste. The author of the article “Goût” in the Dictionnaire de Trévoux (1743-1752) has this to say about the ambiguity of the term: “They speak without cease of taste, of good taste, of bad taste. It is much easier to say what taste is not than what it is.”73 We shall see throughout this chapter how taste changes in different contexts and how it affects the promotion of goûts réunis.

This chapter is organized into three sections. Section one discusses the social dynamics of the general public, connoisseurs, and savants (professional musicians) as arbiters of taste, each group with its own social agenda within a highly structured social hierarchy. Section two focuses on how influential patrons promoted goûts réunis. Section three traces the changing taste for music in mixed style from a more negative attitude to a more positive one.

The Social Dynamics of Musical Judgment

In his article “Learned and general musical taste in eighteenth-century France,” William Weber alludes to the constant balance struck among savants (the professional musicians, trained on the rules of composition), connoisseurs (aestheticians and general

writers from the ranks of *gens de lettres*, patrons, and amateurs),\(^74\) and the general public (privileged members of the upper classes, ignorant of the rules of composition).\(^75\) No single group had the ultimate authority in matters of musical taste. This situation becomes even more complicated because a single individual could be placed in more than one social group, depending on context. The dynamic interrelationship of these groups, each with its own social agenda, contributed to the cultivation of the aesthetics of *goûts réunis*, which provided a fertile ground for the development of accompanied keyboard music. We shall explore each group in detail below to identify its associated values, how each interacted with other social groups, and how their differing values and tastes contribute to the aesthetics of *goûts réunis*.

**The General Public**


> In matters of music one can distinguish two kinds of people: those who may be called the low people, the servants, shop assistants, artisans, porters, etc., who listen to songs of the Pont Neuf and do not go at all to the Opéra; the other kind,
the honnêtes persons, a distinguished multitude who frequent the spectacles but do not have knowledge of the rules; they are the people I have in mind.76

The majority of aristocrats during the earlier part of the ancien régime formed this group. Members of this group, described as les honnêtes hommes (the ideal gentlemen) or the mondains, commonly received a broad general education in all fields but were expert in none. They were well versed in noble civility (politesse), which derived from the classical rhetorical principle where moderation and restraint are to be applied to one’s conduct and mode of communication in order to please members of one’s group as well as to gain favor. The mondains highly prized the ability to please without showing strain and effort. LeCerf describes the balance one should strike between too much artifice and too few ornaments (agréments):

True beauty is found in a happy medium. Savants prove it, courtiers feel it, and the people have heard it so often that they repeat it. It is therefore necessary to stop at this medium and never to be excessive. Too few agréments is nudity, it is a failing. Too many agréments is confusion, it is a vice, it is a monster.77

The mondain code of moderation set by the limits of bienséance (code of etiquette, decorum), derived from the rules of ancient authority, served as the criteria to judge


music, and had a profound influence in the development of the aesthetics of goûts réunis. Rhetoric related to the mondain mode of musical judgment, which values moderation, the ability to please the multitude, and good taste, frequently appear in praise of music that embraces a skillful blend of Italian savant (learned) qualities with the sweet, natural, and noble simplicity of French music.

In a poem, Serré de Rieux (1734) describes the formation of a French “goût scavant” from the mixing of French and Italian music, as performed in concerts organized by Nicolas Mathieu, curé of the church of St. André des Arts between 1681 and 1706:

This intense ardor caused by the example [of Italian music] Formed the goût scavant which Paris saw develop. Our songs, enervated by a faded languor, Took new vigor from its strong character, It seems that all the art of Italy Was accommodated and reconciled to ours. The curious zeal of a pious amateur Attracted these motets to France, And they, forging a new path for our vocal music, Served as models for our nascent composers.78

Ballard’s Avertissement to his edition of motets by Jacques-François (1701) gives us another description that fits the current taste:

Persuaded that what is new always pleases, I give these Motets to the Public with pleasure; the well-informed have found them in such good taste and the Nuns have found them so appropriate for the Choir, that I dare hope for an agreeable reception for them—all the more so because, in performing them, one will acknowledge that the Composer’s genius has found the secret of uniting the structure, scheme, & expression of Italian music with the turn of phrase, delicateness, & gentleness of the French.79

Under the precepts of social privilege, the upper classes (the Public) held the ultimate authority as the arbiter of taste, especially musical taste. Musical entertainment constituted an important part of polite society’s daily life, and did not occupy a rarefied position comparable to literature and painting, for which the public had to acknowledge the authority of the learned tradition of the ancient Classics and the established institutions of the Académie Française. As William Weber observed, the Académie Royale de Musique was merely an opera company at that time, and therefore possessed no equivalent aesthetic authority. It never assumed any intellectual function, comparable to the other Académies, which involved learned speculation on the philosophy and aesthetics of their fields.80 Furthermore, polite society also believed that the ability to judge did not come from vast knowledge, but rather from “bon sens” or “natural


sentiment” which is bound by the limits of socially acceptable behavior within elite circles. 81 Don Fader describes this notion of musical judgment as follows:

Good taste, bon sens, and bienséance are not only concepts borrowed from the ancients and applied to aesthetic judgment, they also form the basic and traditional values of noble conduct and virtue. It is the ideal of the honnête homme’s sense of moderation, politesse and taste that is under attack in the fad for Italian music. 82

This sensibility essentially rules out the authority of the professional musicians (the savants) as arbiters of musical taste because they were believed to be encumbered by too much knowledge of the technical rules, which would affect their ability to judge with natural sentiments. The concept of the public, rather than a composer or a professional musician, as an arbiter of musical taste can also be seen in Louis Fuzelier's preface to Les amours déguisez, balet [sic] représenté par l’ Académie royale de musique l’an 1713 (Paris, 1720): “[it is] useless for authors to defend their plays. It falls to the public to judge them.” 83 A nobleman in a novel of the period voices the same sentiment: “It is the job of the author to win our approval in advance, for we are the ones that decide their fate, . . . [composers have] no merit if they are not fortunate enough to please us.” 84


82 Fader, Musical thought, 57.

83 . . . inutile aux auteurs de défendre leurs pièces de théâtre. C'est au public à les justifier.
According to William Weber, eighteenth-century French connoisseurs belong to three groups in the social hierarchy, which were to change drastically later in the century: 1) wealthy patrons and amateurs, 2) learned philosophers/aestheticians, 3) general writers of contemporary journals and professional publicists.\(^8^5\) In the early eighteenth century, commentators on music were also bound by the social code of etiquette (bienséance) of elite society. They had to curb their erudition and adapt their knowledge to the nobility. William Weber describes them as “intermediaries between musicians and the general public, they were respected for their knowledge and their leadership in musical life, but they did not stand apart from the public in their tastes.”\(^8^6\) LeCerf, a connoisseur himself, points out the hierarchical standing of the connoisseurs in early eighteenth-century French society:

The thing of greatest beauty is that which is admired equally by the public (le peuple) and by the learned or the connoisseurs. Accordingly I esteem first that which is admired by members of the public, and regard least of all that which is admired by the connoisseurs. But Mademoiselle likes precise definitions. The learned are masters of music, musicians by estate, trained by the rules. The public is the multitude, the greater number, who has not been raised to special knowledge and is guided in its judgments only by natural sentiment. Connoisseurs


\(^{8^6}\) Ibid., 89. For explanation of the concept of bienséance, see Fader, *Honnête homme*, 13-14.
are those who are not entirely of the public nor of the learned, half the one, half
the other, . . . owing as much to the rules as to natural sentiment.  

According to LeCerf, the perfect connoisseur is one who “knows how to praise in a
reasonable and proportioned manner” and the role of the savant and the connoisseur “was
to inform the public, not dictate its preferences.” Even though the opinions of learned
connoisseurs did not carry too much weight in the honnête mode of criticism, their
erudite speculations on the aesthetics of arts were nonetheless respected. This is
confirmed by the number of aesthetic tracts, musical dictionaries, and pamphlets found in
the library of the Crozat family, which apparently read and valued their opinions.
Moreover, musical aesthetic theories were frequently discussed and tested in the salons,
the stomping ground of the mondains.

This restrained manner of music criticism would change to a more dogmatic one
after 1750, however, concurrently with the decline in the honnêteté ideal and the rise of
intellectualism among the enlightened philosophes. This change in turn brought about a

88 Ibid., 71.
90 Ibid., 107. See also Marguerite Glotz and Madeleine Maire, Salons du XVIIIe siècle (Paris: Hachette, 1945), 40.
91 For the shift in the perception of the authority of aesthetic judgment in France as a broader phenomenon of the emergence of the bourgeois public sphere, see Johnson, Listening, 384. For the shift of the authority
shift in the authoritative power of the connoisseurs when it came to musical style mixture.

We see an early trace of this shift in Voltaire.

Voltaire, who authored the highly influential *Temple du goût* (1733), effectively used the rhetoric of “taste,” and elevated it to a higher level by prescribing that in order to be a “man of taste,” it was not enough simply to enjoy art works in mixed style. One must also be able to recognize and judge the result of the mixture:

It is not enough to see and become familiar with the beauty of a work, as far as taste is concerned. We must feel it and be touched by it. Nor will it suffice to feel and be touched in some undefined and general way. The various nuances must precisely be distinguished. Nothing must escape immediate notice. The parallel between intellectual, artistic and sensual tastes can be pushed still further, for just as the gourmet instantly smells and recognizes a blend of two liqueurs, so will [the man of taste (*l'homme de goût*)], the connoisseur, instantly spot a mixture of two differing styles. He at once takes note of defects and charms. 92

Voltaire’s association of the “man of taste” with the connoisseur rather than the public (the ignorant) breaks away from the deferential tone of earlier commentators toward the public. It suggests the need for knowledge, experience, and discerning power of aesthetic judgment in France as part of the rise of intellectual activism in music criticism, see Weber, *Learned and General Musical Taste in Eighteenth-Century France*, 58-85. For the gender dynamics of the shift, see Pekacz, *Salonnieres and Philosophes*.

in order to be able to judge. His esteem for the judgment of the connoisseur thus bespeaks a shifting attitude toward knowledge, learnedness.

In 1746, Voltaire’s assertive attitude in musical judgment resurfaced in the writing of Bollioud de Mermet, who perceived a tendency toward the more learned type of music by Rameau:

Now the time when Lully lived, that great Lully, and several others, was the time when music, in the opinion of connoisseurs, approached the closest to good taste, to that true being which never ages . . . It is the duty of skilled connoisseurs to raise their voices against tasteless customs: it is for the academies to protect the efforts of partisans of good taste.”

De Mermet takes an even bolder tone than Voltaire in raising the status of the “skilled connoisseurs”’ ability to judge music by condemning the taste of the public (customs). This was done, of course, under the guise of promoting Lully’s music, which still enjoyed political support among the upper class in De Mermet’s day.

William Weber identifies Rousseau’s contribution to the shift toward a different kind of public with “ears sufficiently trained,” and a “general taste that is more well prepared.” This signals a rise in the power of learned music criticism. In section III we shall see a similar shift in perception of the French public, who did not embrace the more


complex \textit{goûts réunis} found in music composed around the middle of the eighteenth century, the sort apparent in accompanied keyboard music.

**Influencial Patrons’ Promotion of a Public Taste for \textit{Goûts Réunis}**

In the heyday of Louis XIV’s absolutist reign, Versailles had been the center of political, social, and cultural matters. When the king subsequently withdrew from all public appearances during the final years of his reign, and spectacles and grandiose events at Versaille ceased, power and influence gradually shifted from Versailles to Paris:

At the end of the reign, when its prestige had weakened, Paris slowly regained life; a hundred sparks of life, interest, sympathy were enkindled at the death of him whose unique personality had absorbed everything for fifty-six years. Salons were formed, at first on the fringe of royal power, later against it; indifferent, then scornful towards that Versailles that one day D’Alembert would refer to with this disdainful phrase: ‘about fourteen miles from here.’ \textsuperscript{95}

Artistic activities in music, theater, and spectacle flourished under the patronage of such high nobles as Philippe II d’Orléans and such wealthy financiers as Antoine and Pierre Crozat\textsuperscript{96} and La Pouplinièr,\textsuperscript{97} who set up residence in and around the Duke of Orléans’s Palais-Royal in Paris.

---


\textsuperscript{96} See McQuaide, \textit{Crozat concerts}.

Philippe II d’Orléans, the king’s nephew and first prince of blood, became the Regent (1715-1722) after Louis XIV’s death. His high social position afforded the Duke authority as the arbiter of taste, the model emulated by other members of the aristocracy. His influence led the way for a cultural revolution in France at the turn of the eighteenth century.98 The Duke’s interest in Italian music, and more importantly, his curiosity about how the stylistic characteristics of Italian music might be blended with French music, set the tone for French public musical taste. Don Fader summarizes the extent of the Duke’s role in making Italian and Italianate music fashionable in France:

Orléans encouraged Italian and Italianate music in France largely by supporting the activities of individual musicians. This support came in a number of forms: employment in his service (whether on an irregular or permanent basis), recommendation for positions with other institutions, financial contributions to publications, and the granting of pensions or gifts. Musicians associated with Philippe undoubtedly also benefited by the mere appearance of being favored by such a powerful and musically knowledgeable prince.99

The Duke’s taste for music in a mixed style is fully exemplified by the publications of the musicians with whom he interacted closely. In 1706 Battistin Stuck dedicated his *Cantates françaises: à voix seule, avec symphonies*, book 1 (Paris, 1706) to the Duke:


The honor I had in approaching Your Royal Highness has so richly rewarded me that this made me venture to join the style of Italian music with French words. The beautiful melodies, variety, form, harmony and expression which create perfection in music, should—as I have had the honor of hearing Your Royal Highness say many times—suit all nations, as long as one respects the particular genius of each language and never strays from reason and truth. It is on these excellent principles that I have formed and composed this small work.  

Jean-Baptiste Morin offers two other examples that explicitly mention his own effort to unite the two opposing styles. The dedicatory note to Morin’s Motets à une et deux voix, mélez de symphonies. Livre Premier (Paris: Christophe Ballard, 1704) declared:

What should one think of a new author who, in his first attempt at publication, dares to consecrate the productions of his weak talent to Your Royal Highness? If it is possible to justly condemn this boldness, what must I fear when I present to him a work of a perhaps too novel character, formed from those two quite opposite styles of music? How great is my presumption in wanting to reconcile them and to imperfectly imitate a taste of which H.R.H. knows all the power and the delicateness? It would be difficult, monseigneur, to justify the liberty that I take, if it were not founded upon the permission of H.R.H. through the approbation he accorded many of my compositions and through the preference that he showed me in employing me in his service.  

Two years later, Morin declared in the dedication of his Cantates françaises: à une et deux voix, mêlées de symphonies (Paris: Christophe Ballard, 1706):

I was advised to print this collection, and many Persons made me hope that the novelty of these sorts of works might please the public, most of whom, when hearing Italian music sung, do not derive the same satisfaction as they would if they understood the words. I have done what I can to retain the sweetness of our French melody but with accompaniments of greater variety and the tempos and modulations found in Italian cantatas.  

---

100 Trans. by ibid., 317.
101 Trans. by ibid., 303.
The second book of Michele Mascitti’s violin sonatas, *Sonate da camera a violino solo* (1706), espoused a similar goal for instrumental music: “I have discovered such beautiful things in French music that I have applied some of them in my sonatas to reconcile them to the Italian taste.”

Mascitti’s rather arcane idea of “Frenchness” involved using the dance movements of the Italian *sonata da camera* instead of the more abstract *sonata da chiesa* type, which he had used in his first book of violin sonatas (1704), dedicated to Phillipe d’Orléans.

Change of Taste in Musical *Goûts Réunis*

The idea of mixing the French and Italian styles of music was hardly new by the time Morin and Mascitti wrote their prefaces. Earlier comparisons of Italian and French musical style had not amounted to the controversial national pastime they became in the 1700s because seventeenth-century music had largely been discussed in the realm of mathematics and science among academics. It was not until Charles Perrault attempted in the late 1690s to elevate the status of Lully’s opera that music (mainly French operas) began to receive critical attention. Even then, critics involved in the debates about Lully focused their arguments mainly on literary issues. It is nonetheless useful to mention a

---

102 Trans. by ibid., 313.


few comments from earlier in the seventeenth century to illustrate their similarity to
issues that commentators were still raising a century later. This information also
emphasizes how rapidly taste for mixed style changed during the eighteenth century,
concurrently with the development of a modern system of aesthetics, culminating in
Charles Batteux’s influential *Les beaux-arts réduits à un même principe* (1746).106

As early as 1635, J. J. Bouchard, a French traveler in Italy, described the
controversy over the merits of French and Italian music to the French theorist Marin
Mersenne (1588-1648):

> As for what you ask concerning whether Italian music is better than French, this is
> a great controversy here. Our French men who come find Italian music
disagreeable, and the Italians consider ours ridiculous and of no account. If you
> wish to know my opinion, I will say that, for artifice, knowledge, and forcefulness
> of singing, for quantity of musicians, principally castratos, Rome surpasses Paris
> as much as Paris surpasses Vaugirard. But for delicacy, and *una certa leggiadria
e dilettevole naturalezza* [a certain lightness and delightful naturalness], the
> French surpass the Italians by far. . . . The French are more suave and agreeable,
> the Italians more learned and astounding.107

105 Buford Norman, “Ancients and Moderns, Tragedy and Opera: The Quarrel over *Alceste,*” in *French

amateurs de livres, 1989), 333.

*Origins of modern musical criticism,* 11. For detailed study of the early comparison of French and Italian
music, see particularly Chapter I of Cowart’s *Origins* (1981).
A year later, Giovanni Battista Doni (1594-1647)\textsuperscript{108} offered Mersenne an Italian’s perspective on French music:

For instead of making their melody varied and artificial, they mostly make it simple and trivial, as one can see by the number of notes that never move away from one chord. However much your musicians feel obligated to continue in this style, it seems to me that they have the opportunity to perfect and change it. . . . And I am assured that if your princes would go to the expense, and time permitted it, this would succeed enormously.\textsuperscript{109}

The famed French gamba player André Maugars (c.1580-c.1645) expressed a reconciliatory attitude in his treatise \textit{Response faite à un curieux sur le sentiment de la musique d’Italie} (Rome, 1639) in terms that were to resonate strongly among eighteenth-century proponents of a mixed style: “we sin in deficiency, the Italians in excess.”\textsuperscript{110} He urges composers to compose a type of music “which would have their [Italians’] beautiful variety without their extravagance.”\textsuperscript{111} Maugars’ words would echo through eighteenth-century French writers’ tributes to composers known for their style mixture, which also articulate the type of synthesis French commentators came to value.

\textsuperscript{108} Doni was a scholar and music theorist who had traveled to France as papal legate. His extensive correspondence with French theorist Marin Mersenne (1588-1648) contains valuable information on Italian music and musical thought. See Cowart, \textit{Origins of modern musical criticism}, 10.


\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.
The quarrel between Raguenet and LeCerf de la Viéville over the merits of French and Italian music around 1700 sparked a controversy that continued to resonate in France and elsewhere throughout the century. While LeCerf’s massive, three-volume *Comparaison de la musique italienne et de la musique française* mounts a staunch defense of French music in response to Raguenet’s enthusiastic appraisal of Italian music and modern style, his approval of a moderate and tasteful incorporation of some Italian features into French music (as exemplified in Rebel’s violin sonatas) not only reflects the *mondain* mode of criticism but also explains how a skillful blending of the two national styles can appeal to elite society (the Public):

[Rebel] has truly captured some of the Italian spirit and fire; but he has had the taste and sensitivity to moderate these with French wisdom and sweetness, and he

---


113 Jean-Fery Rebel, together with Brossard, and Elisabeth Jacquet de la Guerre were the earliest composers of solo violin sonatas in France. French stylistic features dominate these sonatas and the Italian features have their model in the mid-seventeenth-century Italian violin sonatas such as those of Bassani. See Lionel de La Laurencie, *L’école française de violon*, 68-102, 121-29; and Fader, *Musical thought*, 283.
has abstained from those frightening and monstrous technical feats that delight the Italians.\textsuperscript{114}

LeCerf’s evaluation of Rebel’s sonatas is based on the classical rhetorical ideal, derived from Quintilian, Cicero, and Horace, where moderation and restraint are to be applied to speech in order to move and delight the listener.\textsuperscript{115} The moderation that LeCerf perceived in Rebel’s violin sonatas represents the heart of \textit{mondain} values of moderation and restraint. Perfection lies in an ideal balance between too many and too few musical ornaments (\textit{agreements}), between \textit{savant} reasoning based on rules and \textit{honnête} feeling based on natural instinct, between uniformity and variety. This social notion of taste in moderation is the fundamental aesthetic underpinning of the mixed style. A writer in the \textit{Journal des Savant} in May 1706 called for such a union of the two national styles, suggesting that supporters of both styles could learn from one another:

The reproaches of French writers can prevent the Italians from becoming too involved in the fire or the ingenuity of their imagination. But the contact with Italian authors can also perhaps contribute to bringing some of that fire and ingenuity to French works. . . . \textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114} LeCerf, \textit{Comparaison}, 1: 93. Trans. by Walls, \textit{Sonade, que me veux tu}, 39. LeCerf also mentioned Rebel’s sonatas in the second dialogue; See Laurencie, \textit{L’école française de violon}, 76-7; La Laurencie believed that the sonatas that LeCerf mentioned here were the violin sonatas with basso continuo (Recueil de 12 sonates à II et III parties (2 vn, b viol, bc) (1712) composed in 1695 and published in 1712.

\textsuperscript{115} Cowart, \textit{Origins of modern musical criticism}, 70.

Even though the *Journal*’s exhortation to temper the excesses of Italian music echoes LeCerf’s, the call to incorporate the “fire and ingenuity” of Italian music provides an impetus for the development of the aesthetic of *goûts réunis*.

A lengthy article titled “Dissertation sur la musique italienne et française par Mr L. T.” which appeared in the *Mercure de France* (1713)\textsuperscript{117} actually mentioned the emergence of a third group that bridges the gap between the protagonists of the French and Italian styles of music, thus legitimizing the concept of *goûts réunis* as a distinct notion:

Finally, from these two different parties there develops a third, more reasonable and less stubborn than the two others: the wise ones, the persons of good taste . . . who give justice to French music in its own right, and to Italian music in its own right, who agree that a perfect genre of music can result from the joining of the learned and ingenious taste of the Italians with the natural and simple good taste of the French.\textsuperscript{118}

Even though Mr. L. T.’s tone was similar to that of LeCerf and the *Journal de Savant*, and his oscillation back to the conservative views favoring French music in other parts of his article strangely contradicted the conciliatory attitude seen in this statement, his identification of the proponents of the mixed style as a distinct group, which he calls “the wise ones” (‘*gens sages*’), “the persons of good taste” (‘*gens de bon goût*’), and the

\textsuperscript{117} The article also appears as Chapter 13 of the *Histoire de la musique et de ses effets* by Pierre Bonnet-Bourdelot (Paris, 1715; facsimile of second Amsterdam edition, Graz, 1966), pp. 291-317; here it is entitled “Dissertation sur le bon goût de la musique d’Italie, de la musique française et sur les opera.” For controversy over the author of this article, see Georgia Cowart, *Origins of modern musical criticism*, 176, fn. 9.

party who is “more reasonable and less stubborn” (‘plus raisonnable & moins entêté’) is particularly notable. These positive attributes are social terms that polite society understood well and strived to emulate.

A strong critic of the Italian style, Jacques Bonnet, who edited the first history of music in 1715, was not afraid to voice criticism of the upper classes, who promoted purely Italian music, by calling them: “a little sect of half-knowledgeable, though fairly prestigious, people of property who display their categorical opinions and proscribe French music dogmatically, as dull and tasteless, or entirely insipid.”119 When it comes to music in the mixed style, on the other hand, as illustrated by the newly invented genre of the French cantata, Bonnet’s attitude is quite different: “Our skilled masters have found the secret of how knowledgeably (savamment) to unite the natural taste of the French with the brilliant and learned (savant) style of the Italians in cantatas.”120

A decade later, Couperin articulates a conciliatory and cosmopolitan outlook in his music as well as his preface to Les Goûts Réunis of 1724:

Italian and French taste have shared for some time (in France) the republic of music; as for myself, I have always held in esteem things with merit without regard for author or nation. The first Italian sonatas which appeared in Paris over thirty years ago, and which then encouraged me to compose some, did harm neither to my reputation, nor to the works of Monsieur de Lulli, nor to those of my ancestors who were always more admirable than imitable.121


By the 1730s, we see even more enthusiastic reception of music in mixed style.

Jean de Serré de Rieux attached the positive attribute of “the wise man” to someone who appreciates style mixture in his collection of poems, *La Musique, poème, divisé en IV. chants* (1734).\(^{122}\)

We criticize the coloraturas of Italian melodies, and the Italian yawns at our most tender sounds: one mocks in Paris, the other laughs in Venice, each decides as a sovereign and detests the other. But over time, the wise man, accustomed to the truth, finally ceases to arm himself with prejudice; an exact understanding of a foreign taste destroys the prejudices formed at birth.

Here, de Serré calls for open-mindedness in the reception of music of all kinds. His love for music in the mixed style can be detected in the accolades he gives to such composers as the famed flutist Michel Blavet, and also to Morin, both noted for their style mixture.

After Jean Baptiste Senaillé’s death, the *Mercure* (June, 1738) paid tribute to his achievement specifically for his application of Italian violin virtuosity to the beauty of French melody:\(^{123}\)

He had spent some time in Italy and had acquired enough of the Italian taste to blend it skillfully with the very attractive French melody. The progress that the violin has since made in France is due to him, for he incorporated quite technically difficult things into his music. Because his *Airs de symphonie* were so attractive and had a certain brilliance, everybody was charmed by them and

---


123 Senaillé was a reputable violist and composer of five collections of sonatas for violin and basso continuo published between 1710 and 1727.
wanted to learn how to play them – especially at a time when scarcely anyone had
begun to familiarize themselves with any music that was at all out of the way."¹²⁴

His manner of mixing Italian and French style is also praised by Titon du Tillet in 1743:

He made an agreeable blend of the natural, noble and gracious melody of French
music with the learned and brilliant harmony of Italian music, which
[combination] pleased persons of good taste."¹²⁵

In his *Le spectacle de la nature* (Paris 1746) Noël Antoine Pluche describes most
writers’ general open mindedness in accepting the gradual integration of the two national
styles around 1750:

This quarrel,¹²⁶ I confess, is very different today from what it once was. It is as if
the two nations had drawn closer together. Though they are lovers of melody, the
French have for quite some time been putting more energy and harmony into
composition than they had in the last century. Italian music, though elaborate and
learned, becomes daily more graceful and more lilting. We no longer admire our
own music exclusively: there was a pettiness in doing so that disgraced us while
impoverishing us.¹²⁷

By the 1740s, of course, Mondonville had inaugurated the genre of accompanied
keyboard music with his *Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon,

¹²⁴ Trans. by Peter Walls: ‘Senaillé, Jean Baptiste ’, *Grove Music Online* ed. L. Macy (Accessed 2
February 2007), <http://www.grovemusic.com>

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ This was the quarrel that had erupted in the 1730s over the supremacy of melody, as exemplified by
Lully’s operas, and the domination of learned harmony (influenced by the Italians), as seen in Rameau’s
operas.

¹²⁷ Trans. by Bonnie J. Blackburn and Enrico Fubini, *Music & culture in eighteenth-century Europe : a
ca. 1738. The mixed reactions to Mondonville’s music illustrate a wide spectrum of opinions among connoisseurs, depending on which musical ideals governed their judgments. In the *Mercure de France* (1752), Mondonville “was approved by the connoisseurs and charmed all ears, the skilled as much as the ignorant (*tant les habiles que les ignorants*).”¹²⁸ LeCerf might have deemed this the best assessment for a composer because it has met the approval of all three social groups: the connoisseurs, the savants, and the public.¹²⁹

Pierre-Louis d’Aquin de Château-Lyon wrote specifically about Mondonville’s pioneering Op. 3 collection (*Pièces de clavecin en sonates, ca. 1738*), which successfully integrates features of Italian violin sonatas and concertos with French *pièces de clavecin*:

>This skillful Musician, after having enchanted the public by the masculine & bold sounds of his Violin, after having married harpsichord with his favorite instrument so well (I speak of his admirable Sonatas), shows himself to be a great Master in a genre almost exhausted by one of these Geniuses, which after them seem to leave nothing to be desired. ¹³₀


¹²⁹ LeCerf, *Comparaison*, 1: 78.

One can surmise that among the “Geniuses” that d’Aquin mentioned were the Italian masters, Corelli and Vivaldi, whose violin sonatas and concertos were wildly popular in France from 1700 to 1720s and late 1720 to 1740s respectively.

Rousseau, on the other hand, completely rejects Mondonville’s music and his reputation as a virtuoso violinist. For him, Mondonville represents the fad for Italianate instrumental music, which is fundamentally inferior to vocal music because of its inability to imitate nature:

Purely instrumental music is of little account; in order constantly to please and to prevent boredom, it must raise itself to the rank of the imitative arts; but its imitation is not always immediate like those of poetry and painting; the word is the means by which music most often fixes the meaning of the object whose image it offers us, and it is by the touching sounds of the human voice that this image evokes in the depths of the heart the feeling that it must produce there. . . . Would all the follies of Mondonville’s violin move me as much as two sounds of the voice of mademoiselle Le Maure? Instrumental music animates song and adds to its expression, but does not take its place.”131

Rousseau’s branch of aesthetic theory generally did not affect the development of instrumental music in practice. We shall see, however, how it influenced Mondonville’s conception of the Op. 3 collection in the following chapter.

These assessments by supporters of goûts réunis range from conciliatory to positive. As time passed, the tide turned against those who insisted on the merits of music composed in the extreme style of either national idiom. Rameau, who composed a set of

accompanied keyboard music titled *Pièces de Clavecin en Concerts* (Paris, 1741), notes this progression: “It is necessary often to listen to music of all styles... To embrace one national style more than another is to prove that one is still a novice in his art.”

Certainly by the mid-eighteenth century, descriptions such as Diderot’s of the conservative French group were becoming totally unflattering. In his novel *Les bijoux indiscrets* (Paris, 1748), Diderot characterizes the supporters of French, old-fashioned music (Louis XV and his courtiers in veiled disguise) as the “ignorant and the graybeards” (‘vieillir’) and the partisans of Italianate, modern music as the “young fellows,” and gives high marks to those who appreciate both styles, whom he calls “people of taste”:

> Each of these original artists [Lully and Rameau] had his followers. The ignorant and the graybeards were all for Utmiutsol [Lully]. The young fellows and the virtuosi were for Utremifasolasiututut [Rameau], and people of taste, young as well as old, held them both in high esteem.

Intending to carve out a place for French music in history, proponents of the mixed style, from Mr. L. T. in the *Mercure* (1713) to Cartaud de la Vilate in his *Essai*  

---


historique et philosophique sur le goût (1736), declared that perfection in music could be achieved by mixing the two styles. Jean-Baptiste Stuck offers a composer’s view, which also reportedly expressed the opinion of Phillippe d’Orléans himself on mixed style:

The beautiful melodies, variety, form, harmony and expression which create perfection in music, should—as I have had the honor of hearing Your Royal Highness say many times—suit all nations, as long as one respects the particular genius of each language and never strays from reason and truth.

In the dedicatory note to the first French history of music, the Histoire de la musique et de ses effets (Paris, 1715), Jacques Bonnet praised Philippe II d’Orléans for his effort in cultivating music that balances progress with tradition, and suggested that France in the early eighteenth century had something that equaled or surpassed other nations:

The singularity of the history of music seems to authorize the liberty that I take of consecrating it to Your Royal Highness. It is a heroine, who after having traveled through all the courts of the world over the course of four thousand years, comes to give him an account of her conquests as her protector and as the most enlightened prince in Europe.

The favorable refuge that you give her, Monseigneur, will be for ever a monument of [sic] the esteem and the taste that you have for her, and will serve to mark the epoch in which French music equaled and perhaps surpassed that of

---

135 Cartaud de la Vilate, François, Essai historique et philosophique sur le goût (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), 336. Summarized by Cowart, Origins of modern musical criticism, 99: “He concludes that perfection in the art of music may be obtained only through the reconciliation of Italian compositional technique with French simplicity and naïveté.”

other nations by the great progress she has made since the establishment of l’Académie Royale de Musique in this flourishing kingdom …”

The “progress” that Bonnet talked about relates to the modernization of French music as a result of style mixture. Such redefinition of French music in terms of progress allowed French commentators to accept a new kind of music worthy to stand side-by-side with Lully’s operas—the emblem of French musical identity and the golden age of France. Thus, music that combines the best of French and Italian music becomes essential for the preservation of French national pride. It also conforms to the honnêteté ideal that music’s function was to please. In order to please, it has to strike a balance between too simple and too elaborate. The repertory of early French accompanied keyboard music happily met all these definitions and requirements.

Chapter 3

The Concept of Les Goûts Réunis in French Accompanied Keyboard Music

Introduction

The invasion of highly popular Italian sonatas and concertos in France during the first half of the eighteenth century changed the course of French music. We get a sense of the passion for things Italian from Brossard’s remark that: “At that time [1695], all the composers of Paris, the Organists above all, had the craze, so to speak, to compose Sonates à la manière italienne.” Michel Corrette also commented on how Corelli’s sonatas changed the Parisian concert scene in the preface to his Le Maître de clavecin pour l’accompagnement (1752):

The trios of Corelli, which had been printed in Rome, appeared for the first time at a concert given by Abbé Mathieu, the curé of Saint-André-des-Arts. This new kind of music encouraged all composers to work in a more brilliant style... All concerts took on a different form; scenes and symphonies from opera were replaced by sonatas.

This fascination with Italian music sparked strong reactions from French critics. Arguments about the merits of French and Italian music encompassed highly polemical exchanges that either defended the French tradition (usually based on a Classical


aesthetic of restraint), or championed the progressive Italian tradition.\(^{140}\) Some critics adopted a conciliatory attitude, advocating a style that mixed the best of both traditions. This idea of reconciling the French and Italian musical styles caught the imagination of Parisian composers and the public, partly because of the novelty of a mixed style. Françoise Couperin firmly believed that “musical perfection” could be achieved by bringing together the French and Italian styles.\(^{141}\) Such rhetoric resonated with French composers and critics of music from the late 17th century to the mid 18th century. To compose in mixed style not only showed a composer’s awareness of the current trends, but it also fulfilled a loftier goal of creating perfection in music as well. Couperin’s celebrated sets of concerts titled *Les Goûts réunis*\(^{142}\) (“united tastes”)\(^{143}\) (1724) and

---


\(^{141}\) This view is expressed in the program found in the *Apotheosis of Lully* (1725): *Apollon, persuade Lulli, et Corelli, Que la réunion des Goûts Français et Italien doit faire la perfection de la Musique*. See also Scheibe’s articulation of this sentiment in Laurence Dreyfus, *Bach and the patterns of invention* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1996), 132.

\(^{142}\) This publication is a set of ten *Nouveaux concerts* which includes at the end a trio sonata in the style of Corelli: *Le Parnasse ou L’apothéose de Corelli Grande Sonade en Trio*.

Apotheosis of Lully (1725)\textsuperscript{144} offer but two among many examples of musical works that embody the concept of mixed style, blending or juxtaposing the characteristic features of Italian sonatas and French theater music in the context of French ensemble music.\textsuperscript{145}

The importation of Vivaldi’s violin concertos into France in the mid 1720s carried interest in the idea of mixed style to new heights.\textsuperscript{146} Their vivacious rhythm and tempo, easily memorable melody, and clear construction, based on the alternation of tutti and solo, injected new creative ideas into the formulation of style mixture.

This new wave of inspiration very much encouraged the birth of accompanied keyboard music spearheaded by Mondonville around 1738. Drawing upon the fundamental principles of \textit{goûts réunis}, Mondonville mixes the characteristic features of French \textit{pièces de clavecin} and Italian sonatas and concertos to forge a new generic type, which allows the harpsichord player to assume the role of an equal or even a dominant partner in an ensemble setting. The immediate success of Mondonville’s set of accompanied keyboard music generated other French composers’ interest in continuing to

\textsuperscript{144} The full title is \textit{Concert Instrumental Sous le Titre D’Apotheose Composé à la mémoire immortelle de l’Incomparable Monsieur de Lully} (Paris, 1725).

\textsuperscript{145} For recent studies on the manifestation of \textit{goûts réunis} in French vocal music, see David Tunley, \textit{The eighteenth century French cantata}, 2ed. (New York: Clarendon Press, 1997), 278; idem, \textit{François Couperin and ‘the perfection of music’} (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 172; Fader, \textit{The Honnête homme as Music Critic: Taste, Rhetoric, and Politesse in the 17th-Century French Reception of Italian Music}, 3-44; For similar studies in French violin sonatas, see Walls, ‘Sonade, que me veux tu?’: Reconstructing French Identity in the Wake of Corelli’s Op. 5, 27-47.

\textsuperscript{146} Vivaldi’s Four Seasons was first performed at the Concert Spirituel in 1728. For an informative study on the “Vivaldi fever” in France, see Paul Everett, \textit{Vivaldi, The four seasons and other concertos, op. 8} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 104.
explore and expand on his notion of mixed style in this new genre. This chapter identifies the concept of *goûts réunis* as richly expressed in the repertory of French accompanied keyboard music published between the late 1730s and early 1760s, with special attention to the methods composers used to communicate their ideas of *goûts réunis* to their audience.

We begin with a discussion of Couperin’s idea of “united tastes” in the *Apotheosis of Lully*, which served as one possible model for composers who subsequently created the genre of French accompanied keyboard music. I focus especially on the verbal texts in Couperin’s score, which include titles, movement headings, tempo and expression markings, and instructions for performers, because they are important and self-consciously chosen referents to the French or Italian style. Although these written texts are inaudible in performance, the care with which Couperin and subsequent composers of French accompanied keyboard music annotate them in the scores demonstrates that such texts were important aids to establish a “generic contract” with the contemporary consumers of the music. Jeffrey Kallberg explains such a generic contract between a composer and listener in music as “the agreed upon meaning of some conventions, patterns, and gestures that define a genre. . . . The contract may be signaled
to the listener in a number of ways: title, meter, tempo, and characteristic opening gestures are some of the common means.147

The second part of the chapter analyzes accompanied keyboard music to reveal the illuminating ways composers approach the notion of mixed style. I want to demonstrate how they expanded upon the devices of style mixture found in Couperin’s Apotheosis and established a new generic contract with their audience, defining a new genre.

Couperin’s Concept of Goûts Réunis as Exemplified in the Apotheosis of Lully

In the Preface to his Les Goûts réunis (Paris, 1724), Couperin declared his stance in the heated arguments over the merits of Italian and French music:

Italian and French taste have shared for some time (in France) the republic of music; as for myself, I have always held in esteem things with merit without regard for author or nation. The first Italian sonatas which appeared in Paris over thirty years ago, and which then encouraged me to compose some,148 did harm neither to my reputation, nor to the works of Monsieur de Lulli, nor to those of my ancestors who were always more admirable than imitable.149


148 These are the trio sonatas that Couperin had composed using an Italian pseudonym and later published in 1726 as Les Nations. For a full translation of Couperin’s discussion of the genesis of Les Nations, see Tunley, François Couperin and 'the perfection of music', 145-46.

Couperin’s notion of style mixture serves as an important source documenting a leading French composer’s conception of style mixture, how he distinguishes what is French from what is Italian, and how to mix them. The *Apotheosis of Lully* contains a series of pieces packed with generic references to Lully’s ballets and operas and to Corelli’s sonatas. The detailed textual indicators in the scores (tempo markings, time signatures, performance instructions, etc.) resemble a written catalog of what one would normally encounter in the scores of music in either the Italian or the French style around the 1720s. Not only do these indicators provide modern listeners with clues to the generic contract that a composer could establish with his audience in eighteenth-century France, but they also serve as an established mode of articulating the notion of *goûts réunis* that composers of French accompanied keyboard music could draw upon in ensuing decades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Tempo or expression markings</th>
<th>Time signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apothéose de Lulli</td>
<td>Gravement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lulli aux Champs Élisés: Concertant avec les Ombres liriques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air pour les Mêmes</td>
<td>Gracieusement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vol, de Mercure aux Champs Élisés, pour avertir qu’Apollon y va descendre</td>
<td>Tres viste</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Descente d’Apollon: qui Vient offrir son Violon à Lulli; et sa place au Parnasse</td>
<td>Noblement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rumeur Souterraine: Causée par les Auteurs – Contemporains de Lulli</td>
<td>Viste</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plaintes des Mêmes: pour des Flûtes, ou des Violons tres adoucis</td>
<td>Dolemment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Enlèvement de Lulli au Parnasse</td>
<td>Tres légèrement</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accueil entre-Doux, et Agard, fait à Lulli par Corelli; et par les Muses italiénes</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remerciment de Lulli: à Apollon</td>
<td>Gracieusement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Apollon, persuade Lulli, et Corelli, Que la réunion des Goûts François et Italien doit faire la perfection de la Musique. Essai en forme d’Ouverture</td>
<td>Elégamment, Sans lenteur – légèrement – doux, et modérément</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lulli, jouant le Sujet; et Corelli l’accompagnant Corelli jouant le Sujet; à son tour, que Lulli accompagne</td>
<td>Air léger Second Air</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>La Paix du Parnasse</td>
<td>Lulli, et les Muses françaises (1st violin)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faite aux Conditions / Sur la Remontrance des Muses françaises / que lorsqu’on y parlerait leur langue, on dirait dorénavant Sonade, Cantade; Ainsi qu’on prononcer, ballade, Sérénade; &amp;c Sonade en Trio</td>
<td>Corelli, et les Muses italiénes (2nd violin) gravem.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>Saillie</td>
<td>Vivement</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>(white notation)</td>
<td>Rondement</td>
<td>3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vivement</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first seven movements of the *Apotheosis* set the stage for an imaginary meeting of Lully and Corelli by recounting Lully’s encounters with various mythological figures (see Table 3.1). All the instructions to the performers are deliberately French, including the French violin G-clef, the instruction to turn pages quickly (*Tournés viste*), and the designations for the string parts, which duplicate those commonly used in Lully’s opera scores (*1.er dessus de Simphonie; 2.e dessus de Simphonie; Basse d’Archet; Basse Continuë*). With the exception of the faster movements (no. 3 and 7), all the time signatures of “2” or “3” also reflect the kinds favored by French composers.

In movement no. 8, when Lully and Corelli finally meet, Couperin changes the tempo marking to a specifically Italian designation (*Largo*) and introduces the treble clef for the violinists with a precise instruction in French (*clefs changées*) to alert readers of the score to a change in “nationality.” David Tunley likens the solemn mood of this movement, as expressed in the tempo, “Largo” instead of “Gravement,” to the opening movement of a *sonata da chiesa*. At the end of the page, the Italian *Volti Subito* replaces the earlier French *Tournés viste*. More subtle and also only obvious to readers of the score, trills are now indicated by the Italianate “+” instead of the French manner of notating trills (w) found in the previous movements in French style.

The continuous eighth-note bass figuration (“walking bass”) that opens the movement, typical of Corelli’s sonatas, immediately makes audible the style shift. Yet,

150 Tunley, *François Couperin and ’the perfection of music’*, 90.
Lully’s presence can still be felt at the beginning of this movement in the two violin lines above the Corellian bass line (see Ex.3.1a): The pervasive dotted rhythm preceded by fast thirty-second note *tirades* in the style of the French overture is a rhythmic style that had become associated with Lully’s overture throughout Europe. In measure 1 of Ex. 3.1a, the first violin plays motive “a” with a *tirade* and dotted notes while the second violin plays the dotted rhythm with a Corellian chain of suspensions (motive “b”). The roles are switched in the middle of the second measure. This kind of motivic exchange is common in Corelli’s sonatas as illustrated in Ex. 3.1b, starting on the last beat of measure 15. In the second phrase (mm.6-10 in Ex. 3.1a), Couperin employs a Corellian feature by restating the opening phrase (mm.1-5) in a different key. He invigorates the transposed restatement of the opening phrase by exchanging the melodic parts between the two violins. Thus, we see a case of an amalgamation of distinct characteristics of the French rhythmic style and the Italian melodic and harmonic styles whose national identities are still distinguishable to the listeners.

The movement subsequently becomes more Italianate, when Couperin explicitly notates “*Notes égales, et marquées,*” at measure 11, which indicates performers should avoid the characteristically French performance practice of playing unevenly eighth-note figuration in stepwise motion. Here, Couperin invokes the hallmark of Corelli’s harmonic style by using a succession of secondary dominants and later, starting in measure 14, by

---

151 This Corellian characteristics can be found in Corelli’s trio sonata, Op. 1, no. 12, 1st movement.
combining chains of suspensions with alternating fifths and fourths in the bass (see. Ex. 3.1a, mm.11-18). There is a difference between Corelli’s harmonic style and Couperin’s usage here. For Corelli, the effect of the combined use of chains of suspensions with alternating fifths and fourths in the bass serves to provide forward thrust toward a harmonic goal, as illustrated in mm. 2-3 in Ex. 3.1c, where the combination propels the harmonic movement from the vi chord in m. 2 to the vi chord at the end of m. 3. In the case of Couperin (see Ex. 3.1a, mm.13-18), the sense of tonal direction provided by the long chain of suspensions is intensified by the use of secondary dominants that propel the passage toward a clear dominant on the downbeat of m. 16, while the passage that follows, secondary dominants are resolved in unusual ways and the downward thrust of some suspensions are countered by the upward thrust of augmented fifths resolving to sixths. Particularly noteworthy is the combination of a 9-8 suspension with an augmented 5-6 retardation on the downbeats of mm. 17 and 18, which, according to James Anthony, is a “relatively common post-Lully harmonic procedure in France.”152 This passage thus illustrates Couperin’s fusion of French and Italian harmonic practices.

152 Anthony, French baroque music from Beaujoyeux to Rameau, 261-62.
Ex. 3.1a Couperin, Apothéose de Lully (Paris, 1725) Accueil (mm. 1-10)
Ex. 3.1a - Continued (mm. 11-18)
Ex. 3.1b Corelli, Trio Sonata, Op. 1 (Rome, 1681) Sonata no. 12/I (mm. 14 - 19)

Ex. 3.1c Corelli, Trio Sonata, Op. 1 (Rome, 1681) Sonata no. 12/I (mm. 1 - 5)
In the next movement, where Lully expresses his gratitude to Apollo (no. 9), everything switches back to French, including the French violin clefs (*clés françaises*), the “3” time-signature, and French tempo marking.

The movements that follow under the subheading of “Apollo persuading Lully and Corelli that the union of the French and Italian styles must achieve perfection in music” (no. 10 onward) contain considerable generic mixture drawn from the two leading forms conveying national styles: the French overture and the Trio sonata. Appropriately, in the French overture section in *Essai en forme d’Ouverture* (no.10), Couperin uses the French clef with additional textual designation *clé françoise* for the part for Lully and the French muses and embellishes the melody in ornaments notated in the French way, while Corelli and the Italian muses play the second part in treble clef (marked *clé italienne*) with the trills notated in the Italian manner. The form is typical of a French overture, with a slow opening section in 2, then a livelier section in 3, followed by a return to the slow section. The final slow section offers a literal repetition of the last part of the opening section (mm.12-15), followed by a codetta. The framing slow sections employ the characteristically homophonic texture with pervasive dotted rhythm. Here the violins play mostly in unison. This thin texture is rather unusual, as one would expect a fuller scoring to emulate Lully’s five-part orchestral writing. Such unison writing in the slow sections of the French overture, however, will be used prominently in subsequent French accompanied keyboard collections, which we shall discussed later.
Surprisingly, the unison violin writing reappears in the livelier section, subverting our expectation of a section that usually begins in imitative style. The only thing that remotely signals the imitative texture that one might expect at the beginning of the fast section of a French overture is briefly revealed in the bass, which imitates the violin melody for just one measure (see Ex. 3.2). It is so short that one would normally not consider this a real imitation were it not for the built-in assumption that such a voice was going to continue as part of an imitative line. The character of the energetic, triadic melody in the violin parts in all’ unisono writing is Italianate and it becomes even more so toward the end of the section, when the violins break out into a broken chord figuration resembling the bariolage technique seen frequently in Corelli’s sonatas.

No. 12 ends the collection with a programmatic heading: “The Peace of Parnassus which, following a reproof from the French Muses [i.e., the French conservative critics of Italian music], is made on condition that when speaking there in their language, one will say “Sonade” and “Cantade,” as one also says Ballade and Sérénade.” Couperin also provides a subtitle “Sonade en Trio” underneath the programmatic heading to signify the grouping of the final four movements as part of a trio sonata in S/F/S/F sequence. The fast movements are in imitative style. To appease the French muses, Couperin reverts to

153 Rameau offers another rare example of a non-imitative fast section of the overture in his Fêtes d’Hébé (1739).

154 La Paix du Parnasse Faite aux Conditions / Sur la Remontrance des Muses françaises / que lorsqu’on y parleroit leur langue, on dirait dorénavant Sonade, Cantade; Ainsi qu’on prononce, ballade, Sérénade; /Sonade en Trio.
Ex. 3.2 Couperin, *Apothéose de Lully* (Paris, 1725) Overture (mm. 17-20, 41-47)
French tempo markings and performance instructions in the context of an Italian trio sonata. The fast movements are Italianate in nature, but the slow movements, especially the third movement, which has the expressive designation *Rondement*, are full of the expressive sighing figures commonly found in Lully’s operas. Visually significant is the void notation that Couperin chooses to use for the third movement. While the use of void notation from the antiquated mensural notational system cannot be claimed as exclusively French, it was nonetheless retained the longest in French musical prints, well into the third decade of the eighteenth century.\(^\text{155}\) Another notational peculiarity occurs in the middle of the movement, where the bass melody breaks into faster eighth-note figuration in mostly stepwise motion (see Ex. 3.3, mm.18-23). Couperin adds staccato-like dots to the eighth-note Corellian “walking bass” passage. These dots are to be interpreted as equivalent to the phrase “*notes égals,*” instructing performers to avoid the French convention of playing the notes unevenly. That Couperin chooses to use this rare method to ensure an Italianate performance of this passage instead of the usual “*notes égals*” highlights the French character of the notational style, which forms a visual counterbalance of the Italianate sounding passage characterized by the chain of suspension and the walking bass.

Ex. 3.3 Couperin, *Apothéose de Lully* (Paris, 1725) Sonade en Trio/III (mm. 18-23)
Devices of *Goûts Réunis* in the *Apotheosis of Lully*

Couperin’s formulation of *goûts réunis* as exemplified in the *Apotheosis of Lully* can be summarized into four main categories:

1. Prominence of National Genres

At the first mention of “*réuni des Goûts François et Italien*” in the program,\(^{156}\) Couperin chooses a French overture (a quintessentially French genre) to begin the quest toward a union of the two styles. The Italianate “Sonade en trio”\(^{157}\) is called upon to anchor the other end of the collection. This device of style mixture—placing borrowed genres in notable positions within a collection—is a powerful one to communicate a mixed style to the audience. We shall see how this device is effectively adopted in accompanied keyboard music by Mondonville, Boismortier, Noblet, and Simon in section 2 of this chapter.

2. Programmatic Titles Used to Articulate a Mixed Style.

The subject matter for the *Apotheosis* is straight out of the French theater, in a mythological setting of *Champs Élisés* and *Parnasse*, with Lully and Corelli interacting with such characters as *Ombres lyriques* (lyric Shades), Mercury, and Apollo. This practice draws upon the French penchant for descriptive music in instrumental genres. In

\(^{156}\) Movement no. 10 in the collection: *Apollon, persuade Lulli, et Corelli, Que la réunion des Goûts François et Italien doit faire la perfection de la Musique. Essai en forme d’Ouverture.*

\(^{157}\) Movement no. 12 in the collection consisting of a typical trio sonata with four movements: *La Paix du Parnasse Faite aux Conditions / Sur la Remontrance des Muses françaises / que lorsqu’on y parleroit leur langue, on dirait dorénavant Sonade, Cantade; Ainsi qu’on prononce, ballade, Sérénade; &c Sonade en Trio.*
subsequent collections of accompanied keyboard music, we see a similar use of descriptive programs to convey a movement’s national identity.

3. Notational Features that Convey a Mixed Style

To Couperin, it was important to clarify the different national styles in his composition by the explicit use of French and Italian terms for their respective styles. While it may appear to be a superficial way of representing the music in mixed style, it conforms to the aesthetic ideal of clarity as espoused by eighteenth-century critics, mentioned in the preceding chapter. Instances of this kind of purposeful manipulation can be found in the accompanied keyboard collections by Boismortier and Noblet.

4. Ironic Subversion of Generic Conventions

This device was used cleverly in the Apotheosis in the livelier section of the French overture, where one would expect the two violins to engage in imitative exchanges. Instead we are surprised by the violins’ Italianate all’unisono writing. While this device may not be limited to compositions in the mixed style, the presence of the value-laden national styles serves as a rich backdrop for the deployment of such techniques.

In the following section, I will discuss the various ways composers of accompanied keyboard music explore these four major techniques of style mixture. I especially want to emphasize the way composers expand upon these techniques to forge a new generic contract with the audience, which led to the identification of a new generic type.
The Application of *Goûts Réunis* in the Titles of French Accompanied Keyboard Music

A quick glance at the wide variety of titles for accompanied keyboard music in Appendix A might seem to call into question whether these collections should all belong to the same generic type. In other words, how could the audience tell that these collections are accompanied keyboard music from the titles alone? The relationship of these titles to Mondonville’s pathbreaking title (*Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon*), the first of the accompanied keyboard type, suggests the presence of a flexible construct of generic type, which developed out of the initial models of French *pièces de clavecin* and Italian trio sonatas. We will examine Mondonville’s title in detail to determine how Mondonville establishes his new generic contract with the listener, which will allow for such flexibility in the choice of titles and yet tie these collections together as one generic type. For ease of discussion, I divide the 15 accompanied keyboard collections in Appendix B into three categories according to the appearance of “sonatas” or “*pièces de clavecin*” or both on the title pages: 1) sonata settings; 2) *pièces de clavecin* settings, and 3) hybrid settings.

Pieces adhering to the sonata setting type are generally more Italianate. Each collection contains six sonatas and all of the movements employ a violin or flute accompaniment. These sonatas generally have three movements in fast-slow-fast sequence following, not the Corellian four-movement model, but the more recently fashionable Italian violin concertos of Vivaldi, adding another layer of style mixture that differs from Couperin. Accompanied keyboard music in the *pièces de clavecin* setting, on
the other hand, does not have the kind of structural uniformity that we see in the
accompanied keyboard music in sonata setting. Movements with one or more
accompanying instruments are embedded within a pièces de clavecin collection, which
also contains solo pieces for harpsichord alone. Placement of the accompanied
movements within the pièces de clavecin collections, amidst movements for solo
harpsichord, varies greatly. The accompanied movements generally appear in groups of
three in F/S/F sequence, following the structural model of the accompanied music in
sonata setting. The collections in the hybrid setting generally follow the overall structure
of the sonata settings.

Mondonville’s title and its Relation to the Titles in French Accompanied Music

Mondonville’s Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, Œuvre
3.5 (Op. 3 hereafter), published around 1738, is the first of its kind in the French
accompanied keyboard music repertoire. David Fuller hailed this collection as “a
genuinely original achievement—one of the rare instances of the creation in one stroke of
a new and fully developed genre.”158 The hybrid nature of Op. 3 is apparent from the
title itself. It combines the traditions of the French pièces de clavecin and the Italian
sonata. By invoking in the title the two genres that are firmly affiliated with the French
and the Italian styles, Mondonville communicates to the audience that this collection is in
the mixed style. He took from the pièces de clavecin tradition the fully written out

158 David Randall Fuller, Eighteenth-century French harpsichord music, 1979), 160.
idiomatic harpsichord writing, the role of the harpsichordist as a soloist, and the French practice of having a violinist improvise by doubling the solo harpsichord’s melody at the unison, third, or sixth.\footnote{The violinist does not have a written out part in the scores.}

The switch here in the role of the harpsichordist from a perpetual accompanist, realizing the figured bass part in ensemble music, to a soloist is crucial. It sets the stage for the kind of chamber music that features keyboard as a main or equal partner with one or more melody instruments. Even though Mondonville in his dedicatory note calls his Op. 3 collection “Sonates,” and includes the label “Sonata I, Sonata II, … ” at the beginning of each sonata, the presence of “pièces de clavecin,” given pride of place at the beginning of the title, serves the important function of differentiating the collection from the numerous violin or woodwind sonatas for one or more melody instruments with the accompaniment of basso continuo. Before Mondonville’s Op. 3, the term “sonata” or “sonate” had never been applied to French solo harpsichord music. Jean-Baptiste Barrière’s \textit{Sonates et pièces pour le clavecin, livre VI}, the first French sonata for solo harpsichord, only appeared in 1740.\footnote{Jean Barrière, \textit{Sonates et pièces pour le clavecin, livre VI} (New York: Performers’ Facsimiles, 1999), 37. See also Gustafson and Fuller, \textit{Catalogue of French harpsichord music, 1699-1780}, 41. This collection contains 6 sonatas. Sonatas 1 to 5 are \textit{Sonata da chiesa} and the last sonata opens with four movements in Italian tempo marking followed by 6 pieces with French descriptive titles.}

Mondonville draws from Italian sonatas the compositional technique of unfolding phrases through the use of sequences, and idiomatic violin writing associated with solo

\begin{addnote}
159 The violinist does not have a written out part in the scores.
160 Jean Barrière, \textit{Sonates et pièces pour le clavecin, livre VI} (New York: Performers’ Facsimiles, 1999), 37. See also Gustafson and Fuller, \textit{Catalogue of French harpsichord music, 1699-1780}, 41. This collection contains 6 sonatas. Sonatas 1 to 5 are \textit{Sonata da chiesa} and the last sonata opens with four movements in Italian tempo marking followed by 6 pieces with French descriptive titles.
\end{addnote}
violin sonatas (double stops, broken chord figurations). The lack of strong contrast in tempo markings for all three movements and the restrained use of brilliant and virtuosic violin writing are drawn from the trio sonata style, by comparison with solo violin sonatas. In Op. 3, Mondonville avoids the extreme tempi of Largo and Presto found frequently in solo violin sonatas and concertos.

The three-movement structure in all the sonatas in Mondonville’s Op. 3, however, presents a generic problem. To a French listener around 1730, a sonata either meant the sonata da chiesa (which usually consists of four or five abstract movements alternating in slow-fast-slow-fast sequence) or the sonata da camera (which usually opens with a prelude followed by a series of four or five dance movements). Mondonville employs neither of these in Op. 3. Instead, he uses the three-movement structure in fast-slow-fast order drawn from the concertos of Vivaldi.\(^{161}\) This extra layer of goûts réunis reflects Mondonville’s response to the most current trend in his musical environment. The rage for Corelli’s sonatas at the turn of the eighteenth century was replaced by Vivaldi’s concertos between 1715 and about 1750 in a phenomenon Marc Pincherle described as

\(^{161}\) Sonata I is an exception which opens with a tripartite French overture in slow-fast-slow sequence resulting in an overall three-movement structure in [slow/fast/slow]-slow- fast order.
“Vivaldian snobism.”162 In fact, the sixth sonata of Mondonville’s Op. 3 is specifically subtitled “Concerto.”163

Like Couperin, Mondonville borrowed some characteristic features of the pièces de clavecin, the trio and solo sonatas of the Corelli type, the concertos of Vivaldi and blended them into his Op. 3 collection. His notion of style mixture, however, went further than Couperin by forging a unique type of composition that resulted in the establishment of a new genre. The immediate success of Mondonville’s collection ensured a retention of this new generic type, which brings about a broadened understanding of the term “sonata” to include pieces with harpsichord as equal or dominant partner in an ensemble composition and, at the same time, an establishment of a new kind of harpsichord genre (regardless of whether the label “sonata” is used or not), which adopts the three-movement structure of the concerto.

The newly broadened meaning of “sonata,” which disentangled the harpsichord from the association exclusively with the basso continuo role, allows for collections of accompanied keyboard music in sonata setting to omit pièces de clavecin from their titles.


163 Earlier examples of ensemble collections that have Concerto(s) include Boismortier’s *Cinq sonates ... suivies d’un concerto*, Op. 26 (1729), and Telemann’s first set of six *Quadri* which contains two concertos, two ballets, and two sonatas. It was originally published in Hamburg in 1730 but was later republished in Paris by Le Clerc in 1736. Mondonville’s name appears in the first subscription list printed in the violin part.
(see Appendix B). After Mondonville, such collections by Boismortier (Sonates pour Clavecin et Flute, ca. 1742) or by Dupuits (Sonates pour un clavecin et une vièle, Op. 3, 1743), for example, could now be understood as Sonatas for fully written-out keyboard and the other instrument, whereas earlier collections such as Elizabeth Jacquet de la Guerre’s Sonates pour le viole et pour le clavecin (1707) had meant that the harpsichord part contained only figured bass.

Rameau articulates his understanding of the new kind of “sonata” for harpsichord in the Avis aux concertans to his Pièces de clavecin en concert (1741), which follows Mondonville’s lead: “The success of recently published sonatas, which have come out as harpsichord pieces with a violin part, has given me the idea of following much the same plan in the new harpsichord pieces which I am venturing to bring out today.”164 To him, the new “sonata” means written out harpsichord pieces with the accompaniment of a violin, cast in the new three-movement plan. Rameau replaces Mondonville’s sonate in the title with concert in his own collection, probably because of the additional bass part for the French bass viol. David Fuller argues that by using the word concert in the title, Rameau declares his “independence from his model” and also decidedly shifts the orientation from the Italianized sonate back to France.165 The employment of the three-movement structure partly explains Rameau’s use of a hybrid title (Pièces de clavecin en


concert), which tells the listener that the five concerts in the collection are not the usual kind of solo harpsichord pieces but the accompanied music type established by Mondonville.

The absence of the word “sonata” in the titles of subsequent accompanied music after Mondonville also means that composers are picking up on the pièces de clavecin part of Mondonville’s Op. 3 title and applying the accompanied style to a traditional pièces de clavecin collection consisting mostly of suites of dance movements or character pieces. Even when “sonata” does not appear in the titles of accompanied collections in pièces de clavecin setting, the public could still understand that part or all of the pieces in the collection belonged to the genre of accompanied keyboard music because of the use of “avec accompagnement de…” This is evident in Simon: “Instead of producing the ordinary suites for the harpsichord alone in the same key (those that belong to the uniform and dry kind that is best avoided) I’ve tried to compose some with the accompaniment of violin.”

Remarkably, the three-movement structure established by Mondonville becomes an important identifier for the accompanied keyboard pieces in pièces de clavecin setting. The accompanied collections in pièces de clavecin setting generally consist of a mixture of solo harpsichord pieces and pieces with accompanying instrument(s). The solo harpsichord movements in an accompanied keyboard music collection generally are

loosely grouped by key, without any set number of pieces or sequence of tempos. By contrast, the accompanied movements that intrude within these solo pieces are set apart from them by the presence of the accompanying instrument as well as the grouping according to a three-movement plan in F/S/F sequence.¹⁶⁷

Concept of *Goûts Réunis* in Accompanied Keyboard Music

Mondonville’s Op. 3

Like Couperin, Mondonville made clear to his audience his intention to employ a mixed style in Op. 3 by borrowing a genre in French style (the French overture)¹⁶⁸ and a genre in Italian style (in Mondonville’s case, the Italian concerto instead of the Sonade en trio). Mondonville’s choice of an Italian concerto reflects the fashion of his time, which perceived the concerto as a more modern and progressive type of Italian music than the Corellian sonata. Mondonville made the French overture even more prominent than Couperin had done in his *Apotheosis of Lully* by placing it at the very beginning of the

¹⁶⁷ One exception is Damoreau’s *Pièces de clavecin avec accompagnement de violon et sans accompagnement* (1754) that contains 15 pieces in 5 key groups. There is no apparent structural grouping of the pieces with violin accompaniment.

¹⁶⁸ Although the French overture originated as orchestral music from Lully’s theater music, its transference into keyboard music from the keyboard arrangements of the orchestral overtures to the development of originally composed French overtures for keyboard that usually served as an introduction to a collection of *pièces de clavecin* had been established by the 1710s. See David Chung, “Keyboard Arrangements and the Development of the Overture in French Harpsichord Music, 1670-1730,” *Early Keyboard Journal* 19 (2001): 33-67 and David R. Fuller, *Les arrangements pour clavier des oeuvres de Jean-Baptiste Lully: Keyboard arrangements of works by Jean-Baptiste Lully* (Germany: Laaber-Verlag, 1990), 471-482. Early examples of French overtures in chamber music was found in Agostino Steffani who was active in Munich and Hanover in his *sonate da camera* published by Roger in Amsterdam in 1710; see Anthony, *French baroque music from Beaujoyeux to Rameau*, 130.
collection, with the Italian concerto at the very end. The framing effect of the French overture and the Italian concerto serves as one of the obvious referents to a collection in mixed style. Table 3.2 offers examples of accompanied keyboard music that included either the French overture or the concerto. Most of the concertos appear mainly in the sonata settings (except Simon), while the French overture turns up mostly in the pièces de clavecin settings (except Mondonville, and Legrand, which will be discussed later).

While including a concerto in a collection of sonatas was not new to the Parisian public, its appearance in a setting where harpsichord alternates with the violin as the soloist was quite refreshing. Mondonville labels some of the sectional divisions with “tutti” and “solo” in the score of his sonata no. 6. The use of ritornello structure, the attention-catching unison and hammerstroke opening gesture in the fast movements, and the “motor” rhythm are all hallmarks of Vivaldi’s concertos. The tempo marking “Larghetto” in the slow movement of Sonata VI, subtitled Concerto, distinguishes this movement from the other slow movements in Op. 3, which are labeled Aria. Since aria or air is a popular title for the slow movements of many French violin sonatas, Mondonville

---

169 See Boismortier’s Op. 26 (Vingt Sixième Œuvre de Mr. Boismortier. Contenans Cinq Sonates pour le violoncelle, Viole, ou Basson, avec la Basse chifrée; Suivies d’un CONCERTO pour l’un ou l’autre de ces Instruments (1729).

170 In the first and second movements of Op.3/6, Mondonville puts “solo” underneath the violin or harpsichord right-hand part to demarcate the solo sections from the tutti sections as well as to make it clear who has the solo material in the solo sections. In the third movement, in addition to the “solo” labels marked similarly like movements 1 and 2, Mondonville adds a “tutti” at the beginning of the second tutti section.
follows Couperin’s practice by using tempo marking to highlight a change in national style or genre.\textsuperscript{171}

Table 3.2  Accompanied keyboard music with subtitles of overture and/or concerto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement title</th>
<th>Location of movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville Op.3 (\textit{ca.} 1738)</td>
<td>Ouverture</td>
<td>Sonata I, 1\textsuperscript{st} mvt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville Op.3 (\textit{ca.} 1738)</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
<td>Sonata VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits Op.3 (1743)</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
<td>Sonata I &amp; III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
<td>Sonata V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand Pc de Clv Op. 1 (1747)</td>
<td>Ouverture Has soloistic passages in violin and keyboard</td>
<td>Première Suite, 1\textsuperscript{st} mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoreau Pc de Clv (1754)</td>
<td>CONCERT ouverture Has cadenza-like keyboard passage near the end</td>
<td>No. 12 in 5\textsuperscript{th} key group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legrand Pc de Clv en sonates, op.1 (1755)</td>
<td>Ouverture</td>
<td>Sonata Première, 1\textsuperscript{st} mvt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly 3\textsuperscript{rd} Livre Pc de Clv (1756)</td>
<td>Ouverture</td>
<td>no. 1 in 1\textsuperscript{st} key group. Also no.1 in group of 3 pieces w. violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Pc de Clv \oeuvre I (1761)</td>
<td>Introduction (calls it \textit{ouverture in avertissement})</td>
<td>IV.\textsuperscript{me} Suite 1\textsuperscript{st} mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Pc de Clv \oeuvre I (1761)</td>
<td>Concerto Has extensive keyboard solo</td>
<td>VI.\textsuperscript{me} Suite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{171} Couperin switches to Italian tempo (Largo) and Italian trill symbols (+) in movement no. 8 of \textit{Apotheosis} when Lully and Corelli finally meet.
In addition, Mondonville also follows Couperin’s practice of assigning the French method of notating trills (\(\textit{w}\)) to signify the notion of Frenchness and the Italian method of notating trills (\(\textit{+}\)) to signify Italianism. In Mondonville’s case, French trill symbols appear exclusively in the harpsichord part throughout the collection, emphasizing the French association of the \textit{pièces de clavecin} tradition, whereas Italian trill symbols only appear in the violin part, emphasizing the Italian association of the Italian sonata and concerto. In this way, Mondonville links notational practice with the generic association of the harpsichord and the violin rather than to musical style or programmatic content, as exemplified by Couperin.

Boismortier’s \textit{Sonates pour un clavecin et une flûte traversière}, Op. 91

Boismortier’s Op. 91 (published by 1742) offers a kind of framing effect similar to Mondonville’s Op. 3 from a few years earlier. Boismortier places an Italian Siciliana (in French spelling “Sicilienne”), with its characteristic anacrusis beginning, dotted rhythmic figure in 12/8, as the opening piece of his collection and a pair of \textit{menuets} to conclude the final sonata. These are the only movements in Op. 91 that have explicit dance titles.\(^{172}\) The Italianate element at the beginning of Op. 91 is further underscored by the use of slow (Sicilienne)-fast-slow-fast organization in sonata no. 1, which refers to

\(^{172}\) There are some movements that has the character of a courtly dance, but these are not labeled as such: Gigue (III/3, V/3), Gavotte (I/3, VI/2).
the characteristic structure of the old-fashioned Italian sonata da chiesa. The rest of the sonatas are in the modern three-movement structure, as established by Mondonville.

Boismortier’s Op. 91 sonatas are uncharacteristically French in their orientation, compared to other accompanied keyboard music in sonata setting: He uses only French spelling for the sonatas (I.\textsuperscript{re} Sonate, II.\textsuperscript{me} Sonate, . . .), the movement titles (Sicilienne, Air, Menuet), performance instruction (Recoménciez, fin.), and tempo markings (gayement, gracieusement, légerement, rondement) (see Table 3.3). French style in Op. 91 is further represented by the use of the French rondeau form in most of the slow movements, as opposed to the through-composed form that Boismortier favors for most of the slow movements in his published collections of trio sonatas.\textsuperscript{173} Rondeau form had become the predominant structure used in the pièces de clavecin around the 1720s.\textsuperscript{174}

Table 3.3 Movement titles and tempo designations in Boismortier, Op. 91 (1742)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Movement Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.\textsuperscript{re}</td>
<td>Sonate Sicilienne; Gayement; Gracieusement; Gayement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.\textsuperscript{me}</td>
<td>Sonate Gayement; Gracieusement; Gayement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.\textsuperscript{me}</td>
<td>Sonate Rondement-Gayement; Air Gracieusement; Gayement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.\textsuperscript{me}</td>
<td>Sonate Gayement; Gracieusement; Gayement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.\textsuperscript{me}</td>
<td>Sonate Legerement; Gracieusement; Gayem.\textsuperscript{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.\textsuperscript{me}</td>
<td>Sonate Gayement; Gracieusement; Menuet-2.\textsuperscript{e} Menuet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boismortier’s overwhelming use of French verbal designations in his Op. 91 sonatas is unusual compared to the practice in his other sonatas, which do not belong to

\textsuperscript{173} Lewis E. Peterman Jr, “The instrumental chamber music of Joseph Bodin de Boismortier with special emphasis on the trio sonatas for two treble instruments and basso continuo” (Ph.D. diss., University of Cincinnati, 1985), 320-22.

\textsuperscript{174} Anthony, French baroque music from Beaujoyeulx to Rameau, 307, 314.
the accompanied keyboard music genre. In these other sonatas, Boismortier adopts either all Italian or a mixture of French and Italian spellings for the textual captions. Table 3.4 shows an example of Boismortier’s exclusive use of Italian markings in his Op. 26 collection that contains five sonatas and one concerto for cello, viol, or bassoon with basso continuo, published in 1729. The use of all Italian markings in the Op. 26 collection could be inspired by the inclusion of a concerto at the end of the collection.

Table 3.4 Movement titles and tempo markings for Boismortier’s Cinq Sonates, un concerto, Op. 26 (1729)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SONATA prima</th>
<th>Moderato; Gavotta; Adagio; Allegro; Adagio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SONATA Seconda</td>
<td>Vivace; Allemanda Allegro ma non tropo; Giga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONATA III.⁰</td>
<td>Allegro, ma non tropo; Corrente; Adagio; Minoetto 1.⁰ – Minoetto 2.⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONATA IV.⁰</td>
<td>Adagio; Allegro; Adagio; Minoetto 1.⁰ – Minoetto 2.⁰; Corrente; Largo; Gavotta 1.⁰-Gavotta 2.⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONATA Quinta</td>
<td>Allemanda Allegro; Aria Affettuoso; Adagio; Giga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERTO</td>
<td>Allegro; Largo; Allegro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the four suites in Boismortier’s only solo harpsichord collection, Op. 59 (Quatre suites de pièces de clavecin) (1736), in which all the pieces have programmatic titles, contains only French captions. In addition to the programmatic titles, Boismortier also provides dance titles for a few of the movements (Allemande, Gavotte, Sarabande, Courante, Gigue, Bourrée en rondeau). It appears that Boismortier

---

175 Boismortier published a total of 44 sonatas for which only Op. 91 belongs to the accompanied keyboard music genre. The rest of the sonatas are for melody instrument(s) with or without basso continuo.

176 The title that appears on the title page: VINGT SIXIÈ. me Œuvre de M. r Boismortier. Contenant CINQ SONATES pour le Violoncelle, Viole, ou Baßon, avec la Baße chifrée; Suivies d’un CONCERTO pour l’un ou l’autre de ces Instrumens. . . .
may view textual markings as an important signifier for a certain style, which is similar to Couperin’s attitude. Thus, we see the use of Italian spellings for dances such as *Minoetto* [sic] and *Gavotta* in Italian-oriented sonatas and French spellings for *Menuet* and *Gavotte* in a *pièces de clavecin* collection. Boismortier’s choice of title for his accompanied keyboard music departs from the two earlier collections of the genre by Mondonville (*pièces de clavecin en sonates*) and Rameau (*pièces de clavecin en concerts*) in which the notion of style mixture is immediately apparent in their titles by the display of both national genres. His exclusive use of French captions for his accompanied keyboard sonatas is perhaps due to his desire to counterbalance the Italian association of the title (*Sonates pour Clavecin et Flute*).

Some of the style mixture devices Boismortier uses in Op. 91 are similar to Mondonville’s in Op. 3, except for the order of presenting movements in the French and Italian styles. The stylistic affinity of the framing pieces for Op. 91 is first Italian (Sicilienne and the sonata da chiesa structure in the first sonata), then French (a pair of Menuets as the final movement to end the collection). The tempo markings are all French, as opposed to all Italian in Mondonville’s Op. 3. Even though both Boismortier and Mondonville use roman numerals to number their sonatas, Boismortier chooses the French style (Ire Sonate, IIme Sonate, etc.) as opposed to Mondonville’s Italian manner (Sonata I, Sonata II, etc.) (see Table 3.5).
While it is hard to make sense of the exact relationship between Op. 91 and Op. 3 without more documentary evidence, one can venture to guess that Op. 91 was perhaps Boismortier’s witty way of imitating Mondonville’s model.

Table 3.5 Comparison of the method of mixed style between Boismortier (Op. 91) and Mondonville (Op. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boismortier Op. 91</th>
<th>Mondonville Op. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Ire Sonate, IIme Sonate …</td>
<td>Sonata I, Sonata II …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st movement of collection</strong></td>
<td>Sicilienne (sonata da chiesa structure of slow-fast-slow-fast order in first sonata)</td>
<td>Ouverture (Grave – Allegro – Adagio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last movement of collection</strong></td>
<td>Menuet … 2e Menuet</td>
<td>Concerto (sonata VI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo marking</strong></td>
<td>All French</td>
<td>All Italian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noblet’s collection (1756)

Noblet’s accompanied keyboard collection *Nouvelles Suites de Pièces de Clavecin et trois sonates avec accompagnement de violon* (1756) presents a slightly different way of mixing French and Italian elements. It consists of only two suites for harpsichord solo, into which the composer strangely tucks three accompanied sonatas. Although the sonatas form part of the suites, they can easily be identified, not only by their scoring with violin, but also by their prominent movement headings: *Sonate, avec accompagnement de violon*. Like most of accompanied keyboard sonatas from other
collections, Noblet’s three interpolated sonatas consist of three movements in fast-slow-fast sequence.¹⁷⁷

The juxtaposition of the two opposing styles occurs at several levels: On the broadest level, the collection is framed by a French suite (for harpsichord alone) at the beginning and an Italian sonata (for harpsichord and violin) at the end. The French suite begins with a characteristic opening dance movement, Allemande, whose noble mood also serves as a prelude to the entire collection. The first Italian sonata appears at the end of the first suite. The second suite also begins with a solo harpsichord character piece and ends with a sonata. But this time another sonata is also inserted in the middle of the second suite. This intervening sonata, though clearly Italianate, is the only one in the collection that follows the French penchant for programmatic titles.

The subject of the program for the interpolated sonata (Les Bouffons) very likely refers to the Italian comic players who visited Paris between 1752 and 1754. Their spectacularly successful performances triggered dozens of heated exchanges in the form of pamphlets between supporters of French or Italian music in the sensational guerre des bouffons (War of the Buffonists). Rousseau, as an advocate in the Italian camp, declared that “the French have no music and cannot have any; or that if they have, it will be so much the worse for them.”¹⁷⁸ Such a highly charged opinion was no doubt still fresh in

---

¹⁷⁷ The second sonata starts with a short Andante section of six measures, then follows with the normal Allegro ma non tropo section.
the Parisian public consciousness in 1756 when Noblet’s collection was published. That this sonata is positioned in the middle of the second suite may allude to the origin of opera buffa as “short comic musical interludes between the acts of a serious opera.”

A closer look at the three sonatas in Noblet’s *Nouvelles Suites* reveals a purposeful stylistic move from a French sonata (first sonata), at the end of Suite I, to a mixed style sonata (second sonata), in the middle of Suite II, to an Italianate sonata (third sonata), at the end of Suite II (see Table 3.6). Noblet presents the French features of the first sonata by using French dances (Gavotte, Tambourin) with French tempos (*vivement* and *tendrement*). The contrast in performance instructions between the first and last sonatas is quite illuminating as well. We see “à l’8ème en bas” and “Tournés t. vite” in the first movement of the sonata from Suite I and “Al 8va” and “Volti subito” in the last movement of the sonata that concludes Suite II and also the entire collection. There is a mixture of both French and Italian terms in the second sonata which also has a programmatic title, *Les Bouffons*. Noblet’s purposeful blending of the French and Italian features in *Les Bouffons* may very well be a composer’s proposal to reconcile the two national styles, which had divided Franchophiles and Italiophiles in the War of the Buffonists (*guerre des bouffons*).

---


Table 3.6 Movement titles and tempo and expression markings in Noblet’s NOUVELLES SUITTES (1756)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Title/Tempo or expression markings</th>
<th>Performance instruction</th>
<th>Time signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>PREMIERE SUITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SONATE, avec accompagnement de Violon</td>
<td>Fr. Ornament notation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Vivement</td>
<td>French: à l’8ve en bas; Tournés t. vite.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1ère Gavotte, Tendrement 2.e G. Mineur</td>
<td>French: À la 1.ère Gavotte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.ère Tambourin 2.è T. Mineur</td>
<td>French: Au 1er Tambourin</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2.è Suite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Les Bouffons, Sonate avec Accompagnement de Violon</td>
<td>+ for trill in violin &amp; Fr. Ornament in kybd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Andante – Allegro ma non tropo; Andante – Allegro ma non tropo.</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.ère Menuet … 2.è sans Violon</td>
<td>Doux; On reprend le 1ère Menuet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonate avec accompagnement de Violon</td>
<td>+ for trill in violin &amp; Fr. Ornament in kybd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Aria Gracioso</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Al 8ve, Volti subito; Segue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simon’s *Pièces de clavecin Dans tous le Genres Avec et sans accompagnement de violon*, Op. 1 (ca. 1755, published 1761)

Simon’s Opus 1 collection of accompanied keyboard music (published 1761) contains six suites. In the *Avertissement*, the composer articulates his interest in offering amateurs music in both the French and Italian styles: “I tried to gather here the two kinds of Music which usually divide and sometimes unite the votes of Amateurs; I mean the French style and the Italian style.”\(^{180}\) True to his promise, the collection contains an unusually wide variety of pieces, which evoke the conventions of the *pièces de clavecin*, the French overture, French airs, the eighteenth-century French vocal *romance*, and the Italian sonata and concerto. The overall organization appears to be an exercise in alternating contrasts between the French and Italian styles. (see Table 3.7)

---

180 J’ai tâché de rassembler ici les deux genres de Musique qui partagent ordinairement et qui réunissent quelquefois les suffrages des Amateurs; je veux dire, le goût François et le goût Italien.
### Table 3.7 Overall organization of Simon’s Op. 1 (published 1761)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Violin</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Tempo/Expression marking</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>La Mézangère</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Allemande; Noblement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarabande; Tendrement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legerement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>La Saint Saire</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airs; Tendres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D.C.; Fort, Doux, Fin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Magnanville</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1re Gavotte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>IIe Gavotte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Tyrconell</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pantomime</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>La D'Eaubonnes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>La Fontaine</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Vif</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>La Moriceau</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mouvement de Menuet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thm &amp; Var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>La de Nangis</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Musette</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 a</td>
<td>La de Broglie</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Menuets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13b</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineur</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>La de Villemeurer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Air que l’on peut Varier; Mouvement des Romance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>La de Croisoeuil</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Introduction; Grave</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reprise; Vivement; Lent (1 measure); Vif</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3.7 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Violin</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Tempo/Expression marking</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F Vif</td>
<td>Tutti 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>La La = Corée</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>E flat</td>
<td>Modérément</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>La L’arrard</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B flat</td>
<td>Legerement et Détaché</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>La Le Daulceur</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>E flat</td>
<td>Vivement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>La La Font</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>CONCERTO; que l’on peut Executer avec un Violon Seul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>With Basse qui peut se jouer avec la Quinte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>D Gavottes; Legerement</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Baβe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22b</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Baβe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Vif</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>La de Poyanne</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>D Andantino</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>La de Guibeville</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A Air; Gay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simon assigns the odd numbered suites to solo harpsichord.\(^{181}\) The even-numbered suites are a little more complicated in terms of scoring. They either begin with or consist solely of three movements with violin accompaniment in a fast-slow-fast

\(^{181}\) The last movement for Suite no. 3 adds a violin part. This exception will be discussed in more detail later.
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sequence. Suite no. 2 begins with three pieces for harpsichord and violin, but continues with three more pieces for solo harpsichord; Suite no. 4 contains three movements only (French overture, Andante, Vif), all with a violin part; Suite no. 6, subtitled “Concerto,” begins with 3 movements for violin, bass, and an optional viola part that doubles the bass, imitating the orchestral effect of a concerto. For contrast, this final suite ends modestly with two more French Airs for solo harpsichord. Simon’s method of superimposing a three-movement accompanied “sonata” or concerto onto a French suite is a common structural device used by other accompanied keyboard collections in the *pièces de clavecin* setting as exemplified in Noblet’s collection.

The title for the opening piece of Simon’s Suite no. 1 (*La Mézangére*) refers to Madame la Marquise de la Mézangére, dedicatee of Simon’s Op. 1 and famous harpsichord pupil of François Couperin. She had taken notice of the thirteen-year-old Simon, whom she had brought from Caen to her Paris hotel, where she taught him harpsichord. The stately Allemande marked *Noblement* is an appropriate tribute to her. The noble effect is further achieved by the pervasive, swift runs toward a chordal downbeat, which resemble the characteristic *tirades* in a French overture (see Ex. 3.4).

---

182 The tempo sequence for Suite no. 4 differs from the other accompanied movements because it opens with a French overture, which begins with a slow section.

183 Appendix B lists the French accompanied keyboard music by their settings.

184 Couperin wrote a character piece for her in *Second livre de pièces de clavecin* (Paris, 1716-17), Ordre no. 10.

Ex. 3.4 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 1/1 (mm. 1-9)
Simon’s use of an Allemande at the beginning of Suite no. 1 followed by a Sarabande, which had been popular in many 17th century pièces de clavecin collections, alludes to that older pièces de clavecin tradition. By the 1730s, such old courtly dances as Allemande and Sarabande had gone out of fashion, overshadowed by non-dance character pieces with fanciful titles. Simon’s nostalgic use of this venerable tradition is perhaps a tribute to Madame Mézangére’s connection with the old clavecin school. This old style pièce, positioned as Suite no. 1, also serves as a contrast to the modern concerto that introduces Suite no. 6, at the end of the collection.

Suite no. 2 offers yet another national contrast to Suite no. 1. The title to the first movement of Suite no. 2 (La Saint Saire) refers to a violinist who had taught Simon musique. Not surprisingly, the first three movements have violin parts, followed by three more pieces for solo harpsichord. The sequence of Allegro—Airs Tendres (majeur/mineur)—Allegro in the first three movements recalls the structures of the violin/harpsichord sonatas as exemplified by Mondonville’s Op. 3. It forms an Italianate counterpart to the old court dances of Suite no. 1.

As mentioned earlier, the last movement of Suite no. 3 curiously includes a violin part. The presence of violin here upsets the general pattern of alternating suites with and

---


without violin. Titled “La de Villemeur, Air que l’on peut Varier,” the movement has an additional appellation of *Movement de Romance*.

The eighteenth-century *Romance* is a vocal genre that contains “a strophic poem recounting an ancient story of love and gallantry.”$^{188}$ “Sweet, natural, and rustic” (*douce, naturelle, champêtre*) are the essential qualities prescribed to it by Rousseau in his *Dictionnaire de Musique* (1768).$^{189}$ The soft violin accompaniment to the *Romance* in Simon’s third suite, in sustained two-note harmony of mostly consonant intervals above an arpeggiated tonic pedal (see Ex. 3.5), evokes the sweet, distant sound of “*musique champêtre*” of the sort discussed in chapter 4. The structure consists of two repeating sections (each containing two four-measure phrases in the same rhythmic pattern). The simple melody consists of mostly stepwise motion and small leaps. The structural and melodic simplicity, combined with the wistful sentimentality of the violin accompaniment above the tonic pedal, parallels nicely the sentimental nostalgia of Suite no. 1’s old-fashioned court dances. Even though the violin’s presence in this movement deviates from the general pattern of alternation between suites for solo harpsichord and suites that contain pieces for harpsichord and violin, such deviation sets up another broader pattern, which will be discussed below.


Suite no. 4, oddly, has the subtitle “Introduction,” which Simon refers to as “Ouverture” in the Avertissement. This suggests an overall conception for the whole collection in two halves, similar to Bach’s use of a French overture to introduce the second half of the Goldberg Variations (Nuremberg, 1741). The affinity of Simon’s “Introduction” to the French overture is obvious: it opens with a Grave section followed by a quick, imitative section marked Vivement. The Grave section has the French overture’s typical dotted rhythm and tirades. Simon also incorporates some Italianate, concerto features into this overture. The brief, cadenza-like passage for the keyboard at measure 6, after a pause on the dominant chord, points to distinctive elements of the Italian concerto style featuring solo instruments (see Ex. 3.6).

Simon altered the end of the characteristic slow-fast-slow structure of the French overture by adding a fast codetta-like section (see Ex. 3.7, mm.97-102). The approach to this codetta is quite interesting. The fast, imitative section ends on a sustained chord on V7, after which Simon brings back the mood of the slow section (Lent) in measure 96. This return to the pompous mood of the opening Grave lasts for only one measure. It is abruptly replaced by a fast, six-measure closing section on the tonic chord, of a sort we often see at the end of the first movement of an Italian sonata or concerto. Thus, Simon’s infusion of a typical gesture of Italian music into a quintessential French genre produces a kind of surprise that would not have been lost to his contemporary listeners.

The third movement of Suite no. 4, marked Vif, opens with an all’unisono passage in the violin and right-hand part. The triadic melody and the numerous brilliant passages
Ex. 3.6 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 4/I (mm. 1-6)
Ex. 3.7 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 4/I (mm. 93 - 102)
featuring solo keyboard further highlight the borrowing from concertos (see Ex. 3.8). The formal structure used here is not the ritornello form of Vivaldi’s concertos, however, but an expanded ABA' structure (see Table 3.8). A' offers a return of the first and second melodic groups in the tonic key without the transition (mm. 7-21 in the A section). At the beginning of the second melodic group, Simon uses a minor dominant instead of the usual major dominant. This modal borrowing is very much a French harmonic characteristic. The three-movement structure of Suite no. 4 parallels that of Suite no. 1 which, as stated before, is quite French in its nostalgic use of the old pièces de clavecin organization of courtly dances. The contrast in the social function between the allemande for solo harpsichord (which is suitable for performances in intimate settings) and the Italianized French overture for harpsichord and violin (which requires a grander and more public setting borrowed from the orchestral genre), adds another layer of intriguing contrast between these two suites.

Table 3.8 Formal structure of Simon’s Suite no. 4, 3rd movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A</th>
<th>Section B</th>
<th>Section A'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. grp. I</td>
<td>M. g.IIa</td>
<td>M. g.IIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key: F (I)</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V – vi –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii – I –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ex. 3.8 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 4/III (mm. 1-10)
Suite no. 6 marked “CONCERTO La La Font” is a miniature concerto prominently featuring the harpsichord, accompanied by several stringed instruments. In order to help this concerto achieve the grander sound of an orchestra, Simon adds a new instrument to the usual violin accompaniment, the *basse*, and also suggests in the score: “*Basse qui peut se jouer avec la Quinte.*” The editors of *A Catalogue of French Harpsichord Music 1699-1780* interpret this to mean “bass may be doubled by viola,” adding a fourth instrument to the ensemble.\(^{190}\) The expansive breadth of the scalar passages, the thick, full chords, and the wide spacing of the instrumental parts make it clear that Simon conceives this suite with a larger, orchestral sound in mind. The opening phrase—three thick, repeated chords followed by a free-voiced harpsichord solo—highlights immediately the dramatic opposition in sound between tutti and solo of a concerto. It serves as an introduction to the main melodic group featuring another concerto convention: *all’unisono* writing between the violin and the right-hand melody, which are joined by the other parts at the octave at the end of the phrase (see Ex. 3.9 mm.1-7). Instead of using Vivaldi’s ritornello structure, found in earlier concerto movements of French accompanied keyboard music (for example, Mondonville, op. 3, no. 6, and Dupuits, Op. 3, no. 1 and 3), Simon organizes this concerto movement in a large-scale ABA’ structure with a cadenza inserted toward the end of an abbreviated and

\(^{190}\) Gustafson and Fuller, *Catalogue of French harpsichord music, 1699-1780*, 222. One can also interpret Simon’s instruction to mean bass can be played by viola alone. For practical purpose in order to sell more music, Simon also has the phrase “que l’on peut Executor avec un Violon Seul” prominently placed under the title VI.\(^{\text{em}}\) Suite.
Ex. 3.9 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 6/1 (mm. 1-12)
slightly modified repetition of the A section (see Ex. 3.10). The sustained dominant-seventh chord in third inversion delays the cadence on the tonic by ushering in the cadenza for solo harpsichord. The final A section rearranges the melodic material from the opening A section. This unusual structural scheme offers us a glimpse of Simon’s response to the Italian concerto: he appears to be more interested in the concerto style that offers an opportunity for virtuosic display rather than the aspect of an organized opposition between the tutti and solo sound as carved out by the ritornello form.

The dramatic opening movement of the concerto contrasts sharply with the subdued second movement—a pair of gavottes. Here, Simon returns to the intimate pièces de clavecin world with the rondeau form and a sweet melody laced with delicate ornaments. The choice of a gavotte as the second movement of a three-movement concerto is a French feature, following the example of Jean-Marie Leclair l’aîné’s violin concerto with basso continuo (Op. 10, no. 4, 1745) as well as Dupuits’ Op. 3, Sonata 3 (subtitled Concerto), which is accompanied keyboard music. The gavottes also offer the opportunity for Simon to contrast an overtly Italianate first movement with a simple French dance in the second movement. This pairing of Italian genre with a French piece

\[^{191}\text{Neal Zaslaw considers Gavotte to be “one of Leclair’s most important movement types, in both quality and quantity.” Most of the Gavottes appear in Leclair’s sonatas for violin(s) and basso continuo. See Zaslaw, Materials for the life and works of Jean-Marie Leclair l’aîné, 330, 335.}\]

\[^{192}\text{Dupuits’ collection of accompanied keyboard music titled Sonates pour un clavecin et une vièle ... œuvre III(1743) is listed in Appendix 1 under the sonata settings.}\]
Ex. 3.10 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 6/I (mm. 110-122)
in these two movements (Italian concerto-French gavottes) reverses the order of national styles in the other pair of movements in Suite no. 4 (French overture-Andante).

For a pièces de clavcic collection, Simon’s Op. 1 seems unusually organized in the internal arrangement of the suites. Suites and movements are arranged in a pattern that juxtaposes the opposites (solo harpsichord suites alternating with suites of accompanied movements; a suite in old pièces de clavcic tradition (Suite no. 1) next to a suite in Italian sonata tradition (Suite no. 2), etc.). One may wonder why Simon places an “Introduction” or Ouverture in the middle of a collection when it seems more suitable at the beginning of the whole set, as in those of Mondonville (Op.3), Marchand (1747), Legrand (1755), and Duphly (1756). This strange placement of an “Introduction” in mid-collection draws attention to itself and invites readers of the score to consider this “introduction” as an important structural divider for the collection. Some parallels between Suites no. 1 and 4 and Suites no. 3 and 6 support the binary division of Simon’s set of pièces de clavcic. (see Table 3.9)

193 Important earlier ensemble collections published in Paris that contain a French overture placed not at the beginning of a collection are: Elizabeth Claude Jacquet de La Guerre’s Sonates pour le violon et pour le clavcic (1707): sonata no. 4 out of a collection of 6 violin sonatas (see Anthony, French baroque music from Beaujoyeux to Rameau, 387.); Couperin’s Apothéose de Lulli (1725), which is programmatically driven; Telemann’s Nouveau Quartours (1738) in suite no. 6. Among the accompanied keyboard music published in Paris between late 1730s to early 1761, four have the French overture at the beginning of the collection. Simon’s and Damoreau’s collection are the only two that have a French overture in the middle of the collection.

194 Interestingly, J.S. Bach also uses a French overture (variations no. 16) to divide his Goldberg Variations into two halves. For an illuminating discussion of Telemann’s use of the French overture for theological purpose at the end of his cantata titled Jesus sei mein erstes Wort, see Jeanne Swack, “A
Table 3.9 Contrast between the two halves of Simon’s Op. 1 collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suite no.1</th>
<th>Suite no. 3</th>
<th>Suite no. 4</th>
<th>Suite no. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of mvts: 3</td>
<td>No. of mvts: 5</td>
<td>No. of mvts: 3</td>
<td>No. of mvts: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium: Solo harpsichord</td>
<td>Medium: Harpsichord with violin (last mvt only)</td>
<td>Medium: Harpsichord with violin</td>
<td>Medium: Solo harpsichord (last 2 mvts only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st mvt (Allemande; Noblement)</td>
<td>5th mvt (Air)</td>
<td>1st mvt (Introduction; Grave)</td>
<td>5th mvt (Air)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both halves, consisting of three suites each, begin with suites in three movements and end with suites in 5 movements. The first half begins with a movement for harpsichord solo and ends with a movement for harpsichord and violin. The scoring is reversed in the second half of the collection. Suite no. 4 (1st movement) is for harpsichord with violin and the last movement (5th movement) in suite no. 6 is for solo harpsichord. Both halves end with an Air.

The fact that both halves begin and end with pieces that are considered the French genre par excellence seems a deliberate move by Simon to appeal to the French public’s sense of national pride. The opening movements for both halves (Allemande in the first

---

Comparison of Bach’s and Telemann’s Use of the Ouverture as Theological Signifier” in *Bach Perspectives* 6 ed. by Gregory Butler (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 121-34.

195 As mentioned earlier, Simon breaks the pattern of alternating suites for solo harpsichord (odd numbered suites) and suites that contain accompanied movements (even numbered suites) by including a violin accompaniment for the last movement of suite no. 3. By compromising this pattern of alternation on a micro level, a broader pattern is formed.
half and French overture in the second half) are popular openers for instrumental
collections. Simon makes this parallelism more interesting by contrasting an Allemande
which represents the old pièces de clavecin tradition with a “French” overture, but one
that is both modern and Italianized.

The use of a French overture at the beginning of Suite no. 4 and the placement of
a Concerto at the beginning of Suite no. 6 (the last suite in the collection) is reminiscent
of Mondonville’s approach to style mixture in his Op. 3 collection, where French
overture and Concerto serve as the framing sonatas of the collection as a whole. That the
framing effect of a French genre and an Italian genre starts in the middle of a collection
also signals a new beginning, which recalls Couperin’s celebrated Apotheosis to Lully
(1725).

French Overtures in Accompanied Keyboard Music

The French overture, as cultivated by Lully, had originally functioned as an
introduction to French operas and ballet music. This genre quickly achieved widespread
popularity throughout Europe and was adapted to various performance media as the
introductory piece for suites and sonatas, as a stand-alone piece for solo keyboard in the
form of transcriptions or original compositions, or as part of overture suites. Its unique
stylistic characteristics were associated with the golden age of Louis XIV and Lully. Its
lasting use in French operas and ballets at the height of the French monarchy elevated its
status as representative of French style.
Not surprisingly, many composers who explored the concept of *goûts réunis* during the first half of the eighteenth century exploited the uniquely national identity of this genre. The most notable example is Couperin’s *Apotheosis to Lully* (1725). That Couperin chose a French overture to illustrate the possibility of uniting the French and Italian styles to create “perfection in music” attests to the adaptability of the overture to both styles. Couperin’s *Grave* section—with its characteristic dotted rhythm, its homophonic texture, and ornamental nuances—is French. Couperin’s fast section, not imitative as the equivalent section of many Lullian overtures was, is full of Italian characteristics in its triadic melody, *all’unisono* texture, the use of sequence and harmonic motion in circles of fifths to propel a forward tonal direction. The sprinkling of delicate French ornaments, on the other hand, declares its allegiance to the French style.

To Couperin, the French overture means more than just a symbol of the French style; it is also a flexible genre that allows for the application of style mixture. Some composers of accompanied keyboard music published between the late 1730s and early 1760s share this vision by including a French overture in their collections (see Appendix D). This practice becomes more significant in the accompanied collections that also contain movements for solo harpsichord: the French overture appears exclusively in movements with accompanying instrument(s) in these collections, emphasizing the ensemble aspect of the genre.

As Appendix D illustrates, French overtures only appear in French accompanied keyboard music in *pièces de clavécin* settings (Marchand, Damoreau, Duphly, Simon) as
well as in some hybrid settings (Mondonville and Legrand). This French national genre never made an appearance in French accompanied sonatas. It seems that composers of French accompanied sonatas deliberately avoided using such an overtly French genre in their collections, which is consistent with their decision to drop the term “pièces de clavecin” from their titles, as compared to the title used by Mondonville (Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon). In fact, both Dupuits and Clément tried to Italianize their collections still further by including the subtitle “Concerto” at the beginning of some of their sonatas. Clément also uses Italian terms exclusively, including “Minoetto” [sic] for the pair of minuets in his third sonata.

Dupuits’s tempo markings and performance instructions are all Italian. Italian also predominates in the subtitles in his collection: Gracioso per Lutto, Canone, Fuga da Capella, Aria prima, Aria seconda, Pastorella prima, Pastorella secunda, Minueto prima, Minueto secondo. The few French subtitles only occur early in the collection before Sonata V (Rondement, Second Rondeau, Première Gavotte, Seconde Gavotte, Première Tambourin, Second Tambourin). Ironically, Dupuits’ collection is for vielle and harpsichord. Vielle and musette (a small bagpipe) were the instruments used

196 See Appendix B for a list of accompanied keyboard music in sonata settings.

197 The collection was dedicated to Jean-Baptiste Forqueray (1699-1782) and his wife. Interestingly, the next two collections that Clément published are more French: Pièces de clavecin (1752) and Nouvelles Pièces de clavecin, avec un accompagnement de violon & de basse [œuvre III], fait en concert & gravé séparément, both lost. The later set is the type of accompanied music with ad libitum accompaniment, which is the predominant type of accompanied music during the second half of the eighteenth century.
predominantly for the lighter type of *champêtre* music, very much in vogue with French aristocrats during the first half of the eighteenth century. Dupuits went against the tide and composed his collection by using the Italianate learned styles of canonic and fugal writing and by putting a Concerto at the head of the collection instead of a French overture, to distinguish his collection from the many lighter *musiques champêtres* associated with the vielle.\(^{198}\)

With the exception of Damoreau’s and Simon’s, all of the accompanied movements marked “Ouverture” in French accompanied keyboard music appear at the beginning of collections; both Damoreau and Simon position their French overture in the middle instead. Simon uses “Introduction” at the beginning of Suite no. 4, but refers to this movement as *ouverture* in his *Avertissement*. As discussed earlier, the positioning of the Introduction/Overture appears to have some structural significance in the overall organization of Simon’s collection. This does not appear to be the case for Damoreau: the overture, titled “CONCERT ouverture,”\(^{199}\) is placed as the twelfth piece of the collection in the middle of the 5th key group.

The pieces in Damoreau’s collection seem to have been hastily gathered together and grouped loosely by key. The insertion of an unrelated piece (*La Badine*) in the middle of a group of three different instrumental settings, all based on the same melody

---

\(^{198}\) See Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of this collection.

\(^{199}\) The font used here follows that which appears in the score to avoid confusion with the term “concertouverture” coined by Johann Scheibe to describe a similar type of genre cultivated in Germany.
titled *La Sophie* (no. 1 for harpsichord and violin, no. 2 titled *Quatour* for harpsichord, violin, and viole, no. 3 for solo harpsichord), also points to the haphazard nature of this collection. It is very likely that the composer or the printer gave little thought to organizing the collection with any internal relationship. In fact, the editors of *A Catalogue of French Harpsichord Music 1699-1780* could not resist rearranging the order of the pieces in their detailed listing of the individual movements by putting *La Badine* after the last *La Sophie*. Hence, it would not be fruitful at this point to attempt to make sense of the odd positioning of the “CONCERT ouverture,” whose stylistic significance will be discussed later.

The overtures appearing in French accompanied keyboard collections generally follow the style developed by Lully, with pervasive dotted rhythm, wide melodic leaps, and homophonic texture in the slow section, often marked *Grave*. All the accompanied overtures follow the convention of closing the *Grave* section on the dominant chord. The livelier section that follows generally employs imitative texture. The typical three-part structure of most of Lully’s overtures is retained in the earlier accompanied keyboard collections (Mondonville and Marchand). Those published after the 1750s varied the three-part structure by fusing elements from the “rounded” binary principle of two repeating halves (Duphly), the rondeau form (Legrand), or the concerto (Damoreau and Simon).

---

200 *La Badine* was originally piece no. 3 in the collection. The three pieces based on the melody for *La Sophie* are no. 1, 2, and 4.
Although Damoreau’s “CONCERT ouverture” does not designate tempi for the two sections, the distinctive stylistic contrast between the two sections still retains a strong resemblance to Lully’s overtures. The first section has a pervasive dotted rhythm with a few tirades added to the keyboard part. Its homophonic texture and the ending on the dominant chord points to its French overture origin (see Ex. 3.11). The next section is fugal, although the fugal subject, like most French fugal writing, is not followed through strictly. Damoreau adopts some characteristics of the Italian concerto at the end of this imitative section. He inserts a five-measure, cadenza-like passage for the harpsichord, beginning and ending on an A minor chord (the submediant chord) (see Ex. 3.12, mm.110-16). The beginning of the cadenza is prepared by the sustained high G in the violin part, acting like a dominant pedal. This “pedal” is later switched to high C (the tonic) shortly after the entrance of the keyboard solo passage. At the end of the cadenza, the violin and left hand bass part join the keyboard right hand in unison for one measure before ending on a sustained A minor chord with a fermata. After a brief pause, a three-measure closing all'unisono follows.

Although the cadenza, the all'unisono ending, and even the violin “pedal point” resemble gestures found in Italian concertos, each gesture seems out of sync with the associated harmonic events of a concerto structure. For example, the melody for the final entrance of the fugal subject is buried in a rhythmic process of modified augmentation.

201 The choice of this chord is rather unusual. Most concertos include a cadenza to elaborate a cadence to tonic, intensifying the final resolution of the dominant chord to tonic at the end of the cadenza.
moving toward the cadenza (see Ex. 3.12, mm.105-109). Meanwhile, the violin sneaks in with the high G “pseudo-dominant-pedal” (mm.107-110), then switches to the “tonic pedal” (mm.110-112) while the cadenza is already underway.\footnote{202} As the cadenza begins (m.110), we would expect the harmony supporting the sustained dominant note to be some sort of V chord; instead we find a submediant. Near the end of the keyboard solo, the right hand anticipates the arpeggiated figure before it is joined by the violin and the left hand in unison to end on yet another A minor chord. After the pause (m.116), one would expect a return to the mood of the slow opening section, typical of French overtures. Instead, Damoreau gives his listener a closing coda-like section resembling the end of Italian concerto movements.

The overlapping entrances of each event seem to obscure the distinctiveness of the concerto gestures. Yet Damoreau does communicate clearly to his audience the concerto affinity in his title of the movement “CONCERT ouverture.” That the composer waited until the end of the fugal section to evoke the conventions of the concerto and did so somewhat “sneakily” suggests he intended a French witticism.\footnote{203} In this light, perhaps the odd placement of the concert overture and \textit{La Badine} are not printer’s mistakes but

\footnote{202}{For many Vivaldian concertos, the cadenza is usually supported by a dominant pedal in the bass.}

\footnote{203}{Damoreau’s collection illustrates a tendency to resist ordering and is full of subtle variety and gentle surprises. It seems to fit into a branch of the aesthetics of the \textit{honnête homme} that cherishes the irrational, concealed attractiveness, and individual spontaneity. This aesthetics corresponds to the widely used phrase “\textit{Je ne sais quoi}” as a noun during the eighteenth century. See E. B. O. Borgerhoff, \textit{The freedom of French classicism} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), 266. and Mildred Parker, “Some Speculations on the French Keyboard Suites of the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries,” \textit{International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music} 7, no. 2 (1976): 214.}
Ex. 3.11 Damoreau, *Pieces de clavecin* (Paris, 1754) no. 12: Concert ouverture, Grave section
Ex. 3.12 Damoreau, *Pieces de clavecin* (Paris, 1754) no. 12: Concert ouverture (97-119)
rather the composer’s purposeful intention to position a movement in a place that looks so obviously wrong according to normal conventions simply to play a trick on his audience.

While Damoreau’s Italianate borrowing avoided the return of the slow section typical of many French overtures, Simon’s overture provides that slow section for one measure or so, which closes in a perfect authentic cadence (see Ex. 3.7, m.96). Listeners, however, are immediately surprised by the ensuing fast codetta-like passage. This six-measure codetta-like passage injects a dose of Italianism from the Italian concerto convention into Simon’s French overture, resembling the effect at the end of Damoreau’s overture mentioned above.

The opening slow section of the overtures in French accompanied keyboard music, usually marked *Grave*, is in duple meter. Exceptional tempo markings are found in Legrand (Rondeau) and Damoreau (no tempo marking). Despite such variation, the general serious and majestic mood is still preserved in Legrand and Damoreau’s overtures.

All except one of the French overtures from this repertory use the violin to double the right-hand part of the harpsichord in the opening phrase.\(^{204}\) The extent of the unison device ranges from an entire section (the *Grave* section in Mondonville’s Op. 3 and Duphly) to just the opening measure (Marchand). Legrand’s overture includes unison and

\(^{204}\) Simon’s collection again is different from the other accompanied keyboard collections.
octave writing in all three voices (violin, harpsichord right hand and left hand) in parts of
the Grave section, producing a thin concertante effect, which contrasts with the thick
chordal texture in the left hand on adjacent beats (see Ex. 3.13, mm.1-12). In overtures
that use unison writing between the violin and the right hand, the violin performs the
double duty of reinforcing the sound of the right-hand melody and also, by playing the
same notes, producing a unity of affect, an important feature of Lully’s overtures.

While such a compositional strategy is not surprising, in fact desirable, for a
harpsichord and violin composition, similar use of unison writing for two violins and
basso continuo in Couperin’s “Essai en forme d’Ouverture” from the famous Apotheosis
to Lully (1725) may have served as a possible model for accompanied keyboard
composers. In Ex. 3.14, Couperin opens with a unison between the two violins (one
representing Lully and the French muses, notated in the French violin clef, and another
representing Corelli and the Italian muses, notated in treble clef). The unison writing lasts
for the entire phrase (mm.1-6). The brief pseudo-imitative texture at the beginning of
phrase 2 gives way to a unison melody at m. 8 and continues until the end of the phrase.
It is only in the final phrase that the two violins move in thirds or sixths.

Couperin’s Apotheosis to Lully—an important exemplar of a French composer’s
notion of style mixture—may have helped establish a trope for the use of unison writing
at the beginning of a French overture in ensemble music. We certainly see this trope
applied in all but one of the overtures found in French accompanied keyboard music.
Ex. 3.14 Couperin, *Apothéose de Lully* (Paris, 1725) Ouverture (mm. 1-16)

**Essai**

**Violin 1 & 2 in** en forme d'ouverture

* Lulli et les Muses Françaises
* Corelli et les Muses Italiennes

**Phase 1**

**Phase 2**

**Phase 3**

deux à modéré
Duphly’s *Troisième livre de pièces de clavecin* (1756) is the only set of accompanied music whose title gives no clue to the presence of a violin. It consists of a mixture of pieces for solo harpsichord and for harpsichord and violin. The influence of Mondonville’s Op. 3 can be felt here in the grouping of pieces with violin accompaniment. They are organized into two groups of three movements each. Like Mondonville’s set, Duphly’s collection opens with a French overture in S-F-S sequence followed by two more movements in S-F tempo. The tempo sequence in the second group of accompanied pieces follows the F-S-F sequence, as do the rest of the sonatas in Mondonville’s Op. 3. As mentioned before, the *Grave* section of Duphly’s overture is the only one from the accompanied keyboard collections that follows Mondonville’s mold by having the violin double the right-hand harpsichord part throughout the entire section. Even though it is not uncommon to see the use of French overture in other collections for solo harpsichord, it should be noted that the use of *Ouverture* at the beginning of the collection is a departure from Duphly’s three other books of *pièces de clavecin* (all for solo harpsichord). Such a departure suggests a close connection between Mondonville’s Op. 3 and Duphly’s collection for harpsichord with violin.

205 Most notably Christophe Moyreau’s four collections of *Pièces de clavecin*, all published in 1753. He uses *ouverture* to precede each suite, sonata, and concerto.
French Overtures Featuring Cadenza-Like Passages

A number of overtures in French accompanied keyboard music feature some brief soloistic display for either the violin or the harpsichord. This feature highlights the influence of the Italian concerto. It is also reminiscent of a type of overture that Scheibe called *concertouverture*, a genre that had been cultivated in Germany since the early 1700s:

Considering the solo instruments, one should easily notice that in those pieces where they actually occur, one can already see a free, playful and jocular singing. It is not the strength of the above which must be prominent, but rather the varied entrance, the lively and natural breaking up of the principal chords of the harmony, and the lively and naturally flowing modulations of the solo parts; these are the things that give the *concertouverture* their true beauty and their characteristic fire. Of course one must at the same time take into account the nature of the instruments: they, however, also need not proceed so strictly, nor so lengthily or so strongly as they do within the regular concerto; rather one has to be moderate so that one does not transgress the essential composition and nature of the *ouverture*, and so that one does not lapse from a French style [Schreibart] into an Italian style [Schreibart], and consequently does not make the style of such a movement confused and disorderly.\(^{206}\)

Telemann composed a few *concertouverturen* in chamber music settings that French composers may have known. The sixth Quatuor in *Nouveaux Quatuors en Six Suites*, published in Paris in 1738, opens with a Prelude, which is in fact a French overture. The *Grave* section features a brief solo violin passage on a B minor chord (the minor dominant chord) near the end of the section (see Ex. 3.15, mm.9-10) and this

Ex. 3.15 Telemann, *Nouveaux Quatuors* (Paris, 1738) Suite no. 6/1 (Prelude) (mm. 5 - 12)  
(Source: TWV 43:e4, p. 51)
section is repeated after the imitative fast section.²⁰⁷ This kind of concerto borrowing appears in the overtures of Marchand and Simon. Like Telemann’s example, both examples occur on a sustained dominant chord (see Ex. 3.16, mm.1-35). In Marchand’s case, the dominant is the dominant of the new key of E minor (minor dominant of the home key A minor). Interestingly, the alternate pairing of the violin and right-hand group and the right-hand and left-hand group resembles the concertante principle of the *Concerto grosso*. Near the end of the *Grave* section, Marchand introduces a refreshing imitative bass line before cadencing on the dominant chord.²⁰⁸ As if to balance the brief but distinctive imitative ending of the first *Grave* section, Marchand opens the return of the *Grave* section at the end of the movement with similarly brief pseudo-imitative writing between the right hand and the left hand (see Ex. 3.16, mm. 53-67).

Insertion of solo passages did not occur only in the *Grave* section of the French overture. The composers of French accompanied music also added cadenza-like passages in the fast imitative sections. In Ex. 3.17 (mm. 36-40), Mondonville inserts a brilliant violinistic passage on a dominant pedal after the final entrance of the fugal subject. The sixteenth-note arpeggio in the right hand adds more brilliance to this passage. Damoreau’s collection, discussed earlier, contained another example of a cadenza

²⁰⁷ For study on Telemann’s concert overture in orchestral setting, see Trinkle, *Telemann’s Concertouverturen*, 26-7.

²⁰⁸ Some rare examples of imitative writing in the *Grave* section of an overture are Lully’s *Xerses*, and *Proserpine* (see ibid., 250, fn18.) and Rameau’s Castor et Pollux (1737) (see Frederick Niecks, “Historical Sketch of the Overture,” *Sammelbande der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 7, no. 3 (1906): 386-390.)
Ex. 3.16 Marchand, Op. 1 (Paris, 1747) Suite no.1/I (mm. 1 - 35; 53 - 67)
Ex. 3.17 Mondonville, Op. 3 (Paris, ca. 1738) Sonata no. 1/I (mm. 36 - 40)
insertion in the imitative section of a French overture. The kind of concerto convention that alternates between tutti and solo, following the ritornello principle, is not used in the overtures found in the French accompanied keyboard music.\textsuperscript{209} That type of borrowing is used exclusively in movements titled Concerto.

Concertos in Accompanied Keyboard Music Collections

Given the immense popularity of Vivaldi’s concertos, which swept France in the 1720s, it is not surprising that composers of French accompanied keyboard music interested in style mixture incorporated features of the concerto style into their works. From the repertoire composed between the late 1730s and the early 1760s, five accompanied keyboard sonatas or suites use the concerto subtitle. Table 3.10 lists three concertos in sonata settings, one in hybrid setting, and one in \textit{pièces de clavecin} setting.

\textsuperscript{209} Telemann exploits this in the imitative section of his overture in his suite for 2 oboes and strings (\textit{Musique de Table}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} set published in 1733 whose subscribers include Handel, Quantz, and the famous French flutist Blavet).
### Table 3.10 Concertos in French accompanied collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Collection Title</th>
<th>Title on first movement</th>
<th>Date published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, Op. 3, no. 6</td>
<td>SONATA VI Concerto</td>
<td>1737-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits</td>
<td>Sonata</td>
<td>Sonates pour un clavecin et une vièle, Op. 3, no. 1</td>
<td>SONATA I Concerto</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits</td>
<td>Sonata</td>
<td>Sonates pour un clavecin et une vièle, Op. 3, no. 3</td>
<td>SONATA III Concerto</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément</td>
<td>Sonata</td>
<td>Sonates en trio pour un clavecin et un violon, [Op. 1]</td>
<td>SONATA V&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Concerto</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin tous le Genres Avec et sans accompagnement de violon. Op. 1, no. 6</td>
<td>Concerto VI. &lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Suite La La Font</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Three-Movement Overall Structure

All the concertos except Simon’s Op. 1 adopt the three-movement structure in a fast-slow-fast order, following Vivaldi’s mature solo concertos. Simon’s Op. 1 is a collection of six suites in which the designation “concerto” is inserted above the VI.<sup>me</sup> Suite. It consists of 5 movements, the first three scored for harpsichord with violin and bass, and the last two, for solo harpsichord. The big contrast in scoring and length between movements 1-3 and 4-5 leaves no doubt for listeners that the former belong to the Italianate sonata/concerto tradition and the latter allude to the French <i>pièces de clavecin</i> tradition.
Overall Formal Structure in Accompanied Keyboard Concertos

These five concertos exhibit considerable variety in the way they incorporate the concerto style. The ritornello form popularized by Vivaldi in his solo concertos is an obvious option. Several composers draw upon this model, modified to fit their purpose. For their opening fast movements, all but one use some kind of ritornello procedure. Some refer to the instrumental concerto ritornello form and others take inspiration directly from the da capo aria structure, which includes a recurring instrumental ritornello.

The structure of the second movements varies widely, even compared to Vivaldi. We find examples of a fugal ritornello structure (Mondonville), a French rondeau form in an aria (Dupuits, sonata 1), a French rondeau structure in a pair of gavottes with an overall tripartite da capo form (Dupuits, sonata 3), a pair of arias (Clément)—one in a rounded binary form, and the other in binary form—and a pair of gavottes similar to those in Leclair’s violin sonatas and concerto (Simon). It should be noted that the use of slow movements in rondeau form is a French trait. Vivaldi does not use it, but such French composers as Leclair (who composed using Vivaldi’s prototype) do.

The third movements exhibit just as wide a variety in formal procedures as the second movements. We see another use of ritornello form in Mondonville’s example, a da capo aria form (Dupuits, sonata 1), a binary form for a fanfare (Dupuits, sonata 3), a rondeau (Clément), and a large, rounded binary form (Simon). The choices of a fanfare (Dupuits) and a rondeau structure (Clément) for a third movement are quite unusual for a
concerto, illustrating yet another stylistic juxtaposition of French and Italian national characteristics.

Internal Formal Procedures in Accompanied Keyboard Concertos

One of the hallmarks of Vivaldi’s solo concertos is the use of ritornello form, with clearly delineated, block-like alternation between solo and tutti. Several French concerto composers, such as Leclair, Naudot, and Gaviniés, adopt this structural characteristic between the late 1730 and the mid-1750s. Clearly, the ritornello form had been accepted as a concerto identifier for French composers by the late 1730s, and this structure is sometimes used by composers of French accompanied keyboard concertos. The way the ritornello principle is incorporated into sonata movements reveals considerable variety, depending on how composers blend sonata and concerto features into their movements. Movements organized by the ritornello principle occur most frequently in the first movement (Mondonville, Clément, Simon). Mondonville adopts the ritornello form for his second and third movements as well, while Dupuits uses the ritornello structure drawn from the da capo aria tradition in the first and third movements of his sonata 1.

Binary form was a popular choice for third movements (Dupuits’ Sonata no. 3, Simon). The French predilection for the rondeau form used in French pièces is evident in

---

210 For a divergent interpretation of the importance of the ritornello form as a defining characteristic of the late-Baroque concerto, see David Schulenberg, “The Sonate auf Concertenart: A Postmodern Invention?” Bach Perspectives 7 (2008): 30-31.

Mondonville’s Op. 3/6/I (ca.1738)

Among French accompanied keyboard collections, only Mondonville’s employs ritornello structure for all three movements of his Op. 3/6 sonata. The clear, simple phrase structure, the diatonic, distinctive melody, and the unison opening obviously point to the Vivaldian prototype. The three-part structure of the opening ritornello also evokes a structure frequently found in Vivaldi’s opening ritornellos: an initial thematic idea (Vordersatz), followed by spun out phrases in harmonic sequences (Fortspinnung), ending with a cadential gesture (Epilog) (see Ex. 3.18, mm. 1-13). 211

In the first movement, the “soloists” (violin and right-hand part) take turns presenting the solo material in Solo 1 and Solo 2, as a double concerto. Halfway through Solo 2, the head motif of the opening ritornello (first 5 notes of the Vordersatz in Ex. 3.18) begins to appear in the violin accompaniment. The ritornello’s opening phrase becomes even more prominent at the beginning of Solo 3, when the entire phrase is used with its attention catching all’unisono texture. Its appearance here is especially significant, because this is where the listener expects to hear Ritornello 3. Mondonville first denies

Ex. 3.18 Mondonville, Op. 3 (Paris, ca. 1738) Sonata no.6/I (mm. 1-13)
fulfillment of this expectation by supplying the solo rubric above the violin part. By making the section tonally ambiguous, he also casts doubt on the ritornello status of the head motif, which is supposed to confirm the arrival of the new key. The head motif begins in F# and ends on B (mm.49-50). Then it begins again in E and ends on A, the home key (mm.51-52). The progression from Solo 2 straight to Solo 3, without the stabilizing effect of an intervening ritornello section, obscures the architectural clarity of the Vivaldian prototype. The appearance of the ritornello material at the beginning of the Solo 3 section further blurs the distinction between solo and tutti in a medium where the two soloists also perform the double duty as ripienists.

Near the end of S3, the violin plays a melody recognizable as a variant of the ritornello’s *Fortspinnung* phrase, while the keyboard plays a variant of the accompaniment material in S1 (see Ex. 3.19, mm. 58-59). An exchange of material between the violin and the harpsichord follows in mm. 60-61, by which Mondonville refers back to the voice-exchange technique found in many Baroque trio sonatas. In sum, the generic status of the concerto style is clear in this movement up to Solo 2, when we see a deliberate subversion of the concerto style by first omitting R3, and then by introducing the opening ritornello material in the accompaniment, which functions
Ex. 3.19 Mondonville, Op. 3 (Paris, ca. 1738) Sonata no.6/I (mm. 58 - 61)
differently from the opening measures. The appearance of voice exchange between the violin and harpsichord in mm. 58-61, on the other hand, recalls the sonata style.212

Mondonville, Op. 3/1/III (ca. 1738)

Mondonville uses the title *Giga* for all the third movements in his Op. 3 collection. This usage could refer to both sonata and concerto practice, for many eighteenth-century sonatas, including Corelli’s, end with a giga.213 Even though Vivaldi does not provide dance labels for the final movements of his concertos, some of them do refer to dance rhythm, such as Op. 7/3 (an Italian giga) and Op. 8/1, “Spring” (a French gigue).214 More importantly, dance rhythm appears frequently in eighteenth-century French concerto finales, as exemplified by Leclair’s Op. 7/6 and Op. 10/1, which bear the title “Giga.”215

212 According to Scheibe, some of the differences between a sonata and a sonata in concerto style (*Sonate auf Concertenart*) are: “The proper essence of [trios] is above all the presence of a regular melody in all parts, especially the upper voices, and a fugal working out. If they are not arranged in concerto style, one may introduce few convoluted and varied passages . . . . Should the trio be concerto-like, one [upper] part can be worked out more fully than the other and thus a number of convoluted, running and varied passages may be heard. In this case the lowest part can be composed less concisely than in another regular sonata.” *Critischer Musikus*, 675-678. Trans. Steven Zohn, “The *Sonate auf Concertenart* and conceptions of genre in the late baroque,” *Eighteenth Century Music* 1, no. 2 (2004); Rousseau also writes about the non-imitative nature of the solo instrument in his *Dictionnaire de musique* (1768): “we call more particularly by the name of concerto, a piece made for some separate instrument, which plays alone at set times with a simple accompaniment, after a beginning by the whole orchestra, and the piece continues always thus alternatively between the same instrument reciting, and the orchestra in chorus.” Trans. Jean Jacques Rousseau and William Waring, *A complete dictionary of music*, 2ed. (Dublin: Printed for L. White, 1779), 77.


215 Ibid., 133.
What sets the giga in Mondonville’s Op. 3/6 apart from the other giga in his Op. 3 collection is its use of ritornello form.

Mondonville’s third movement follows the ritornello procedure of the Vivaldian prototype, with three solo sections linking four ritornellos (see Table 3.11). The reference to concerto is clearly set by the unison and octave passages in all parts (violin, right hand, and left hand) in the Vordersatz phrase (see Ex. 3.20, mm.1-4). But the generic status of concerto is perhaps thrown into doubt in the next phrase (Fortspinnung), when Mondonville introduces a rapid exchange of material between the violin and the right hand, with the right hand reusing the melodic material from the opening phrase (motif k). This kind of motivic alternation very commonly occurs in trio sonatas. The composer brings back the unison and octave passage at the end of the ritornello with a variant of the opening phrase (motif k), which cadences emphatically to close the ritornello section with a perfect authentic cadence.

The separation of R1 and S1 is clarified by the fermata on the tonic chord at the end of R1, followed by rests. Mondonville makes it even clearer by adding “solo” in the harpsichord part in m.13. This turns out to be necessary because the violin is playing the attention-capturing opening ritornello phrase (k), this time as accompaniment to the harpsichord solo.

In sum, the pervasive use of melodic idea k throughout the ritornello section, as well as in the solo sections (as accompaniment), of Mondonville’s third movement keeps his listeners on their toes with regard to the landmarks of the ritornello structure. As is the
Ex. 3.20 Mondonville, Op. 3 (Paris, ca. 1738) Sonata no.6/III (mm. 1-12)
case with the first movement, the big surprise occurs around R3, where the ritornello principle begins to break down. The tonal affirmation function of R3 is unfulfilled when Mondonville chooses instead the modulating part of his ritornello section.\textsuperscript{216}

\textsuperscript{216} Vivaldi’s ritornello procedure usually has four or five ritornellos.
Table 3.11 Mondonville Op. 3/6/III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal structure</th>
<th>Melodic idea</th>
<th>Key/Cadence</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>k, l (cadence)</td>
<td>A: (half cadence)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M, k' (voice exchange)</td>
<td>A: (half cadence)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A: (half cadence)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k&quot;</td>
<td>A: (Perf. auth. cad)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solo 1 harpsichord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k (violin accomp)</td>
<td>A: I - V</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>k, l</td>
<td>E: (half cadence)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M, k'</td>
<td>E: (half cadence)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E: (half cadence)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k&quot;</td>
<td>E: (Perf. auth. cad)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solo 2 Violin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like Solo1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k (right hand accomp)</td>
<td>E: modulatory f#</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>M'</td>
<td>f#: [end of m.46]</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n'</td>
<td>f#:</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solo 3 harpsichord + violin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begins like Solo1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n&quot; (mm.58-60) on A pedal</td>
<td>Sequence in circle of fifth starting on F# chord to A A: (Perf. Auth. Cad)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 – 60 [DaCapo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R4 is an exact repetition of R1, by way of a da capo return to the opening ritornello, at the end of Solo 3. R2 repeats all the materials in R1 in the dominant. R3
stands out as an anomaly in this ritornello structure. Rather than confirming a new key of F# minor, which is prepared by the last chord of S2, R3 begins on a B minor chord (m. 44), which surprises the listener, who expects the ritornello to confirm the new key. Instead Mondonville chooses to start R3 on the tonally unstable part of the opening ritornello (phrase 2).

A confirmation of the F# minor key eventually arrives three measures into R3 (beat 4 of m. 46) (see Table 3.11). Phrase 2 of R3 ends on the dominant like R1. What comes next is another playful surprise. Instead of offering the unison and octave passage, which would confirm the F# minor key like R1, Mondonville plunges right into S3 on an F# major chord (m.49). Even though this section is not labeled ‘solo’ (perhaps intentionally!), the parallel use of the same material from S1 and S2 is clear. That S3 begins with a F# major chord instead of a F# minor chord offers a mild surprise, but falls within the French penchant for modal changes.

Mondonville: Op. 3/1/II (ca.1738)

The second movement of Op. 3/1 also employs ritornello form. Motivic continuity is even tighter in this movement than it is in the outer movements because of the imitative texture deployed between the right hand and the violin in the opening ritornello. The opening ritornello can be divided into three distinct parts. The opening segment begins with a right-hand presentation of the fugal melody, subsequently imitated at the unison by the violin. The next segment offers an extended Fortspinnung, which
moves to different tonal areas through sequential motion. An Epilog begins at m.24 and ends with a distinctive, one-measure all'unisono passage (m. 25).

Solo 1 begins with a lyrical melody in the right hand, accompanied by the fugal melody in the violin. R2 seems to begin in m. 38 with the arrival of a new key (III) and the appearance of the fugal melody, first in the violin and later in the right hand. It should be noted that the order of appearance of the fugal melody in R2 is in reverse to that in R1 (fugue subject in right hand followed by answer in violin). Solo 2 (violin) enters in m. 41 unexpectedly, when R2 is still in progress. This overlapping of solo and tutti sections greatly undermines the clarity of the ritornello structure but, on the other hand, gives the movement a more fugue-like quality. Mondonville restores order at the entrance of R3 at m.54 by having the violin cadence on the first beat of that measure. The material for R1 returns in its entirety at R3.

Dupuits, Op. 3/1/I (1743)

The ritornello form used in Dupuits’s Sonata Op. 3/1/I demonstrates a different influence than the Vivaldi prototype. It has a closer affinity to da capo aria form with instrumental ritornellos. The ritornello structure is embedded within the framework of a binary form (see Table 3.12). R2 concludes with a double bar and a dal segno sign instructing the performers to return to S1. The second half of the binary form, marked Reprise, begins with S3.
Table 3.12 Dupuits: Op.3, Sonata no. 1/I Ritornello structure

| Section | R1 | || S1 | S2 | R2*:: || S3 | S4 | S5 | R3 |
|---------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Key     | I  | I   | I   | V   | V-IV-I | I   | V   | I   |     |     |
| Instrument | T | H   | V   | T   | H   | V   | H   | T   |     |     |

T = Tutti  
H = solo featuring harpsichord  
V = solo featuring vièle  
* = Dal segno sign before a double bar line signifying a return to the dal segno sign at the beginning of S1

Overall there are three iterations of the Ritornello. The first and last are identical, characterized by mostly all’unisono writing, occasionally harmonized at the end of the antecedent phrase (see Ex. 3.21, mm. 3-6). The consequent phrase is entirely all’unisono. R2 is a variant of the opening ritornello theme.

The three ritornellos are linked by five solo sections in which vièle and harpsichord alternate as the featured soloist. In the middle of S4, where the vièle is accompanied by the keyboard basso continuo, Dupuits introduces two brief tutti interjections (see Ex. 3.22, mm. 71-73; mm.82-83) to provide an antiphonal reply to the cadential material of the solo melody played by the vièle. This movement is in the galant style, characterized by short, simple phrasing and frequent repetition of short motifs and cadences. The kind of orchestral response to the solo points more toward the vocal source in operas and cantatas than to instrumental concertos.
Ex. 3.21 Dupuis, Op. 3 (Paris, 1743) Sonata no. 1/I (mm. 1-12)
Ex. 3.22 Dupuits, Op. 3 (Paris, 1743) Sonata no. 1/I (mm. 68 - 87)
Dupuits, Op.3/1/III (1743)

The overall structure of the first and third movements is organized in a similar fashion, using an expanded da capo aria form, in which section A closes in the tonic, followed by a dal segno sign to repeat section A, again from S1 (omitting R1). Section B begins immediately in the dominant and never modulates. A da capo sign signals a return to the opening ritornello (R1) (see Table 3.13).

**Table 3.13 Dupuits: Op.3, Sonata no. 1/III Ritornello structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T = Tutti  
H = solo featuring harpsichord  
V = solo featuring vièle  
* = Dal segno sign before a double bar line signifying a return to the dal segno sign at the beginning of S1  
** = Da capo sign instructing players to return to R1 and end after R2 with a double bar line.

In Ex. 3.23 (mm.1-14), the opening ritornello resembles many Italianate concertos in which an antecedent phrase (*Vordersatz*) containing a brief *all’unisono* passage is followed by a consequent phrase containing a sequence and a short cadential formula.
Ex. 3.23 Dupuis, Op. 3 (Paris, 1743) Sonata no. 1/III (mm. 1-14)
As in the first movement, R2 is placed at the end of section A. R2, which is still in the tonic, contains only a variant of R1’s antecedent phrase, but now in parallel 3rds and octaves instead of the unison and octave passage. Its entrance is still easily detectable from the dynamic contrast with the previous solo section. The antecedent phrase is used again for R3, at the beginning of section B in the dominant key. This sudden, unprepared key change seems less abrupt because of the listener’s familiarity with the ritornello melody. This may explain the awkward placement of two ritornellos back-to-back.

Dupuits provides two solo indicators for the rest of the B section, which is sixty measures long (not counting the initial four-measure ritornello material). While the beginning of these two solo sections (S3 and S4) is clear, it is rather difficult to determine whether there is any interjection of the tutti section in response to the change in texture and accompanying styles of S3 and S4.

Dupuits: Op. 3/3/I: (1743)

The overall structure of this movement resembles a modified da capo aria form. Section A is in C major, but ends in G major. Section B begins in G and very quickly moves back to C major within ten measures. This section, however, ends on the dominant chord of C major, followed by a double bar with a da capo. The fermata over


218 The total length of section B is 41 measures.
the tonic chord in bar 7 indicates that the repetition of the A section should end after the first phrase (m. 7), on a perfect authentic cadence. In contrast to the carefully marked solo sections in the first sonata, this sonata curiously has only one solo rubric, at the beginning of the score, above the harpsichord part. Dupuits’ instruction to the performer in the Avertissement seems to give the harpsichord player the option of playing this movement as a soloist without the vielle. He writes:

Most of the pieces which make up these sonatas can be executed on the vielle without the accompaniment of the harpsichord. . . . These sonatas can be executed as well on the harpsichord alone, however more cautiously. [In] all movements of sustained melody, such as the Allegro of Sonata No.2, . . . it is necessary to play the part of the vielle with the right hand, omitting the part written for this hand which is often only a figural accompaniment, and to play the bass without any change.

I believed it necessary to compose these pieces in this way, because the vielle not being an instrument [which can be] perfectly softened, the principal melody which would be played by the right hand of the harpsichord would be found to be too absorbed. Also entire movements for the harpsichord will be recognized by the word “solo” written at the beginning of the piece in the part for this instrument.219

According to the last sentence of Dupuits’ statement above, this movement could be a “concerto” for solo keyboard. On the other hand, it is strange for Dupuits to suggest the movement (subtitled concerto) be played by the harpsichordist alone, especially when he includes a brief solo part for vielle at mm. 22-23. The “solo” rubric might be a printer’s mistake, but this seems unlikely given the careful placement of the “solo” marking in other movements. One could speculate that the obvious contradiction between the “solo”

marking, meant for a solo harpsichordist, and the concerto subtitle, accompanied by the concerto style of this movement, is a joke that Dupuits played on his performer(s). As we shall see, after the opening *all’unisono* phrase, Dupuits delights in exploring different combinations of textures in concertato style. The phrases are set apart by sharp contrasts: unison, homophony in parallel thirds or sixths, antiphony, solo. This free alternation between different concerting groups recalls Corellian concerti grossi. Ex. 3.24 (mm. 20-23) shows an interesting textural change from a block of three-part texture to a loud *all’unisono* passage, ushering in a lone vièle solo for a brief moment before the three-part texture returns. While Corelli’s concerti grossi may have provided the inspiration for this movement, Dupuits modifies his “concerto grosso” by adding more up-to-date practices drawn from the concertos of Vivaldi. Such conventions as the three-movement structure and the opening *all’unisono* passage, with its energetic opening hammerstrokes and sixteenth-note running figurations, introduce a modern flair into Dupuits’s Sonata 3.

The gavottes and fanfare in the second and third movements are natural French adaptations of the type of Corellian concertos consisting of preludes and dance movements.\(^{220}\) Dupuits again modernizes his suite movements by using the fashionable rondeau form for his pairs of gavottes.

\(^{220}\) Corelli, *Concerti Grossi*, Op. 6: no. 9-12 (Amsterdam, 1714).
Ex. 3.24 Dupuits, Op. 3 (Paris, 1743) Sonata no. 1/I (mm. 20 - 23)

Clément organizes his first movement in a structure resembling ritornello form. He sporadically provides the solo and tutti rubrics as clues to the structure of the movement. Both the distinctive *all’unisono* texture in the upper parts (violin and right hand) of the opening phrase and the melody, which consists of triads and short scales, provide easily recognizable landmarks when they reappear (see Ex. 3.25, mm. 1-8). On the other hand, Clément also deliberately introduces other elements that contradict these clear signifiers of a concerto ritornello form. Textural, harmonic, and melodic elements of his ritornello structure in this movement are out of sync with each other, resulting in a rather bizarre effect.

The ritornello theme does not end with a full cadence in the tonic key for example; an internal ritornello begins in the dominant key, as expected, but ends by returning abruptly to the tonic; and a section marked “Tutti” turns out to be harmonically ambiguous. The tonality is later confirmed as g minor, which turns the brief, two-measure tutti (mm. 87-88) into a tutti interjection, linking a solo section that has just ended in d minor and another solo section that is heading toward g minor. This D major chord for the tutti at m.87 thus represents a modal switch for the former section and a dominant for the subsequent section; a final iteration of the ritornello begins in the supertonic key (g minor) and progresses through the circle of fifths to the dominant (C major) and finally to the tonic (F major). All these strategies playfully stretch the concerto convention.
Ex. 3.25 Clément, *Sonates en Trio* (Paris, 1743) Sonata no. 5/1 (mm. 1 - 8)
established by Tartini and Vivaldi and followed by such French composers as Naudot and Leclair.

The second movement of Clément’s Sonata no. 5 consists of a pair of arias in opposite modes. Clément instructs the performer to return to Aria I after Aria II, creating a tripartite overall structure, which we usually see in French paired dances such as the menuet and musette. The use of binary form for the two arias further links them to the French tradition of dance music. Aria I is a finely wrought piece in rounded binary form, containing many carefully placed slur marks and ornaments to create a restrained and detached sound. At the return to the tonic key in the B section, only a variant of the opening violin melody reappears. This time Clément repositions the slurs in the violin melody in order to create a hemiola effect reminiscent of rhythmic practice in a French courant. The rhythmic subtleties, together with the delicate ornaments, fit the French ideal of refinement and good taste. The angular melodic writing, however, conforms more closely to the expressive, extravagant Italian style. All these characteristics fit the stereotype of a slow movement in a French sonata or concerto except for the brief imitative openings of Aria I and Aria II. Most concerto slow movements entitled Aria usually have homophonic texture with lyrical melodies. Two other sonatas in Clément’s collection of 6 sonatas have Arias as their second movement: Sonata 1 and Sonata 4. Both are in rondeau form, and Sonata 4 has a pair of Arias. None, however, has imitative upper voices.
The third movement of Sonata no. 5 introduces the odd tempo marking *Allegro, poco andante*. This is not a case of a French composer misusing the Italian term because of limited knowledge of the Italian language. Elsewhere in the same collection, Clément uses the term *Allegro, ma non troppo* correctly several times.\(^{221}\) This leaves us to wonder if the tempo designation in Sonata no. 5 is intended as some sort of joke.

The movement’s formal structure follows the French rondeau form, with very elaborate episode sections. The structure of the third movement and its tonal scheme are summarized in Table 3.14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>R4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I - V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I - vi - I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I - IV – ii - I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither the second nor third movement of Clément’s Sonata no. 5 exhibits any concerto characteristics. They do, however, function as a counterbalance to the Italianate first movement, with its many “skewed” concerto features. The incongruous title or tempo marking to the music in the second and third movements further contributes to the burlesque quality of this sonata.

\(^{221}\) Sonata 1/I, Sonata 2/III, and Sonata 6/I.

The first movement of the final suite in Simon’s Op.1 is much longer (137 measures), and more expansive in range than the other suites in the Op. 1 collection. It is written for harpsichord, violin, and bass, which can also be played by a viola. The composer’s conception of a massed orchestral sound is clearly illustrated by the addition of the bass part and the three repeated chords in the opening measure, which require the violin to play in quadruple stops. Although Simon did not clearly mark the various sections “Tutti” and “Solo,” a resemblance to ritornello procedure can be detected as the guiding formal structure to this movement. The overall structure is outlined in Table 3.15:

### Table 3.15: Simon, Op. 1, Suite no. 6/I  Ritornello structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>S2a</th>
<th>S2b</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>R4a</th>
<th>Cadenza</th>
<th>R4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (no. of mm.)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V → vi</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>→ I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V/I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It consists of 4 ritornellos and 3 solos. A solo harpsichord cadenza, elaborating the dominant chord, turns up in the middle of the last ritornello. Solo harpsichord passages also appear in structurally prominent places: 1) the end of S1 (mm. 37-43 for 7 measures); 2) the end of S2a (mm. 69-70 for 1 measure), signaling the end of D major (V) and the beginning of a transition to e minor (vi); 3) the end of S3 (mm.108-109 for one and a half

---

222 The harpsichord part spans 4 1/2 octaves from low g to high e.
measures); 4) the cadenza in the middle of R4 (mm.115-119 for five measures). The opening ritornello is the longest, consisting of six phrases: an introduction, an all’unisono phrase, a pair of contrasting phrases in lighter texture with softer dynamics, a return of the all’unisono phrase, another contrasting phrase in softer dynamics, and a cadential ending. The internal ritornellos are much shorter, drawing upon different parts of the opening ritornello. The final ritornello also derives its material from the opening ritornello and introduces the written-out cadenza for the harpsichord. The solo sections generally differ from the tutti section because of their brilliant keyboard figuration. Long keyboard scalar passages do occur in both the solo and tutti sections, however, and thus blur the solo/tutti distinction.

The second movement consists of a pair of gavottes in rondeau form. While a diversity of styles and structures can be found in Vivaldi’s slow movements, none uses a dance form. Dance movements, especially the gavotte, do occur in French concertos. From the accompanied keyboard concerto repertory, we also see an example of slow gavottes in Dupuits’s Op. 3/3/II.

Simon’s 3rd movement is a large, rounded binary form with repeat signs. In many respects, this movement challenges the listener in terms of its generic type. In the beginning, it sounds very much like a trio sonata, where the two solo instruments (violin and keyboard) take turns as soloist. The solo violin is accompanied by keyboard continuo

---

but without a bass instrument. When the keyboard enters in mm.18-23, it plays without any accompaniment until the very end, when the violin enters to punctuate the end of the phrase. What follows appears to be an exercise in textural diversity between the solo violin, solo keyboard, and various combinations of the two, plus the additional bass part to produce additional variety in ensemble sonority.

In Ex. 3.26, the recurring materials of the opening solo violin (material a, mm.1-2) and the closing material (material g, mm. 59-62) that ends in the tonic key can be used as the guide posts to the “ritornello” structure when they reappear within the appropriate harmonic plateau. The “ritornello” is first presented by the violin and then by the keyboard (material a). This material comes back again at the arrival of the dominant key (see Ex. 3.27, m. 86). This time the violin and keyboard together refashion the motives taken from material a into a tutti statement. The closing material g also returns in the dominant key in mm. 92-99. It now prepares for the arrival of the sustained dominant chord in D major in mm. 100-101, followed by a cadenza-like, wide-ranging keyboard passage. After the double bar, the solo violin material marked *forte* returns in the dominant. After going through several key areas, the closing material g reappears to confirm the key of B minor (iii), before ushering in the return of the opening A section of the binary form. Simon added an extended coda section to conclude the movement and the concerto by calling forth an “orchestral” *Forte all’unisono* passage for six measures. This passage is framed by two iterations of the opening material a in the keyboard for
Ex. 3.26 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 6/III (mm. 1 - 2; 59 - 64)
Ex. 3.27 Simon, Op. 1 (Paris, 1761) Suite no. 6/III (mm. 86 - 101)
contrast. The coda ends with another *all’unisono* passage, followed by three thick hammerstrokes to complement the opening hammerstrokes of the first movement.

The solo opening of Simon’s third movement may be unusual, but there is precedent in Vivaldi’s concerto for two violins (movements 1 and 3 of Op. 3/11 in D minor) and in Leclair’s violin concerto (movement 3 of Op.7/2). When Simon assigns the dominant key to both ritornello 2 and ritornello 3 (beginning of section B) within the rounded binary structure, he may be responding to the classical tradition of giving structural weight to the dominant. This choice sets his concerto apart from the other accompanied concertos that also embed ritornello procedure within a binary form, such as those of Dupuits.

Simon’s deployment of the scalar unison passage at the end of the coda section in the third movement is used much more dramatically than the Vivaldi prototype to complement, if not compete with, the drama created by the cadenza-like passage at the end of the A section.

An examination of these five accompanied keyboard concertos reveals a variety of references to different kinds of concerto models. These French composers use different strategies to amalgamate the styles and structures of the concerto into their sonatas or suites. We witness several instances where composers toy with established concerto conventions to thwart listener’s expectations. Mondonville introduces surprises against

the general ritornello principles popularized by Vivaldi. Dupuits gives us two kinds of concertos in his Op. 3 collection: the first is more Italianate, based on the Vivaldian ritornello principle; the second is a French-styled concerto grosso in the Corellian vein, incorporating gavottes and a fanfare as the second and third movements. This fits within Dupuits’ overall intention to present a variety of genres and styles in his collection, which also includes a fuga and canone. Clément’s ironic toying with concerto convention offers valuable insight into a French perception of the Italian concerto. Simon’s concerto, composed about fifteen to twenty years after the first four accompanied keyboard concertos in this repertory, shows a different response to the musical environment of the mid to late 1750s, where tutti has acquired a more symphonic sound as compared to earlier concertos.

Conclusion

The various applications of the concept of *goûts réunis* as exemplified in French accompanied keyboard music provided the impetus for Mondonville’s creation of a new genre. This subsequently allowed for an elastic expansion of the genre to lean toward either the Italian sonata/concerto tradition or the French *pièces de clavecin* tradition. Upon examination of these accompanied collections, one is struck by the significant use of the printed score as a vehicle for the communication of the two national styles. There are several examples where the notion of *goûts réunis* governs the structure of the entire
collection, even though all the pieces in the collections were not expected to be performed together.\textsuperscript{225}

\textsuperscript{225} For a discussion of the internal relations of pieces in a collection, see Hans Theodore David, “The Structure of Musical Collections up to 1750,” \textit{Bulletin of the American Musicological Society}, no. 3 (1939): 2-5. For argument against looking for internal organicity in 17\textsuperscript{th} century and early 18\textsuperscript{th} century French collections, see Parker, \textit{Some Speculations on the French Keyboard Suites of the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries}, 203-217.
Chapter 4

Explaining Instrumental Choices in French Accompanied Keyboard Music

Introduction

Variety in instrumental scoring is one of the attractive characteristics of French accompanied keyboard music composed before 1760. Besides the more common combination of violin and harpsichord (e.g. Mondonville’s Op. 3) and the violin and harpsichord plus viol or cello (Rameau’s Pièces en concerts), we discover other less usual combinations such as voice, violin, and harpsichord (Mondonville’s Op. 5), vielle and harpsichord (Dupuit’s sonatas), oboe and harpsichord (Marchand), and cello and harpsichord (Marchand). In Marchand’s collection, we even encounter an interesting case of one instrument (violin) imitating another (vielle) in a movement about the carillon. 226

The wealth of instrumental combinations in this new kind of ensemble music reflects the genre’s experimental character. Why a composer chose one instrumental scoring over another is an interesting and complicated question closely tied to the social and cultural associations of the instruments.

Of the 16 collections of accompanied keyboard music examined in this study, half employ a single instrumental combination throughout (see Appendix E). Most of the time, the choice of instrument largely depends on the composer’s own proficiency on the

226 This eight-measure passage, marked ‘Vielle’, is in Suite no. 1 (mm. 125-132).
chosen instrument(s). In the case of Mondonville and Guillemain, renowned violin virtuosi, it was only natural for them to compose for violin and harpsichord. Similarly, Dupuits probably chose the unique combination of vielle and harpsichord in his Op. 3 sonatas because he taught both instruments.

On the other hand, in another eight collections composers pick and choose among different instruments for different movements in their collection, revealing different intentions in each case. In Simon’s harpsichord pieces with various accompanying instruments, for example, some pieces are written for harpsichord alone, while others are accompanied by violin, or by violin, bass and an optional viola. The descriptive titles for many of these pieces offer clues to the instruments chosen for the music. In the sixth suite, titled “concerto,” Simon calls for violin, harpsichord, bass and an optional viola to double the bass. This instrumentation is obviously intended to expand the sound to imitate a large orchestral ensemble.

This chapter focuses on two collections that employ unusual instrumental scorings: Marchand’s Op. 1 collection (1747) exploits the varied combination of harpsichord with oboe, with violin, with cello and bass, and also for harpsichord alone whereas Dupuits’ collection scores for harpsichord and vielle throughout, emphasizing them as equal partners. The purpose of this chapter is twofold: 1) to investigate the intricate manifestations of social and symbolic values in musical instruments and how these values

\[ \textit{Simon, Pièces de Clavecin Dans tous le Genres Avec et sans Accompagnement de Violon, Oeuvre III (Paris: Leclair), 1761.} \]
affect composer’s decisions regarding instrumentation; and 2) to illustrate that certain instrumental deployments in accompanied keyboard collections can contribute to the notion of style mixture—an important feature of this repertory.

Marchand’s *Pièces de Clavecin avec Accompagnement de Violon, Hautbois, Violoncelle ou Viole. Ouvr I* (1747)

Luc Marchand’s *Pièces de clavecin avec accompagnement de violon, hautbois, violoncelle ou viole, Divisées en six Suittes dont les deux dernières sont pour le Clavecin seul*, Op. 1 (1747) offers the most varied instrumentation in the accompanied repertory: almost every one of the six suites employs a different instrumental combination. Marchand’s *Avertissement* clearly reveals that variety was on his mind: “My intention in composing these pieces was to make them accessible to everyone, if at all possible, contrasting them in taste and varying accompaniments.” In the following sections, I hope to show that Marchand not only provided different instrumental combinations for the sake of variety, but his interesting instrumental choices, combined with the organization of his pieces with programmatic titles, and the mixture of Italian and French style features, also reveal the composer’s sensitivity to complex historical and cultural changes of his time.

228 (Simon-) Luc Marchand, *Pièces de clavecin avec accompagnement de Violon, Hautbois, Violoncelle ou Viole*, Oeuvre 1 (Paris, Boivin), 1747.

The previous chapter has illustrated the importance of the overall organization of French accompanied keyboard collections to the concept of style mixture. Marchand shows similar concerns in his choice of instrumental combinations. He combines his instrumental choices with specific formal structures to project the set’s affinity with both the Italian sonata/concerto and the French pièces de clavecin traditions (see Table 4.1).

**Table 4.1 Instrumental combination in Marchand’s Op. 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suite I</td>
<td>Harpsichord + violin (3 mvt: accompanied sonata format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite II</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Oboe (suite format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite III</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Cello (suite format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite IV</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Cello (suite format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite V</td>
<td>Harpsichord (3 mvt: accompanied sonata format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite VI/ mvt 1-4</td>
<td>Harpsichord (suite format )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite VI/ mvt 5</td>
<td>Harpsichord + cello + violin (thm + variations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suite no. 1 follows the accompanied sonata tradition à la Mondonville’s Op. 3 in terms of its three-movement structure and its instrumentation of harpsichord and violin. Suites no. 2, 3, and 4 employ the loose overall organization of the pièces de clavecin tradition with undefined numbers of movements loosely grouped together in keys that
share the same tonic. The presence of the oboe (suite no. 2) and cello (suite nos. 3 and 4) put them into the accompanied keyboard music category instead of the solo *pièces de clavécin* type. For suite no. 5, Marchand turns to solo *pièces de clavécin* instrumentation by specifying solo harpsichord; at the same time, however, he maintains a tie with the accompanied keyboard tradition by using the three-movement scheme, following the Italian concerto structure. In suite no. 6, Marchand initially reverts to the solo harpsichord choice of the *pièces de clavécin* tradition, avoiding the three-movement structure in favor of a suite of character pieces. For its last movement (movement 5), however, Marchand adds cello and violin to the mix and effectively reconnects to the accompanied keyboard music repertory at the very end of the collection. The introduction of these additional instruments in the last movement resembles the instrumental choice of Rameau’s *Pièces de clavécin en concerts* for harpsichord, violin, and viol/cello. The framing outer suites of Marchand’s accompanied set therefore refer to two of the early prototypes of French accompanied keyboard music—one in sonata setting (Marchand’s Suite no. 1 recalls Mondonville’s Op. 3)230 and the other in the *pièces de clavécin* tradition (Marchand’s Suite no. 6 recalls Rameau’s *Concerts*).

In sum, Marchand demonstrates his ingenuity by mixing and matching different features of the accompanied keyboard music, Italian sonata/concerto, and French *pièces de clavécin* to create a refreshing variety of hybrid suites in Op. 1. Following the French

---

230 Both collections begin with a French overture for harpsichord and violin.
penchant for descriptive music, most of the movements in Marchand’s Op. 1 contain programmatic titles. We will examine the relationship of the descriptive titles and the choice of accompanying instruments in the following section.

Suite no. 1

Suite no. 1 shows a strong affinity to Mondonville’s model of accompanied keyboard music—Op. 3 (ca. 1738). Both Marchand and Mondonville begin with a French overture and conclude with two more movements. It should be noted that Marchand was the first to adopt Mondonville’s model, after about a nine-year gap, by opening his accompanied collection with a French overture for harpsichord and violin. Subsequent accompanied collections by Damoreau (1754), Legrand (1755), Duphly (1756), and Simon (1761) also open with a French overture.

In movement 3, “Carillon Du Parnasse,” Marchand uses violin and harpsichord to allude to the sound of the carillon. The composer shows his sensitivity to instrumental colors by imitating the echo effect of a fading bell. This section (marked “Echo”) is played by the violin and the harpsichord on the upper, softer manual. Interestingly, the violin is also required to imitate the sound of a vielle in the middle of this movement (mm.125-133). The built-in drone of the vielle, played on the violin’s C and G strings, was probably the sound effect that Marchand attempted to associate with the static, repeated bass notes of carillon music. Both instruments evoke imagery of the outdoors and the vielle complements the pastoral association of the carillon, which Couperin had
also exemplified in his *Le Carillon de Cithère*.\(^{231}\) It is also possible that the unusual
evocation of the vielle in the third movement is intended to pay homage to the only
collection in the accompanied keyboard repertory to use the vielle—Dupuits’s *Sonates
pour un Clavecin et une Vièle* (1741). This practice of referring to important collections
in the history of accompanied keyboard music will become clear when we discuss
additional references to Mondonville and Rameau in Suite no. 6. One should point out
that the collections by Mondonville, Rameau, and Dupuits (all published between ca1738
to 1741) are the earliest prototypes for French accompanied keyboard music.

**Suite no. 2**

Suite no. 2, in which the composer specifies oboe or violin, incorporates subtitles
for each movement to depict various events from a hunting trip. Although Marchand’s
*avertissement* claims that violin can be used in this movement, the oboe is clearly his first
choice: “I suggest oboe to accompany Suite Number 2, because this country style
instrument suits the character of a hunt, or [one may use] a violin, if one wants.”\(^{232}\) What
makes an oboe suitable in this case is its loud sonority, which can produce effects similar
to the fanfare calls of the trumpet or the horn. According to Roger Cotte:

---

\(^{231}\) François Couperin, *Pièces de Clavecin ... Troisième livre* (Paris: , 1722), 14th ordre, no. 6.

\(^{232}\) Trans. by Patterson, *French accompanied keyboard music from Mondonville's Opus III to
Mondonville's Opus V: The birth of a genre. A lecture recital, together with three recitals of selected works
of J. S. Bach, F. Couperin, G. Frescobaldi, W. A. Mozart, C. Balbastre, D. Scarlatti, J. P. Rameau and
others*, 48.
The association of elements of nature conjures up imagery of the outdoors and the rustic setting of the hunt. The oboe in Marchand’s Suite no. 2 refers to its symbolic association with nature as well as its parallel association with the horn and the trumpet, actually used in the hunt.

Suite no. 3

The third suite, titled La Fête Champêtre, is composed for harpsichord with cello or viol accompaniment. This musical fête champêtre finds its model in the fashionable fête champêtre paintings of the seventeenth century—represented by Flemish artists such as David Teniers the Younger and Theodoor van Thulden—and of the eighteenth century—represented by Watteau. The seventeenth-century pastoral paintings of the Flemish painters remained very popular in eighteenth-century France, as attested to by the numerous French engravings of them. Geoffrey De Bellaigue observes that “so popular were the paintings of David Teniers the Younger that his name came to be used

233 Roger Cotte, Musique et symbolisme: résonances cosmiques des œuvres et des instruments in Collection Horizons ésotériques (St-Jean-de-Braye, France: Dangles, 1988), 209.

in the manufactory to describe all peasant scenes, irrespective of whether they derived from his paintings or not.”

Marchand’s “rustic” Suite no. 3 is divided into two parts. The first consists of a series of movements that depict peasant scenes (*Marche des Villageois, Sauteuse, La Bergerie, L’Innocente Villageoise, L’Adieu DES* [sic] *Villageois*) and dance movements associated with the outdoors (Pastourelles, Musettes, Tambourines) (see Table 4.2).

**Table 4.2 Movement titles in Marchand’s Suite no. 3**

- Marche des Villageois
- Pastourelle
- Sauteuse. Les Croches egalles
- La Bergerie
- Premier Menuet
- 2e Menuet
- Premiere Musette
- Deuxieme Musette
- 1er Tambourin
- 2e Tambourin
- L’Innocente Villageoise
- L’Adieu DES Villageois [Fin de la Féte]
- Premiere Badine
- 2e Badine
- Le Petit Rien

At the end of *L’Adieu DES Villageois*, Marchand adds the marking “Fin de la Féte” to signal the conclusion of the peasant festivities, though the suite continues. A pair

---

235 Ibid., 752.
of Badines, and a character piece (Le Petit Rien) that conclude Suite no. 3 have nothing in common with the previous peasant scenes. They reflect instead the idle, frivolous lifestyle of the French rococo upper classes, a feature that is a hallmark of the eighteenth-century fête champêtre paintings as exemplified in Watteau.\(^{236}\) A badine is a movement of playful character found in French suites and Le Petit Rien refers to the frivolous games played by aristocrats. Trevaux, an eighteenth-century dictionary, defines this term as: “Small talk, also signifying gallantry, playfulness, an agreeable way of saying things. ‘Petits-riens’ which amuse lovers.”\(^{237}\) By appending the three “non-peasant” movements at the end of the country festivities, Marchand creates a scene-within-a-scene effect, recalling a painterly convention commonly used in the earlier seventeenth-century Flemish fête champêtre paintings. Fig. 4.1 depicts a country wedding scene by Theodoor van Thulden where all kinds of merriments are in progress. In the left foreground, a lavishly dressed noble couple stands at the side watching the village fair at a distance. Their contrasting dress and posture heightens their differences and establishes a class distinction between the aristocrats and the country folk. We see a similar kind of heightened difference in Marchand’s suite where the three final movements seem to

\(^{236}\) Marchand uses a similar arrangement at the end of Suite no. 2 (also about outdoors—hunting), appending a theme and variation on a vaudeville melody “Le Petit droits” after the “Fin de la Chasse.”

Fig. 4.1 Theodoor van Thulden, *Wedding Feast*
(Source: Brussels: Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Cat. no. 465 (Copyright KIK-IRPA, Brussels))
represent the metaphorically well-dressed nobility standing on the edge, as if observing the earlier country festivities.

Why did Marchand choose an instrument typical for indoor concerts instead of instruments such as the musette or vielle, which have obvious pastoral association? Marchand’s choice is indeed rather unusual for his outdoor theme. In the Avertissement, Marchand explains his choice for this suite: “For the 3rd and 4th suite [sic] I have conceived that the tender and mellow sound of the celebrated violoncellos of the present day, or the flattering melody of the viol, would be a novelty in combination with the clavecin.”

While the tender and mellow sound of the cello may conform to rustic placidity, the instrument itself does not, for the cello was not generally used in the fête champêtre genre. Watteau, the most famous French painter of this genre during the first half of the eighteenth century, never places it outdoors in his fête champêtre paintings. The cello or viol, however, makes a rare appearance as part of a village scene at least once in a painting titled Marriage Feast by David Teniers the Younger (1610-90) (see Fig. 4.2).

While Marchand’s fête champêtre may resonate with similar depictions in visual art, his use of the cello/viol calls to mind a movement, titled pastorale, in Nicolas Chedeville’s Il Pastor Fido, a sonata for musette, vielle, flute, oboe, violin with basso

---

238 J’ay imagine pour la 3.ᵉ et 4.ᵉ Suitte [sic] que le tender et mœleuse son des celebrea Violoncelles d’aujourd’huy ou la falteuse melodie de la Viole feroient nouvautés en les associant au Clavecin.
continuo. Originally attributed to Antonio Vivaldi, the work’s authenticity has been convincingly called into question by Philippe Lescat. An original movement titled *Pastorale* in the fourth sonata from the collection contains a beautifully written obbligato cello part. It is quite likely that Marchand knew *Il Pastor Fido* because his cousin, Jean-Noël Marchand, is assumed to be the Marchand who took out the privilege for *Il pastor fido*, and Chedeville was a distant relative of both Marchands and a colleague of Luc at the Academie Royale de Musique. This rare pastoral association of the cello/viol might have given Marchand the musical inspiration to combine harpsichord with cello/viol in his own *fête champêtre* suite.

**Suite no. 6**

The instrumental deployment for Suite no. 6 is the most complex of the set. The first four movements are for harpsichord alone. The fifth and final movement is a theme and variations (*Les Folies Françoises*) that features harpsichord alone in variations 1, 3, and 6; harpsichord and cello in the theme, and in variations 2, 4, and 5; and harpsichord, 239 Nicolas Chédeville, *Il pastor fido : sonates, pour la musette, viole, flûte, hautbois. violon, avec la basse continuë : opera XIIIa* (Paris: Boivin, 1737), 39.


242 Ibid., 170-71.
violin, and cello in the final, flashy variation subtitled *Le Spectacle des Main* (variation 7).²⁴³

Movement 1: *Le Labirinthe Harmonique*

Marchand’s labyrinth incorporates two possible layers of representation: 1) a harmonic labyrinth, which denotes a type of music that explores tonal wandering into unusual keys; 2) a programmatic representation of the well-known Cretan myth of the Minotaur, a man-bull creature who resided at the center of a labyrinth.

In the early eighteenth century when equal temperament was not yet widely adopted, composers generally avoided wandering into distant keys with too many sharps or flats because the keys would sound wildly out of tune. This tuning phenomenon is especially notable for instruments with fixed tuning such as the harpsichord. The harmonic labyrinth challenges composers’ ingenuity to solve the inherent tuning problem. In France, Marin Marais’s famous *Le Labyrinthe* from the fourth book of *Pièces de Viole* (1717), which Titon du Tillet hailed in 1732 as one of the two pieces among Marais’s

²⁴³ The cover page of the first published edition says that suites no. 5 and 6 are for harpsichord alone and yet *Les Folies Françaises*, which concludes suite no. 6, is not just for harpsichord. Even though the composer does say in the *Avertissement* that *Les Folies Françaises* can also be played by harpsichord alone with some adjustments (On peut aussi joüer cette piéce avec le Clavecin seul en observant de transposer la partie du Violoncelle une octave plus haut seulement dans le sujet, dans la 2. 4. et 5. Variation), the effect of timbral contrast between the long sustained notes of the violin and cello, playing the Folie theme, and the brilliant arpeggio passages across the range of the harpsichord keyboard would be sorely missed if the performance omits the strings in the last variation (*Le Spectacle des Main*).
works that “the Masters of Art consider very highly,” offered an important prototype for Marchand. Marais’ Labyrinth displays a daring tonal roaming to unusual keys traversing the entire cycle of the circle of fifths. Marchand’s harmonic labyrinth explores keys within one third the cycle of the circle of fifths and only ventures out as far afield as the key of E major. While Marchand’s tonal journey does not venture into the dangers of such distant keys as Bb minor or F# major, he did modulate to more keys than usual to imitate the twists and turns of the path in a labyrinth. Marchand also adopts the multi-sectional scheme with different tempi and meters featured in Marais’s labyrinth. But in its clear, three-part structure, Marchand’s harmonic labyrinth also appears to conform to the Cretan myth of Theseus and the Minotaur.

According to the legend, King Aegeus was forced to sacrifice seven youths and seven maidens every year by sending them into the labyrinth where the Minotaur awaited them. One year, Theseus volunteered to be one of the sacrificial victims in order to kill the Minotaur. Ariadne gave Theseus a ball of twine to mark his path through the maze. Theseus ventured into the heart of the labyrinth, killed the Minotaur, and returned safely to his beloved by retracing the trail of twine.

---


245 An earlier Labyrinth for harpsichord by Fevrier titled *Le Labyrinthe* (in Suite no. 2 of *Pièces de clavecin*, 1734) also explores only half the cycle of the circle of fifths. But it did briefly go to one of the most distantly related keys of F# major (six sharps).
Marchand may have matched the movement’s A B A’ structure to the narrative structure of the Minotaur myth. Section A (in triple meter marked *moderement*) represents Theseus’s entrance into the labyrinth; section B (in duple meter marked *Andante*) depicts Theseus’s confrontation with the Minotaur and the slaying of the monster at the center of the labyrinth; and section A’ (an abbreviated version of section A in triple meter marked *Gay*) portrays Theseus’s joyful exit from the maze.

In the opening section, Marchand employs extensive tonal wandering that moves forward and backward among keys within one third of the circle of fifths (D, A, E, [A, D], f#, A, a), mirroring the twists and turns of a labyrinthine journey. As the center of the labyrinth (section B) approaches, Marchand suddenly switches to A minor (mm.150-158), a key that involves no sharps or flats. This sudden change to A minor at measure 150 provides a shift to a darker mode after the previous A major key (mm.145-149) to prepare for the impending encounter with the Minotaur at the labyrinth’s center (section B, m.159).

In section B, Marchand maintains A minor, but switches the time signature from 3 to 2. In addition to a meter change at section B, Marchand also switches the tempo marking from the French *Moderement* of section A to the Italian *Andante*. The switch to an Italian tempo marking may be an interesting play on the general French perception.

---

246 Capital letter denotes a key in major and lower case letter denotes a key in minor. The brackets around the keys signify that the keys are briefly touched upon but not fully established.
that Italian music was frightful, with unrestrained chromaticism—which promptly follows in Marchand’s depiction.

Marchand’s section B depicts the dramatic scene in which Theseus battles and slays the Minotaur, with the frequent use of chromatic appoggiaturas and neighbor notes (see, for example, mm.159 and 165 in Ex. 4.1), chromatic bass movement (D#-D(natural)-C#-D) in mm. 167-170, concentrated use of various diminished seventh chords, and secondary dominant harmonies that intensify the overall chromaticism of this section. The large skip in register of the melodic motive centering around a repeated note with chromatic neighbor notes (mm. 165-168) again seems to signify the dueling between Theseus and the Minotaur. As the end of section B nears, Marchand slips from A minor to D minor at m. 170 (a key on the flat side of the circle of fifth) in order to prepare for a return to D major, the original key of the movement.

The final section of Marchand’s labyrinthine excursion depicts the cheerful journey out of the maze, with another switch back to the French tempo marking, from Andante to Gay, and from duple meter (2) to triple meter (3). Marchand reuses only part of the materials from the opening section (mm.47 – 72 of section A) in the final section. This portion of the A section is tonally stable and does not modulate. The composer’s use of a new tempo and expression marking with the tonally stable portion of the old music alludes to the similar path used for entrance and exit from the labyrinth, but without the psychological effect of trepidation, wandering, and confusion, represented originally by the tonal wandering in mm. 99 -158 of section A.
Ex. 4.1 Marchand, Op. 1 (Paris, 1747) Suite no. 6/I (mm. 159 – 174)
Movement 2: Marche des Orientaux

Marchand’s second movement moves from the world of classic myths to a representation of exotic foreigners. But, as we shall see, it may incorporate a labyrinthine reference of its own. This construction of an exotic “Other” should be viewed in the context of the early eighteenth-century French practice of musical representation. “Turkish” music was frequently used as the default model for all foreign music.\textsuperscript{247} Marchand’s March of the Orientals represents Turkish Janissary music, the music most commonly described by French travelers to the Middle East.\textsuperscript{248} Such music was generally characterized by “repeated notes, scale runs, unison writing, striking interval leaps, simple harmonies and sudden changes in dynamics.”\textsuperscript{249} Several such features turn up in Marchand’s march. Eric Rice also points out that this music frequently begins with “three notes played at the level of the basic pulse.”\textsuperscript{250} The three repeated opening quarter notes in Marchand’s March of the Orientals can be construed as also representing “turkishness”


\textsuperscript{250} Rice, Representations of Janissary Music (Mahter) as Musical Exoticism in Western Compositions, 1670-1824, 46.
Marchand’s strong emphasis on skips of perfect fifths and octaves also alludes to Turkish kettledrums playing in a slow, solemn procession (Gravement).

One significant feature in this movement is not “Turkish,” however: the imitative technique used prominently in the first three phrases. Such imitative writing in a “non-western” march contrasts with the eighteenth-century perception that non-western music was monophonic or heterophonic. A contemporary of Marchand, for example, noted the proficiency of Janissary bands in ensemble playing of unisons and octaves: “The Turks know so well how to accompany themselves when they play together that one would say two or three hundred produce but a single sound.”

Another significant stylistic element in this movement is incongruous with the genre of the western march. The rather curious lengthening of each of the first three phrases from 8 to 12 to 20 measures and the compression of the final phrase to only 4 measures contrasts with such marches’ generally predictable phrase lengths. The long held notes with fermatas at the end of phrases 1 and 3 further emphasize the anomalous, caricature quality of this short so-called “march.” By juxtaposing orientalist elements, western conventions, and an unconventional phrase structure, Marchand toys with eighteenth-century expectations along lines that he will intensify in an even more unusual and unconventional tonal scheme in movements following the march.

---

Ex. 4.2 Marchand, Op. 1 (Paris, 1747) Suite no. 6/II (mm. 1 - 44)
Marchand’s contact with the Orientals

What could have inspired Marchand’s rare attempt at Turquerie in the Marches des Orientaux? Marchand was born in Versailles and belonged to a large family of royal musicians. He would have had several opportunities to encounter Turkish dignitaries during their official visits to France. In 1721, when Marchand was twelve years old, the ambassador of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, Mehmet Effendi, and his entourage of about eighty made a grand entrance into Paris. This grand procession was described in Le Nouveau Mercure, and captured in paintings as well. Mehmet Effendi described his entrance into Paris:

The King himself, his uncle and tutor the duc d’Orléans, all the people of the court and the great lords had taken houses to watch my entry. Although I … could not bring an equipage worthy of such an occasion, by the help of God we were nevertheless assured that no one in Paris had ever seen so superb an entry as ours.

Parisians’ curiosity about these foreigners was so extreme that some ladies even requested an audience to watch the Turks take their meals. Mehmet Effendi’s visit resulted in a rash of turquerie in France—most notably in the areas of clothing,


255 Goczek, East encounters West, 38.
decorative arts, and painting. The first entrée of Rameau’s opera-ballet *Indes Galantes* (1735) offered one notable musical manifestation of the oriental vogue.  

Mehmet’s son, Said Effendi, returned to Paris as ambassador in 1741.  Marchand was thirty two by then; it was just six years before he published his Op. 1. It seems possible that Marchand might have had Said Effendi in mind for this march. It is even possible that delicious details of Said Effendi’s visit may explain Marchand’s irregular phrasing with its confusing pauses. The composer might have intended these musical aberrations to allude to notorious reports of Said’s drunken ramblings in the labyrinth of the garden of Versailles.

Connection between *Le Labirinthe Harmonique* (movement 1) and *Marche des Orientaux* (movement 2)

In 1717, Marin Marais published his fourth book of *Pièces de viol*, which contains a section titled *Suite dans le goût étranger*. Among Marais’ “strange” pieces are his famous *Le Labyrinthe*, *La Bizarre* (characterized by technical complexity), and *L’arabesque* (characterized by heavy ornamentation). The pairing of Marchand’s own *Le*

256 Rameau’s work, however, was not the first example of musical *turquerie*. Lully’s comedy-ballet *Le bourgeois gentilhomme* (1670) and Campra’s opera-ballet *L’Europe Galante* (1697) with final act titled “La Turquie,” represent some of the earliest attempts at musical orientalism.

257 Said Effendi accompanied his father, as his personal secretary, during the previous 1721 trip to France.

258 There were several reports of Said Effendi’s drunken excursions in contemporary sources. Of particular interest was the one that placed him spending two days with a lady at the famed labyrinth in Versailles, drunk. See Yirmisekiz Mehmet Çelebi, *Le paradis des infidèles : relation de Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed efendi, ambassadeur ottoman en France sous la Régence*, trans. Julien-Claude Galland and Gilles Veinstein. (Paris: François Maspero, 1981), 223; Originally published as *Relation de l'ambassade de Mehemet Efendi à la cour de France* (Paris, 1721); cited in Göçek, *East encounters West*, 69.
Labirinthe Harmonique and Marche des Orientaux may follow a similar logic in that both his movements represent something unusual or strange: movement one explores unusual tonal wandering and movement two depicts the exotic Other. The fact that these two movements are the only two in suite no. 6 to share the same key strengthens the connection between them and suggests that they were conceived as a pair. Table 4.3 lists the title of each movement and its key.

Table 4.3 Movement titles and keys in Suite no. 6

| I    | Le Labirinthe Harmonique [D major] |
| Ii   | Marche des Orientaux [D major]     |
| iii  | La Contrepointeuse [E major]       |
| iv   | La Flateuse [C minor]              |
| v    | Les Follies Françaises [G major]   |
| VII  | seventh variation—Le Spectacle des Mains [G major] |

Normally, movements in a French suite share the same key, of course. The first five suites in Marchand’s Op. 1 follow that norm. The composer’s use of other keys in movements three to five in Suite no. 6 inevitably calls attention to the tonal linking of movements 1 and 2. It appears that Marchand deliberately links these two movements together in order to showcase them as opposites.

The Harmonic Labyrinth is long (200 measures) and complex, with abrupt changes in tempo, texture, and meter. This is in stark contrast with the Oriental March, which is very short (44 measures) and simple with only four phrases. If the March of the Orientals hints at Said Effendi’s drunken frolicking in the labyrinth at Versailles, as I
have suggested, then it stands in marked contrast to the horrific labyrinth of the Minotaur invoked in the Harmonic Labyrinth.

The story behind movements 3, 4, and 5

The concluding three movements return us from ancient times and exotic foreigners to the familiar ground of French harpsichord music. The titles of the final three movements of Suite no. 6, as a group, may represent Marchand’s witty tribute to the historical development of French harpsichord music. *La Contrepinteuse* (movement 3) signifies old, outdated, non-idiomatic harpsichord music, which had employed old-fashioned contrapuntal writing. *La Flateuse* (The Flatterer) (movement 4) represents a newer type of ingratiating character piece, which became the predominant type in *pièces de clavecin* collections after the 1720s, replacing the traditional dance movements of previous decades.\(^{259}\) Finally, *Les Folies Françaises* (movement 5, a theme with seven variations) signifies the very latest thing in French harpsichord literature. The addition of cello and violin to form an ensemble with the harpsichord in this final movement of Suite no. 6 embodies the fashionable genre of *pièces de clavecin en concert*, created by Rameau.

\(^{259}\) *La Contrepinteuse* may literally be a musical portrait of a lady who is skilled at the high art of musical conversation and *La Flateuse* that of verbal conversation.
Comparison of Marchand’s movement 5 with Rameau

In the last variation titled *Le spectacle des mains*, the brilliant arpeggiated harpsichord passage against the slow moving melodies played by the cello and violin pays homage to a new kind of keyboard virtuosity illustrated in Rameau’s *L’Agaçante* (third movement of the Second Concert in *Pièces de clavecin en concerts*, 1741).

*L’Agaçante* is also one of the movements in Rameau’s *Pièces de clavecin en concerts* that the composer arranged for solo harpsichord. Significantly, Marchand states on the title page of Op. 1 that “the last two [suites] are for harpsichord alone.”260 In the *Avertissement*, Marchand also indicates that “one can also play [*Le spectacle des mains*] with the harpsichord alone by transposing the cello part an octave higher in the theme, the 2nd, 4th, and 5th variation.”261 He also gives instructions on how to arrange other variations for harpsichord alone. That Marchand uses an instrumental deployment for the *Le spectacle des mains* similar to Rameau’s *L’Agaçante* strengthens their connection.

Marchand’s *Le Spectacle des Mains* may well be a tribute to Rameau’s famous accompanied keyboard collection in the *pièces de clavecin* setting, forming a nice contrast with the French overture for harpsichord and violin at the beginning of the

260 Divisées en six Suittes dont les deux dernières sont pour le Clavecin seul.

261 … on peut aussi jouer cette pièce avec le Clavecin seul en observant de transposer la partie du Violoncelle une octave plus haut seulement dans le sujet, dans la 2.é 4.é et 5.é Variation.

247
collection, which appears to offer homage to Mondonville’s Op. 3 sonatas, another “monument” in the history of the genre.

Dupuits’ Sonates pour un Clavecin et une Vièle (1741)

Dupuits’ Sonates pour un Clavecin et une Vièle Op. 3, published in 1741, offer a singular, carefully concocted mixture of fashionable international musical styles. At the same time, through its unusual instrumentation, the collection also pays homage to current fashions and playful pursuits amongst French high society.

By positioning the Italianate “concerto” (sonata 1) and the French sonata (sonata 6) at opposite ends of the collection, Dupuits follows the organizational strategy of Mondonville’s accompanied keyboard set to highlight his conception of style mixture.262 The success of Mondonville’s pioneering collection must have inspired Dupuits to compose his set of sonatas. As stated in the avertissement, Dupuits tries to emphasize the equal partnership of the harpsichord and the vielle (a type of hurdy gurdy), a feature that is also the hallmark of Mondonville’s collection for harpsichord and violin. Similar to what Mondonville has done to the ensemble combination of violin and harpsichord, Dupuits has developed a unique, idiomatic style for vielle and the singular ensemble of vielle and harpsichord.

262 Mondonville’s organization, however, is the reverse of Dupuits: French overture in Sonata 1 and Italian concerto in Sonata 6.
On a broad scale, sonatas 1 and 6 (the first and last sonatas in Dupuits’ Op. 3) are cast as stylistic opposites. Sonata 1 is Italianate, in the vein of a Vivaldian Concerto. The first movement, subtitled Concerto, uses ritornello form and an *al unisono* opening. The second movement is subtitled *Aria Affetuoso* in rondeau form, injecting a taste of French style into an Italianate sonata. Dupuits clarifies the form of this movement as the French rondeau instead of the Italian rondo by using the terms *Rondeau double* and *Rondeau triple* for the couplets. The third movement is an Italianate Allegro in Da Capo Aria form, also with an *al unisono* opening. In contrast, Sonata 6 is more French. Its first movement (Allegro assai), in French rondeau form, introduces for the first time in the collection, idiomatic keyboard writing that was a hallmark of Rameau’s virtuosic style. Some of the techniques involve rapid hand crossing (*batteries*) and quick, sixteenth-note figurations split between the right and left hands, producing an interesting visual effect (both in performance and in the score) amidst the aural brilliance.²⁶³ The subsequent pastorals and minuets, on the other hand, resonate with French aristocratic *mores*, as we shall see.

While variety in styles and genres appears to be Dupuits’ guiding principle throughout this collection, the composer also seems to delight in organizing such stylistic or generic borrowings in pairs. For the concerto, he invokes the new (Sonata 1—I—the Vivaldian concerto) and the old (Sonata 3—the Corellian concerto). For traditional, 

²⁶³ Rameau conveys the effect when referring to his *batteries*: ‘I believe that these *batteries* are peculiar to me. At any rate, none similar have yet appeared; I may say, in their favour, that the eye shares in the pleasure which the ear receives in it.’ Trans. and cited in Girdlestone, *Jean-Philippe Rameau: his life and work*, 24.
contrapuntal style, he offers a *Fuga da Capella* (Sonata 4/I) and a *Canone* (Sonata 5/III). For the aria, he marks one “Affettuoso” (Sonata 1/II), and another, “Spirituoso” (Sonata 4/II). We also find another aria pair in Sonata 5/II, with Aria Prima marked *Soave* and Aria Seconda, *Amoroso*. For French folk dances, he introduces a Première Gavotte and a Seconde Gavotte (Sonata 3/II) and a Première Tambourin and a Second Tambourin (Sonata 4/III); we also have paired pastoral dances, but in Italian spelling: Pastorella Prima—Pastorella Secunda and Minuetto Primo—Minuetto Secondo. Finally, Dupuits introduces two movements that imitate the sound of another instrument: the lute in *Gracioso per Lutto* (Sonata 2/II) and the trumpet in *Fanfare* (Sonata 3/III).

Dupuits’ most striking personal addition to the varied repertoire of French accompanied keyboard music is his introduction of the vielle to the diverse range of instruments that characterizes the genre. When Dupuits’ Op. 3 was published in 1741, the vielle was enjoying its height of popularity as a pastoral instrument in France. It frequently appeared in portraits of the upper class, dressed in shepherd or shepherdess costumes, as well as in Watteau’s paintings, where it provides outdoor music for aristocrats in the rural scenes. The demand for vielle music was tremendous. If Ancelet can be believed, the master musicians of the vielle could demand higher pay than the best organists.  

---
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In the following section, I will explore how the French nobility perceived the vielle and how this perception played into music for the instrument. This will help us understand Dupuits’ unusual choice of instruments (harpsichord and vielle as equal partners) against the social construction of the vielle as part of pastoral conventions.

Social perception of the vielle

In the early seventeenth century the vielle was associated with the destitute, especially blind beggars. Mersenne provides a view of the vielle’s undesirable reputation in his treatise *Harmonie universelle* (1636):

If men of distinction usually played ‘la Symphonie,’ which is called vielle, it would not be as scorned as it is. But because it is played only by the poor, and especially by the blind, it is less esteemed than others that give less pleasure. This does not prevent my explaining it here, since skill does not belong to the rich more than to the poor and since there is nothing so base or vile in nature or in the arts as to be unworthy of consideration.\(^{265}\)

The impact of this disreputable image is even greater in the visual arts where vielle players are presented in a pitiful light. In Fig. 4.3 (*Hurdy-Gurdy Player*),\(^{266}\) Jacques Bellange (act. 1602-17) portrays the destitution of the vielle player not only by presenting his unkempt clothing and facial hair, but also his missing teeth, blank stare, and stooped shoulders, which further underscore the harsh life he leads. Richard Leppert suggests that

---


Fig. 4.3 Jacques Bellange, *Hurdy-gurdy Player*
(Source: Paris: BN, Cabinet des Estampes)
such an exaggerated portrayal of a hurdy-gurdy player borders on caricature and may not offer an “accurate” picture of a real life hurdy-gurdy man. Nevertheless it would surely have established the repulsive association between the man and the instrument in the minds of viewers. The fact that this picture is only one of many that depict a vielle player in this manner reveals that blind beggars who played the hurdy-gurdy must have been a common sight and it suggests how they were socially constructed.

Verses accompanying an engraving titled “Bagpipe, Shawm, and Burdy-gurdy Players” from Varii generis instrumenta musica likewise comments derisively on country musicians (see Fig. 4.4):

Limited as is their intelligence,
So are their instruments.
Shawms, hurdy-gurdies [vielles], and bagpipes,
Playing naught but the tune.
The effect is so charming
One wants to hold his ears.

The bagpipe gurgles a lot of nonsense,
The hurdy-gurdy purrs along
The fellow with the shawm
Hasn’t much to occupy him
His skill being confined to two holes.
Turn your crank around once more
Toot a penny whistle and maybe your mouth
Will not be so twisted.

267 Ibid., 20.

268 One frequently cited picture in this vein can be found in Sydney Beck and Elizabeth E. Roth, Music in prints (New York: New York Public Library, 1965), figure no. 23.
The author clearly links the mechanical limitations of the hurdy-gurdy and the bagpipe to the simple-mindedness of their players. In the picture, the lower-class status of the vielle is associated with the woman’s peasant clothing and her prominent bare feet. Since this print is part of a series of engravings presenting most of the instruments of the time, the representation of each instrument says a great deal about the contemporary social status of the instruments. From this print we can tell that all three instruments (shawm, musette, and vielle) are frequently performed outdoors as opposed to the print’s depiction of more serious, indoor chamber settings for other more highly esteemed instruments such as the harpsichord.

In his *Ballet de l’impatience*, first performed at the Louvre in 1661, Lully provides a musical equivalent for such iconographic parodies. He uses the vielle to introduce ten blind beggars (third Entrée, part IV) and also includes an air for the blind vielle players (second air pour les aveugles jouant de la vielle).

These examples clearly illustrate the negative seventeenth-century attitude toward the vielle. The vielle’s subsequent ascent from an instrument of the destitute to one of the most popular court instruments in France between 1700 and the 1760 is therefore remarkable. Of the numerous factors affecting this change in sentiment, the most important has to do with the vielle’s induction, following in the footsteps of the musette (a kind of bagpipe), into the fold of acceptable pastoral conventions. Emanuel Winternitz

---

Fig. 4.4 Martin Engelbrecht, “Bagpipe, Shawm, and Hurdy-gurdy Players,” from Varii generic instrumenta musica
(Source: New York Public Library, Prints Div., Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations
(Copyright New York Public Library)
attributes the vielle’s pastoral association to the drone, which is an inherent characteristic of the instrument. In the continuous sound of the drone, Fontenelle (1657-1757) perceived a kind of permanent timelessness and the tranquil atmosphere of the country.

According to Terrasson, Henri Bâton’s refinements to the vielle between 1716 and 1720 gave further impetus to the aristocratic passion for the instrument. Bâton, an instrument maker at Versailles, built vielles on the backs of old guitars and lutes, reshaped the peg box to resemble a viol’s, and decorated it so that it “pleases the ladies.” His vielles became expensive, lavish, highly decorative instruments—symbols of opulence, despite their humble origins.

By 1725, the vielle’s popularity had become so pervasive that it invaded salons, boudoirs, and even concert halls. The instrument also appears in portraits and in paintings of Watteau, Nattier, Drouais, and Pater, resting in the refined hands of members

270 Winternitz, Bagpipes and Hurdy-gurdies in their Social Setting, 69.


272 Antoine Terrasson, Dissertation Historique sur la Vielle; Ou L’on Éxamine l’origine &les Progrès de cet Instrument; Avec une Digression sur l’histoire de la Musique Ancienne & Moderne (Paris: Lamesle, 1741), 96-8.

of the upper class. The highest ranking members of Louis XV’s court participated extensively in the vogue for such pastoral instruments. Famous composers and music teachers all wrote compositions and method books to take advantage of this insatiable passion for the vielle.

Riding on the coat tails of such popularity, a handful of accomplished vielle virtuosi such as Charles Bâton and Danguy emerged, demanding sophisticated music for their instrument. This kind of technically demanding vielle music was swamped, however, by the vast outpouring of simple arrangements of airs for vielle. Only a few composers such as Dupuits rose to the virtuosi’s challenge.

General characteristics of the vielle repertory

Compositions strictly for vielle tend to be light, short, and technically undemanding. They frequently have descriptive titles borrowed directly from pastoral


275 For further details on the French aristocratic craze for the vielle and musette, see Leppert, Arcadia at Versailles: noble amateur musicians and their musettes and hurdy-gurdies at the French court (ca. 1660-1789). A visual study.

276 Dupuits has mentioned Danguy in his Op. 3 avertissement as the person with whom he had tested the pieces in Op. 3 before he venture to present to the public: “ce n’est qu’apréci plusieurs épreuves que j’ay faites avec Monsieur Danguy que je hazarde de presenter au Public un ouvrage dont je souhaite qu’il goûte la nouveauté.”

277 Lindemann, Pastoral instruments in French Baroque music musette and vielle, 34.

278 For details about other sophisticated vielle music, see Green, The Hurdy-Gurdy in Eighteenth-Century France, 38-49.
dramas or fête galant paintings, including *Amusement champêtre ou les aventures de Cythère* by an anonymous composer, *Les Amusements d’une heure et demy ou les jolis airs variés contenant six divertissements Champêtre* by Bouin, *Le Berger fortuné* by Corrette, *Le Pasteur Fidèle ou les délices de la campagne* by Dubois, *Les fêtes pastorales* by Chédeville, *Fêtes rustiques* by Naudot, *Divertissements champêtre* by Michon, Boüin, et al, and *La noce champêtre* by Hotteterre.\(^{279}\) Common title words such as amusement and fêtes suggest that the French public favored a type of pastoral akin to what Alexander Pope called the “delightful pastoral, exposing the best side only of a shepherd’s life, and concealing its miseries.”\(^{280}\) In the same spirit, Nicolas Chédeville’s arrangement for vielle and musette of Vivaldi’s *Le Quattro Stagione* adds the additional title “les saisons amusantes” to “le printems.”\(^{281}\)

The frivolous titles, so prevalent in the music for vielle, confirm Winternitz’s succinct summary of aristocratic French taste: “It was rustic life conventionalized as a pleasant game for the nobility.”\(^{282}\) The upper class preferred to view country life as a prettified Utopia, filled with nature’s beauty and tranquility, with none of the harsh

---

\(^{279}\) Ibid., 29-49.

\(^{280}\) Cited in Williams, *The country and the city*, 19.


\(^{282}\) Winternitz, *Bagpipes and Hurdy-gurdies in their Social Setting*, 80.
conditions associated with poverty, danger in the wilderness, severe droughts, and hardships that could destroy lives, livestocks and farmland.

One has to wonder, therefore, what the genteel pastoral-loving viellists would have thought of Dupuits’ publication. While they capitalize on the vogue for the vielle, Dupuits’ sonatas contrast significantly with the majority of the simple-minded vielle repertoire in terms of stylistic features and overall mood. There are none of the typical, whimsical descriptive titles, while some movements bear sober, learned subtitles such as *Fuga da Capella* (sonata IV, first movement) and *Canone* (sonata V, third movement), and betray musical textures associated with serious music for sophisticated audiences. The well-respected modern vielle performer and scholar, Robert Green, deems Dupuits’ sonatas the most technically difficult and the highest in musical quality among the eighteenth-century vielle repertoire.283

There is, in fact, very little hint of pastoralism in Dupuits’ collection except toward the end of Sonata 6, whose second movement offers a pair of *Pastorellas*, recalling the vielle’s pastoral association. Even so, these are not the simple, tranquil type commonly associated with most musical pastorals. The simple kind of musical pastorals are generally short; their bass lines move in slow, simple, even rhythms or in long sustained notes imitating the drone. They are frequently marked *naïvement*284 or


284 See Couperin’s La Pastorelle in François Couperin, *Pièces de Clavecin ... Premier livre* (Paris:, 1713), 1st Ordre, no. 12.
Dupuits’s Pastorellas consist of busy sixteenth-note figurations in the harpsichord bass, while the homophonic texture of the vielle melody and the harpsichord right-hand part is thicker than eighteenth-century viellists would have expected in a pastorale.

The paired minuets that conclude Sonata 6 also conclude Dupuits’ collection as a whole. The minuet was the most popular dance performed at Louis XV’s court. JoLynn Edwards has argued that the minuet can be interpreted as a pastoral signifier in Watteau’s paintings even though it is technically not an outdoor dance:

The minuet would ordinarily be regarded as inappropriate for the out-of-doors. Its geometric designs were intended to be seen inside the ballroom for the critical appreciation of the surrounding audience. Yet Watteau’s reference to the minuet here [L’Accordée de village and Les Bergers] appears deliberate and specific. It may be said that Watteau extends the pastoral setting of the painted boiseries in the Régence ballroom to an encompassing and benign natural environment for his minuet dancers. Watteau, in combining notions about the natural and social orders, seems to break down the boundaries between exterior and interior space. The minuet dancers in the open air conjure up an idea of man in harmony with nature yet conforming to pre-ordained patterns of social ritual.

Dupuits may have drawn on similar pastoral associations when he placed the minuets next to the pastorellas. Together, these movements nicely balance the opening of the Op. 3 collection. It begins with a modern Italian concerto in the style of Vivaldi (Sonata 1) and ends on a style that evokes the quintessential French Rococo. In Dupuits’


juxtaposition of the pastorella (a country dance) and the minuet (a courtly *danse de bal*), we may also observe an intriguing musical parallel to the rustic activities celebrating a marriage contract being signed in Watteau’s *L’Accordée de village* (see Fig. 4.5). The group of dancers on the right foreground perform a country line dance (Branle)\(^{287}\) accompanied by a vielle and a musette in the right-hand corner. The couple dancing in the middle foreground, in refined clothing, appears to dance the minuet.\(^{288}\) Such a juxtaposition of social hierarchies on canvas re-echos in the musical score at the end of Dupuits’ Op. 3.

The engraving on the title-page of the vielle method Dupuits published in the same year as Op. 3 probably expresses Dupuits’ attitude toward the vielle, which is also manifested in his compositions for the instrument—an instrument capable of music of the highest quality as exemplified by joining together the vielle and the “noble” harpsichord. (See Fig. 4.6) The equal partnership with the harpsichord (an instrument of high respectability), the deliberate avoidance of playful titles, and the use of serious and learned compositional devices such as fugue and canon give Dupuits’ sonatas a serious tone that contrasts markedly with the kind of superficial vielle literature that appealed to


\(^{288}\) JoLynn Edwards specifically identifies this aristocratic couple doing the demi-coupé of the minuet. See Edwards, *Watteau and the Dance*, 223.
popular taste or the pastoral vogue. Dupuits’ approach provoked skeptical disapproval from Louis de Mermet, who opposed the vielle’s rustic appearance in the concert hall:

Vielle and musette, appropriate to pastoral music, derive from the species (espèce) that characterises them. Destined [originally] to [be used for] Pastorale and Dance music, they [now] turn up in regular orchestras; and while we deprive the flute and the viol of the serious and the tender [roles in the orchestra], we impose these characteristics upon the rustic instruments whenever pathos and affection weep, and thus, they become ridiculous.289

For De Mermet rustic instruments could never quite escape their country bumpkin associations, even when dressed up in serious or tender music. But a pragmatic defender of Dupuits’ variety of sophisticated musette and vielle music, writing in the Mercure later that year, would have the last word:

I will not dwell on what M. Bollioud has to say about other instruments such as musettes and vielles, which he would like to be heard only beneath the elm tree. He thus deems it reprehensible to compose complex pieces for them. If he heeded the fact that one must allow for different talents as well as satisfy different tastes; that moreover ability on these instruments is fostered by young Ladies to whom nothing may be denied, to whom these compositions are commonly dedicated, then he would not have turned our taste into a crime.290

---

289 Louis Bollioud de Mermet, De la corruption du goust dans la musique françoise (Lyon: 1746), 33-37. “La Vielle, la Musette, propres à la Musique champêtre sortent de l’espèce qui les caractérise. Destinées à la Pastorale & à la Danse, elles entrent dans les Symphonies régulières; & tandis qu’on ôte le sérieux & le tendre à la Flute, à la Viole, on transporte ces caractères sur des Instrumens rustiques, où le pathétique & l’affectueux pleure, & devient ridicule.”

290 Anonymous, Mercure (September 1746), 78. “Je ne m’arrête point à tout ce que M. Bollioud dit des autres Instrumens, comme les Musettes, les Vielles, qu’il voudrait qu’on n’entendit que sous l’Ormeau, & pour lesquelles il trouve très-mauvais que l’on compose des Pièces travaillées. S’il eut fait attention qu’il faut varier aussi les talents, comme satisfaire les différents goûts; que d’ailleurs le talent de ces Instrumens est pratiqué par de jeunes Dames à qui l’on ne peut rien refuser, à qui même ces Pièces sont communément dédiés, il n’en eut pas fait un crime à notre goût.”
Conclusion

The accompanied keyboard music by Marchand and Dupuits offer us a kaleidoscopic view of their unique uses of instrumental scorings to express their individual notions of goûts réunis. In Marchand’s Op. 1, we see the concept of goûts réunis manifested in the varied combination of instrumental scorings and formal structures associated with Italian sonata or concerto, French pièces de clavecin, and also the newly established conventions of accompanied keyboard music. In each suite, Marchand delights in presenting a new way of combining instrumental scorings, resulting in a myriad of hybrid relationships to the fashionable national styles as well as to the earlier prototypes of the accompanied keyboard genre. In Dupuits’ case, the attempt to treat harpsichord and his second instrument as equal partners follows Mondonville’s intention for his pioneering accompanied keyboard collection. More importantly, this equal partnership also makes Dupuits’ collection unique among the repertoire for vielle, which was dominated by simple airs for one or two vielles with or without basso continuo. The incorporation of learned Italianate features (as part of the notion of goûts réunis) in Dupuits’ collection also makes a significant contribution toward raising the level of sophistication in vielle literature.

The intriguing overall organization of both Marchand’s and Dupuits’ accompanied keyboard sets appears to be motivated by their desire to balance and contrast the Italian and French national styles. Marchand’s purposeful placement of movements at both ends of his collection to imitate similar scorings of Mondonville’s and
Rameau’s accompanied collections demonstrates his keen awareness of the development of the accompanied keyboard genre and his understanding of the flexibility embedded in a genre that capitalizes on hybridity. For Dupuits, the framing effect of Italian concerto at the beginning and French pastoral dances at the end of his Op. 3 conforms to the general strategies of style mixture in accompanied keyboard music. The delayed appearances of the pastoral dances, which link Dupuits’ collection to the expected norm of vielle music, create a tension that mirrors the status of vielle music within the hierarchy of art music. The equal blending of vielle and harpsichord also reflects a mixture of the instruments’ social construction: harpsichord = artificial + high status, vielle = natural + low status.
Chapter 5

The Enigmatic Imitation of \textit{la Belle Nature} in Mondonville’s Op. 3

En puisant dans les combinaisons harmoniques, j’ay taché de ne point perdre de vue le seul modele qu’on doit imiter, je veux dire \textit{la belle nature}. . . .

Delving into the harmonic combinations, I worked from nothing else but the only model that one should imitate, I mean \textit{la belle nature} . . .

Mondonville, Dedication for Op. 3

Jean-Joseph Cassanéa de Mondonville made this statement in the dedicatory note to his new collection of sonatas for harpsichord with violin accompaniment published in about 1738.\textsuperscript{291} This statement raises several issues. What could Mondonville have meant when he linked the mimetic concept to the compositional process of Op. 3? More interestingly, how does his specific reference to the imitation of \textit{la belle nature}, as opposed to imitation of nature in general, fit within the context of contemporary French aesthetic theory, which from the late seventeenth century (Charles Perrault) to the mid-eighteenth century (Charles Batteux) had favored idealized nature as the mimetic model? Why would Mondonville even attempt to link the mimetic concept to a collection of non-programmatic instrumental music which, in the opinion of most aestheticians, was deficient because of its non-representational quality?

\textsuperscript{291}For the most recent dating of this collection see Denis Herlin and Davitt Moroney, eds., \textit{Jean-Philippe Rameau, Opera Omnia} (Paris: Gérard Billaudot, 1996),XXXII, fn. 8; and David Fuller, “Reviews: Jean-Philippe Rameau, Opera Omnia, ser. 1, vol. 2, \textit{Pièces de clavecin en concerts},” \textit{JAMS} 51/1 (Spring 1998), 185, fn. 7.
In this chapter, I shall address these issues by tracing the development of the concept of *la belle nature* from Perrault to Batteux and then by suggesting how the aesthetic model of *la belle nature* could relate to Mondonville’s musical *la belle nature*. This chapter is organized into four subdivisions. The first establishes the uniqueness of the notion of imitation of *la belle nature* in musical composition, especially in a collection of absolute music; the second traces the meanings of *la belle nature* in French aesthetics from Charles Perrault, at the end of the seventeenth century, to Charles Batteux, around the mid-eighteenth century, and also its related theory of beauty; the third presents interesting features in Op. 3 that may have been influenced by the concept of *la belle nature*; the fourth discusses Mondonville’s notion of *la belle nature*.

The Notion of Imitation of *la Belle Nature* in Musical Composition

*Contemporary Prefaces to Musical Collections*

A quick perusal of the prefaces and *avertissements* of music published during the first half of the eighteenth century in Paris, including the fourteen collections of accompanied keyboard music\(^\text{292}\) that came after Mondonville’s Op. 3, reveals that French composers did not customarily evoke in their prefaces the concept of mimesis so passionately discussed in the realm of the *académie*.\(^\text{293}\) Rameau, both a practical

\(^{292}\) See Appendix A for a listing of these collections.

\(^{293}\) My search includes Gabriel Banat, *Masters of the violin* (New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1981; 1982); Jane Adas, *The eighteenth-century continuo sonata* (New York: Garland, 1991), vols. 3, 4, 9; Antonia Bembo’s dedicatory pages to her vocal music in mixed style included in Claire Anne Fontijn,
musician and an academician interested in the theory of music, was the exception. It is thus not surprising that two prefaces written by Rameau use the aesthetic vocabulary of “imitation” and “nature.”

The first preface appears in Rameau’s 1735 Opéra-ballet, Les Indes galantes, where he utilizes a phrase resembling the one used by Mondonville in Op. 3:

Always preoccupied with the fine declamation and the beautiful tour de chant that prevail in the recitative of the great Lully, I try to imitate, not as a servile copyist, but by following his example in taking as a model the beauty and simplicity of nature (la belle et simple nature).294

The model of “la belle et simple nature,” as espoused by Rameau, here reveals an aesthetic assumption that considers declamation to be the most natural way for music to imitate in order to express passion.295 It also highlights the many meanings of la belle nature in a different context. Rameau’s la belle et simple nature is introduced in the context of vocal music, where musical imitation can be understood with the help of words.

Let us next consider Rameau’s reference to Classical imitative theory in the context of purely instrumental music, which appears in a book accompanying Rameau’s

---


Nouvelles Suites de Pièces de Clavecin published ca. 1729-30. Rameau makes the following comment with reference to a specific piece entitled L'Enharmonie: “The harmony which creates this effect [the effect of enharmonic change in the 12th measure of the reprise] has by no means been thrown in haphazardly; it is based upon reason and has the sanction of nature herself.” The “nature” that Rameau used here is the natural acoustical phenomenon of the overtone series, which coincides with the fundamental sound of his corps sonore (sounding body), a principle which he had incorporated into his theory of harmony in 1726. True to his time, Rameau believes that Nature is the foundation of any endeavor in the sciences and arts of the eighteenth century, “that mother of Sciences and Arts” (cette mère des Sciences et des Arts). His theory of music, which was derived mathematically by the method of string division (1722), becomes much more palpable when it is validated by the natural phenomenon of


297 Trans. by Thomas Street Christensen, Rameau and musical thought in the Enlightenment (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 204.

298 Jean Philippe Rameau, Nouveau systéme de musique theorique, où l'on découvre le principe de toutes les regles necessaires à la pratique, pour servir d'introduction au Traité de l'harmonie (Paris: De l'impr. de J. B. C. Ballard, 1726), j, 114, [6].


300 Jean Philippe Rameau, Traité de l'harmonie reduite à ses principes naturels (Paris: De l'impr. de J.B.C. Ballard, 1722), 432, 17.
overtones. While Rameau’s “nature” may not necessarily be the same as Mondonville’s *la belle nature*, it does point to a common spirit of eighteenth-century rationalism, where a composer explains and justifies his compositional choice based on rules found in nature that can be rationalized by the mind. To illustrate how unusual it is to find imitation of *la belle nature* mentioned in a collection of absolute music, it is necessary to map out how instrumental music was perceived in France during the first half of the eighteenth century.

**Instrumental Music as Imitative Art**

Among all the imitative arts (poetry, painting, music, and dance) music was the most difficult to fold into the mimetic philosophical enterprise because it lacks precise representational capability. When aestheticians talked about music within their system of imitative principles, they generally were talking about vocal music. Instrumental music, very popular since the beginning of the 18th century, had yet to receive critical acceptance among the learned in France. It was frequently dismissed as merely a vehicle for empty displays of technical brilliance. We see this attitude reflected in Rousseau:

> Purely as harmony, music is of little account. If it is to provide constant pleasure and interest, it must be raised to the rank of an imitative art. However the subject of the imitation is not always as immediately obvious as it is in painting and poetry. It is by words that music most frequently defines the idea (image) that it is depicting, and it is through the touching sounds of the human voice that the idea evokes in the depths of the human heart the feeling (sentiment) that it seeks to arouse. Who does not feel, in this respect, the inadequacy of instrumental music (symphonie) in which brilliance alone is the aim? Can all the trivialities of M. Mondonville's violin be as moving as just two notes sung by Mme. le Maure? Instruments may enliven the song and enhance its expression but they can never supplant it. To understand what all the din of a sonata is about we would have to do what the incompetent painter did, when he wrote beneath his works, "This is a tree," "This is a man" and "This is a horse." I shall
never forget the witty riposte made by the celebrated Fontenelle after he had been bored to death by an endless succession of instrumental pieces: "Sonate, que me veux-tu?"301

Peter Kivy succinctly points out that mimesis was, at that time, “the only game in town” in terms of understanding fine arts.302 Within this cultural milieu, Mondonville’s proposition of composing his collection of accompanied keyboard music based on an imitation of la belle nature suggests a deliberate intention on the composer’s part to make some sort of connection with the current aesthetic thought of his time. The absence of a similar alliance to imitative principles in other contemporary prefaces to musical collections only highlights the uniqueness of Mondonville’s use of such terms.

The Theory of the Imitation of la Belle Nature and the Theory of Beauty

The concept of a creative artist drawing inspiration from and imitating a model had been articulated since Antiquity. What changes through time is the nature of the mimetic model that an artist should imitate. Since these models are related to our understanding of la belle nature, they will be discussed below.

---


 Plato’s concept of idealized nature was an invisible, harmonious order of the universe which was rational and perfect. Aristotle’s brand of mimesis, that one should imitate nature by aligning artistic creation with human passion, continued to maintain a strong hold in linguistic principles of many seventeenth and eighteenth-century French philosophers. It also forms the basis for the Doctrine of Affection during the Baroque period. Descartes had lead the way in this discipline by systematically formulating a set of musical figures to parallel the figures of speech in rhetoric. The use of musical figures to represent certain passions or ideas becomes a composer’s way of demonstrating that music can be an imitative art. This musical conception of artistic imitation also relegates instrumental music to a lower level because of its inability to express precise meaning.

When Rameau related his musical theory, based on Pythagorean principles of harmonic proportion, to the acoustical phenomenon of the overtone series, and claimed that the source of his musical theory was rooted in Nature itself, he created a stir in the academic world. His theory was cited by many aestheticians, including Charles Batteux, who believed that harmony, which comes from nature, can contribute to musical


304 Ibid., 42-59.

expression. In his *L’Essai sur le beau* (1741), Yves Marie André also equates musical essential beauty (the highest kind of musical beauty) with Rameau’s *corps sonore.*

**Perrault’s *la Belle Nature***

Charles Perrault used the phrase *la belle nature* in his seminal treatise, *Parallèle des anciens et des modernes* (1688-1697). *La belle nature* differs from *la pure nature,* which Perrault defines as the common nature that one sees in the everyday world, in that it is embellished, refined, and cultured. He applied the selective process of imitating nature specifically to paintings and contended that an artist should choose *la belle nature,* rather than the works of the ancients as his model. A champion of modernism, Perrault felt that *la belle nature* was the model to imitate because a modern painter could improve upon the nature that he sees with the benefit of years of accumulated knowledge and experience. *La belle nature* to Perrault is art and civilization: nature that has been embellished and transformed, and perfected through progress made over the years. *La*

---


307 Ibid., 30. See also Charles William Dill, *French theories of beauty and the aesthetics of music 1700 to 1750,* 1984), 79.

308 For detailed discussion of the seventeenth-century quarrels between Ancients and Moderns, see Chapter 2 of Cowart, *The origins of modern musical criticism: French and Italian music, 1600-1750,* 27-48; and Norman, *Ancients and Moderns, Tragedy and Opera: The Quarrel over Alceste,* 177-196.
pure nature, on the other hand, is primitive, wild, savage, disorderly, and thereby unfit for art.309

Besides la belle nature and la pure nature, Perrault also brought up the idea of beauty (l'idée du beau):

I go even further and say that it is not enough for the painter to imitate the most beautiful nature so that the eyes see it, it is necessary that he go further, and that he try to catch the idea of beauty, which not only pure nature, but even beautiful nature can never achieve; it is according to this idea that he must work, and that he must use nature only to reach that point.310

Saisselin points out that Perrault’s idea of beauty illustrates the tendency in late-seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century France to merge the concept of nature with those of beauty and truth. Several aestheticians dealing with the theory of beauty explored this idealized nature, which could only be understood by the mind. Although its abstract nature had its origin in Plato, the idealized perfection (beauty/truth) that such modernist French aestheticians as Perrault espoused resided in the arts of modern times, not in ancient antiquity.311 Perrault’s association of the imitation of la belle nature with

309 Rémy G. Saisselin, The Rule of reason and the ruses of the heart : a philosophical dictionary of classical French criticism, critics, and aesthetic issues, 1987), 125.

310 Charles Perrault, Parallèle des anciens et des modernes en ce qui regarde les arts et les sciences : Dialogues, 2ed. (Genève: Slatkine, 1971), 214. Je vais encore plus loin et je dis que ce n’est pas assez au peintre, d’imiter la plus belle nature telle que ses yeux la voient, il faut qu’il aille au delà, et qu’il tâche à attraper l’idée du beau, à laquelle non seulement la pure nature, mais la belle nature même ne sont jamais arrivées; c’est d’après cette idée qu’il faut qu’il travaille, et qu’il ne se serve de la nature que pour y parvenir.

311 Saisselin, The Rule of reason and the ruses of the heart : a philosophical dictionary of classical French criticism, critics, and aesthetic issues, 127.
modernism represents an important advancement of the mimetic theory, which Saisselin explains as follows:

If the ancients had imitated pure nature, in Perrault’s use of the term, their works could hardly be perfect, because pure nature was accidental. If the moderns imitated *la belle nature*, then they could improve upon the ancients.  

**Batteux’s *la Belle Nature***

Although Perrault had introduced the concept of *la belle nature* as a particular kind of nature, which an artist should imitate, Charles Batteux emphasized the imitation of *la belle nature* as the single principle (*même principe*) for all arts in his influential work *Les beaux arts reduits à un même principe* (1746). Batteux considered that “the human mind can only create in a very imperfect manner: all its productions bear the stamp of a model.” His notion of genius depends on rational reasoning and keen observation of *la belle nature*.

Like Perrault, Batteux’s *la belle nature* is formed by a process of selection:

---

312 Ibid., 125.


315 Trans. and quoted by ibid., 45. “Genius then that seeks to please must not and cannot exceed the bounds of nature herself. Its function consists, not in imagining the impossible, but in seeking out what exists. Artistic invention is not a matter of giving substantive form to an object, but in identifying an object and seeing it for what it is. . . . They are only creative because they have observed; and conversely, they only observe in order to be in a position to create.”
Finding the pleasures of simple nature too monotonous and finding himself moreover in a situation in which he could enhance his pleasure, he created out of his own native genius a new order of ideas and feelings, one that would revive his spirits and enliven his taste. For what could the man of genius do? He was on the one hand limited in inventiveness by nature herself, and on the other hand by the people for whom he worked, people whose faculties were similarly limited. He had necessarily to direct his entire effort to a selection from nature of her finest elements, in order to make from them an exquisite, yet entirely natural whole, one that would be more perfect than nature herself.316

So, how does an artist make his selection from la belle nature? Batteux proposes that, with the help of good taste, an artist can arrive at the idealized model he seeks. He claims that “there can be only one good taste, which is that of nature. The arts themselves can only be perfect when they represent nature; taste, then, which operates in these same arts must be that of nature.”317 Batteux takes a liberal view in his allowance of many different kinds of taste resulting from the riches of nature. To illustrate the riches of nature, Batteux raises the example of the artist who could copy his model from many different angles: each position produces different features and combinations. He then makes a parallel with music: “French and Italian music each have their [sic] own characteristics. It is not that one is good music, the other bad. They are two sisters, or rather two faces of the same object.”318 One can only assume that the “same object” that

317 Ibid., 47.
318 Ibid., 46-47.
Batteux talks about is nature itself. It follows that if both French and Italian music derive from nature, then the model of *la belle nature* can mean a tasteful selection of all the characteristic features that are inherent in both national styles.

According to Batteux, his guide for making the right selection is taste. The problem with Batteux’s argument about taste, the taste that approves of *la belle nature*, is that it gets into a vague loop so that one cannot quite understand what taste means.\(^{319}\) Since taste is necessary for any judgment about what is beautiful and what identifies *la belle nature*, we must also examine contemporary theories of beauty as they relate to the notion of *la belle nature*.

**La Belle Nature and the Theory of Beauty**

The late seventeenth and eighteenth-century convergence of the concept of nature and the theory of beauty and truth further complicates the notion of *la belle nature*. A discussion of *la belle nature* necessarily has to include some aspects of what beauty means. Saisselin considers Batteux’s *la belle nature* to be abstract nature, perceivable only through the mind. He links Batteux’s Platonian metaphysical approach with Père André’s formulation of the theory of beauty in *Essai sur le beau* (Paris, 1741)\(^{320}\) and

---

\(^{319}\) In his *Lettre sur les sourds et muets* (Paris, 1751), Denis Diderot attacked Batteux specifically for his imprecision and vagueness in defining *la belle nature*.

makes the connection between Batteux’s *la belle nature* and André’s “essential beauty” (*le beau essential*), an idealized geometrical beauty that exists purely intellectually, as the fundamental principle which all arts should imitate.  

While Batteux was unclear about how *la belle nature* could be used as a model, André’s definition of beauty helps us understand what guides an artist during the process of transforming and embellishing elements taken from nature. For André one of the requirements for essential beauty (his version of the idealized model) is ‘symmetry and proportion’ with a ‘proper blend of unity and variety’ which pleases.

The association of symmetry and proportion with beauty, which pleases the mind and the senses, can be connected to the principle of *la belle nature* in that the main objective of fine arts, as Batteux put forth, is pleasure. This notion of the function of fine arts is similar to the *mondain* principle which, as mentioned before in Chapter 3, was adopted widely by French connoisseurs and the general public. Thus, structural symmetry can be one of the choices that an artist uses as his model for *la belle nature*. It is therefore an important criterion when we consider Mondonville’s *la belle nature*.

---

321 Saisselin, *The Rule of reason and the ruses of the heart: a philosophical dictionary of classical French criticism, critics, and aesthetic issues*, 32.

322 “The pleasures of art should appeal to intellect as well as sentiment. This is accomplished in fairly obvious or at least familiar ways. The intellect is pleased by variety, but invariably finds too much variety to be fatiguing; for this reason, artists compose their works with symmetry and proportion, insuring that a proper blend of unity and variety will be achieved.” Trans. and quoted by Dill, *French theories of beauty and the aesthetics of music 1700 to 1750*, 101.

Musically, both Batteux and André believed Rameau’s *corps sonore* was the ultimate nature behind all the musical rules. André makes note of this:

. . . there is, in the concert [a musical performance], an *agreement* purer than the sweetness of the sounds you hear there, a beauty that is not the object of the senses, a certain beauty that charms the intellect and which the intellect alone perceives and judges. . . . you discovered the principle in an insight superior to the senses, in the idea of sonorous numbers [nombres so nores] and in the rules of harmonic proportions and progressions that are their essential image.  

Batteux provided a similar view on harmony in his explanation of how all sounds related back to the basic triad (Rameau’s *corps sonore*):

Harmony contributes to musical expression. All harmonious sound is of its nature threefold, carrying with it the major third and the fifth. On this, Descartes, Father Mersenne, M Sauveur and M Rameau are all agreed, Rameau having adopted it as the basis of his new musical system. It follows from this that even in nature a simple cry of joy has its own harmony and consonance.  

Batteux’s main thesis for his study was to apply a universal principle, *la belle nature*, to all arts. If the basic triad is one of the models that an artist could imitate, then it could be applied to disciplines outside of music as well. Charles Etienne Briseux’s attempt to connect ancient architectural designs and the principles of harmony, exhibited in sonorous bodies, exemplifies this interdisciplinary approach. Briseux, an eighteenth-century French architect who studied the monuments of Greek and Roman antiquity, believed that those architectural plans that followed simple numerical ratios and

---

324 Trans. by Dill, *French theories of beauty and the aesthetics of music 1700 to 1750*, 78-79.

proportions had the ability to convey beauty directly to the mind. The text describing the construction plan of a building in numerical ratios illustrates his point clearly:

The length AB is divided into 20 equal parts. Each of the pairs of columns marked E comprises 2 parts, separated by 3 parts at D, and 6 parts at C. These three different distances are positioned according to the harmonic proportion 2, 3, 6, which in music produces the fifth and its octave. The columns F are placed at the edge of the pilaster such that their bases are set back slightly. The width between GH is divided into 5 parts, 4 of which correspond to the height IK. Thus this height is to the width GH as 4 is to 5, which is the ratio of the major third. The 3 parts LM, MN, NO are in the harmonic proportion 2, 3, 6, which produces the fifth and its octave. Finally, the principal masses of the pedestal are in the arithmetic proportion 1, 3, 5.326

The kind of beauty that Briseux describes here, which directly pleases the mind, is about a deeper kind of structural beauty that only the mind can perceive and this may also be the kind of *la belle nature* that could have influenced Mondonville’s organization of the sonatas in Op. 3, which we will discuss next.

### Structural Analysis of Op. 3

If structural symmetry as the symbol of beauty is music’s goal, then Mondonville achieved such a goal in his overall planning of the sonatas in Op. 3. Mondonville places the sonatas in the collection in a specific order to create a logical pattern for the whole. This pattern emerges from (1) the arrangement of pieces with distinctive stylistic characteristics unique to specific genres such as the French overture, the Italian concerto,

the Lullian air, the solo violin sonata, and the solo pièces de clavecín; and (2) the tonal planning of the sonatas, whose intervallic relationships form a distinctively symmetrical pattern.

**Organization by stylistic features**

Mondonville emphasizes the goûts réunis aspect of his Op. 3 by prominently framing the collection with two sonatas that clearly refer to the representative genres of the French and the Italian styles (see Fig. 5.1): Sonata I opens with a French overture, labeled *Ouverture*, and sonata VI is an Italian concerto, labeled *Concerto*. Mondonville creates further unity in the collection by pairing other movements using expression markings or subtitles: the second movements of sonata II and sonata IV are linked because they are the only second movements with *Gracioso* expression marking; the third movements of sonata III and sonata V are connected because they are the only third movements marked Allegro, instead of employing the dance subtitle *Giga*. By this method, all the sonatas in the collection are paired in various ways. An interesting numerical play emerges out of these three pairings: the first pair involves the first movements (sonatas I & VI), the second pair concerns the second movements (sonatas 2 & 4), and the third pair connects the third movements (sonatas III & V).
Besides the three pairings, one can also detect a general concentration of French styled movements in the first half of the collection and Italianate movements in the second half. The key signatures used for the sonatas in this collection support the bipartite division: the key signatures for sonatas I-III (g minor, F major, B♭ major) are on the flat side of the circle of fifth; the key signatures for sonatas IV-VI (C major, G major, A major) are on the sharp side of the circle of fifth (see Table 5.1).

By dividing the collection using the sharp-flat opposition of key signatures, Mondonville appears to respond to a widespread belief in the existence of meanings associated with keys.\(^{327}\) One of the theories that emerged out of this doctrine of key characteristics was the distinction between sharp and flat keys.\(^{328}\) The general idea of flat

\(^{327}\) For an excellent study on this topic, see Rita Steblin, *A history of key characteristics in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries*, 2ed. (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2002), 408.

\(^{328}\) Ibid.; see especially Chapter 7, “Psychological Factors: The Sharp-Flat Principle.”
major keys expressing “gaiety mixed with gravity”\textsuperscript{329} or “majesty or gravity,”\textsuperscript{330} and flat minor key for “something touching or tender”\textsuperscript{331} interestingly recalls the words used by 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th}-century French aestheticians to describe French music: noble, calme, douceur, tendresse, touchant.\textsuperscript{332} Correspondingly, the general notion of the sharp keys, which expresses “gaiety or brilliance”,\textsuperscript{333} corresponds well to the general perception of Italian music.\textsuperscript{334} This theory of key characteristics can only be applied in the most general sense here since there are great discrepancies among theorists and musicians concerning the specific meanings of the keys and how these meanings can be construed in a piece that modulates.

\textsuperscript{329} Charles Masson, \textit{Nouveau traité des règles de la composition de la musique} (Paris: Jacques Collombat, 1697), 8-10. Trans. and quoted by Steblin, \textit{A history of key characteristics in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries}, 35.


\textsuperscript{331} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{332} Anthony, \textit{French baroque music from Beaujoyeux to Rameau}, 145.

\textsuperscript{333} Charles Masson (1697) and J.-J Rousseau (1743). See Steblin, \textit{A history of key characteristics in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries}, 39, 99.

\textsuperscript{334} Anthony, \textit{French baroque music from Beaujoyeux to Rameau}, 145.
Table 5.1  Stylistic shift between sonatas in first and second half of Op. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata</th>
<th>Mvt/Heading</th>
<th>Style characteristic</th>
<th>Tempo Marking</th>
<th>Time signature</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1: Ouverture</td>
<td>French overture</td>
<td>Gravé-Allegro-Adagio</td>
<td>2/4 - C</td>
<td>g, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Aria</td>
<td>French air “Lullian”</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Giga</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Aria</td>
<td>Pièces de clavécin tradition: Violin accompanies w descant melody.</td>
<td>Gracioso</td>
<td>6/8(vln) 2 (kybrd)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Giga</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Aria</td>
<td>Unique texture: violin plays a French style melody accompanied by keyboard right hand and left hand in imitative texture.</td>
<td>Gracioso</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>B²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keyboard uses “batterie” technique alla Rameau</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Concertante” writing influenced by Italian concerto</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Aria</td>
<td>Italian sonata tradition: Solo violin with figured base texture</td>
<td>Gracioso</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Giga</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Aria</td>
<td>Italian sonata tradition: Solo violin with figured base texture</td>
<td>C (cut)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1: Concerto</td>
<td>Italian concerto: Ritornello form</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A-B-A form</td>
<td>Larghetto</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Giga</td>
<td>Italian concerto: Ritornello form</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The French overture in Sonata I not only gives a French emphasis to the first half, but it also functions as the grand introduction to the entire collection, as frequently happens in other eighteenth-century instrumental collections. It opens with a typical slow, homophonic Gravé section, followed by a fast, imitative section, marked Allegro. The choice of Allegro instead of Vite for the fast imitative section is part of the style mixture that French composers sometimes use to project a hint of the Italian within the context of a traditional French piece. The second movement of this sonata proceeds mostly with parallel thirds and sixths between the violin and the right-hand melody in a manner very similar to the cool and restrained mood of Lullian airs. The third movement of Sonata I is an energetic Italian Giga, characterized by triadic, even eighth-note figuration in 12/8. By putting a typically Italian-styled dance at the end of a French sonata, Mondonville uses the method of style juxtaposition to produce a mixed-style sonata.

To conclude the collection Mondonville employs an Italian concerto, featuring ritornello form in outer movements and A-B-A form in the slow, middle movement. The composer makes the ritornello form even clearer by marking some sections “solo” in the score. The lack of a heading, and the use of the tempo marking “Larghetto” in the slow movement of Sonata VI set this movement apart, by comparison with all the other slow movements in Op. 3, which are all labeled Aria and carrying either no tempo marking or

---

335 Among the collections of French accompanied keyboard music, four open their collections with a French overture: Marchand (1747), Legrand (1755), Duphly (1756), Simon (1761). See Chapter 3 for detailed discussion of these overtures.
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marked *Gracioso* (Sonata II and IV). Since *aria or air* was a popular title for slow movements in many French violin sonatas, Mondonville’s use of *Larghetto* distinguishes this sonata, specifically labeled *concerto*, from the other sonatas in Op. 3. Furthermore, the second movement of Sonata VI is also the only slow movement in the collection cast in “Italian” ABA form rather than “French” rondeau form.336

The stylistic differences in the sonatas at the center of the set are less obvious: The second movement in Sonata II recalls another French clavecin tradition in which the keyboard right hand presents the main melody while the violin accompanies it with an improvisatory descant melody.337 The second movement in Sonata III offers a unique texture in which the violin plays a French style melody characterized by mostly stepwise motion peppered with delicate French ornaments. The 4 + 4 phrasing reflects the French predilection for dance phrase structure.

The third movement of Sonata III employs the technique of alternating hands (*batterie*) which typically appears in some of Rameau’s *Pièces de clavecin*. This is also one of two third movements in Op. 3 that is not labeled “Giga,” but “Allegro” instead. The Allegro tempo marking represents another manifestation of style mixture, adding an Italianate element to a decidedly French movement.

336 See Chapter 3 for more details of the stylistic contrast between the French overture and the Italian concerto in French accompanied keyboard music.

337 This French tradition is discussed in Borroff, *An introduction to Elisabeth-Claude Jacquet de la Guerre*, 115.
From Sonata IV onward, the texture in the slow movements has stronger affinity to Italian sonatas. The second movement of Sonata IV adopts the style of a typical Italian sonata for solo violin and figured bass, in which the violin plays the main melody and the keyboard provides the harmonic accompaniment in the manner of a realized figured bass. The descending walking bass and the chain of suspensions provide powerful forward motion, typical of Italian sonatas. Mondonville uses the French time-signature 2 and also the French rondeau form, however, to inject some French features into this otherwise very Italianate movement.

The second movement of Sonata V has a texture very similar to that of Sonata IV, in which the left hand provides a continuous bass line; after the first few measures, Mondonville actually uses bass figures for the harpsichordist to realize. Rondeau form reappears here, as in the slow movement of Sonata IV, to achieve a stylistic amalgamation.

The third movement of Sonata V is one of two third movements in Op. 3 that is not an Italian Giga in compound meter. The French time signature of 2, the overall homophonic texture with some passages in parallel thirds and sixths, and the French ornaments give this movement a French flavor. However, the Italian tempo marking, “Allegro,” suggests an Italian connection. While the third movement of Sonata III emphasizes the French aspect of the sonatas in the first half of the collection, the French

338 Compare, for example, Bach’s sonatas for violin and cembalo, no. 4, Adagio (third mvt.) BWV. 1017.
styled third movement in Sonata V gives variety to the sonatas in the second half that are generally more Italianate. A similar juxtaposition of styles is seen in Sonata I where an Italian Giga rounds out a sonata that opens with a French overture.

In summary, one can detect a larger pattern in the organization that encompasses the entire Op. 3 collection: six groups of three movements; two groups of three sonatas (French vs. Italian group and sonatas with sharp key-signatures vs. those with flat key-signatures); and three groups of two paired movements, as illustrated in Table. 5.1.

Despite the obvious contrast in the choice of genres that Mondonville borrowed from the French or Italian sources, he frequently softens such a contrast by deliberately incorporating stylistic features of the opposing style, sometimes by juxtaposing an Italian movement, such as the Giga, next to a French, Lullian air, or by amalgamating an Italianate texture and harmonic movement into a French rondeau form. The result introduces a varied textural relationship between the violin and the harpsichord and also creates a new method of blending and juxtaposing, whose textural variety prompted Marpurg to comment that Mondonville’s sonatas differed from Sebastian Bach’s in that the texture was not limited to a certain number of voices.339

Organization by Tonal Planning

The diagram in Fig. 5.2 outlines the careful tonal planning of the sonatas in Op. 3, as a whole, illustrating a symmetrical intervallic pattern formed by the keynotes. The diagram shows a symmetrical intervallic pattern formed by the keynotes.

**Fig. 5.2 Tonal scheme of Mondonville’s Op. 3**

- w = major second
- x = minor third
- y = perfect 4th

This pattern imposes a sense of unity and regularity on the architecture of the collection as a whole, the pleasing quality that André proposed in his essential beauty. It should be pointed out that such tonal planning is unique to Mondonville’s Op. 3 collection. No similar, discernable pattern appears in Mondonville’s other instrumental collections, Opp. 1, 2, 4 and 5. The special arrangement of the keys with the intervallic relationships of 2nd, 3rd, 4th may be Mondonville’s way of suggesting unity and symmetry for the overall planning of this collection. Such playful invocation of the numbers that

340 Lower case alphabet denotes minor key and upper case alphabet denotes major key.
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correspond with the harmonic ratios of octave (1:2), 5\textsuperscript{th} (2:3), and 4\textsuperscript{th} (3:4) may be a witty reference to the first four notes in Rameau’s \textit{corps sonore}: G – G – D – G (1:2, 2:3, 3:4).\textsuperscript{341}

**Structural Patterns in Individual Movement**

On a smaller scale, a different kind of numerical proportion may be apparent in the architectural framework of Mondonville’s sonatas. Fig. 5.3 provides a structural analysis of the exposition of sonata no. 5, movement I. The exposition consists of 14 measures, which can be divided into three parts: the first two parts consist of 6 measures each, and the final part contains a cadential figure of two measures. Parts 1 and 2 have small units that can be grouped according to patterns of repetition. The first expresses the tonic key, and its six-measure unit is subdivided into three smaller groupings (2 + 2 + 2). Each two-measure unit is characterized by a self-duplication of 1 + 1. The second part, which moves from the tonic to the dominant, is subdivided into two three-measure units: 3 + 3. Each unit can then be further broken down to a pattern of 1 + 2, in which the third measure is a repetition of the second. The remarkable thing about this melodic and rhythmic organization is the inverse relation between the internal groupings: part 1 is grouped as (3 x 2) and part 2 is grouped as (2 x 3). 2:3 reflects the numerical proportion of a perfect 5\textsuperscript{th}, the interval between the tonic key and the dominant key.

\textsuperscript{341} On the other hand, one could argue that the limited range of keys commonly used for violin music in the eighteenth-century makes the emergence of some kind of pattern almost inevitable. It should be pointed out, however, that another commonly used key for violin music (D) is absent from this collection whereas this key was used in his earlier two collections of sonatas. Mondonville uses the key of D in his solo violin sonata (Op. 1, no. 3) and also in his trio sonata (Op. 2, no. 5).
Mondonville’s *la Belle Nature*

Perrault and Batteux advance the notion of *la belle nature* as a new model or perfect order, which an artist should imitate by the process of selecting, transforming, transposing, and embellishing materials that reside in the real world nature. It is an abstraction, an essence, a spirit. What then, is Mondonville’s *la belle nature*? As a music practitioner, the parts of real-world nature that Mondonville chose to embellish are the established musical genres of his time: the *pièces de clavecin*, the arias and dance music from Lullian operas, the Italian sonatas and concertos. By amalgamating and juxtaposing the various styles and features associated with these genres, Mondonville invented a new genre that is arguably more perfect than the original models. *La belle nature* in this sense is a process as well as a spirit. This mixing of styles is folded into *goûts réunis*, the fashionable musical notion of the late seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth century. The aesthetics of *goûts réunis* slowly became more acceptable to the learned by the
second quarter of the eighteenth century, but faded away when the mature Classical style absorbed national styles into a common musical language.\textsuperscript{342}

When Perrault advanced his notion of \textit{la belle nature}, he did it from the modernist point of view by advocating that one should imitate models of nature of his time instead of the Ancients, to take advantage of accumulated knowledge and experience. Mondonville presents his Op. 3 in the same spirit, claiming in his dedicatory note: “… I have attempted something new.” He makes the hybrid nature of his Op. 3 obvious by the title itself, which combines the French and the Italian genre (\textit{Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon}), and by the prominent placement of the French overture and Italian concerto as the opening and closing sonatas for the collection. The selective process of \textit{la belle nature} is fully displayed throughout the collection, with French and Italian styles overtly or subtly blended and juxtaposed. It is not enough simply to combine the French \textit{pièces de clavecin} with the Italian sonata to form a new genre. Mondonville modernizes his new work by incorporating the three-movement (fast-slow-fast) structure of the most fashionable Italian genre at that time, the concertos of the Vivaldian type, into his sonatas. Earlier French sonatas had either followed the old four-movement structure (slow-fast-slow-fast) of the sonata da chiesa type or the dance suites of the da camera type. This new three-movement structure for sonatas or \textit{pièces de clavecin} was immediately adopted by many subsequent accompanied keyboard

\textsuperscript{342} Musical nationalism would reemerge in the age of Romanticism during the nineteenth century.
collections, including Rameau’s set of *pièces de clavecin en concert*, as well as other French sonatas or *pièces de clavecin* for solo harpsichord.

On a deeper level, the charming variety of generic mixture balances an overall symmetry and order found in the delightful pairing of sonatas by stylistic features and textual indications, by the overall key scheme of the collection, and by the internal structure of individual sonata movements. Such appeal to the mind and the senses may reflect an influence from contemporary aesthetic principles of beauty.

By using the phrase *la belle nature*, Mondonville calls attention to the most ubiquitous category of nature adopted in eighteenth-century France. It also reveals his singular attempt to link current aesthetic thought discussed in the academy to musical practice, and thereby calls into question the suggestion in modern studies of this period that there was generally no correspondence between speculative aesthetic theory and musical practice, especially in instrumental music.343 Italianate absolute music of the 1730s faced the same skepticism from the learned in French society that French opera had confronted in the 1690s. By invoking *la belle nature*, Mondonville may be taking a modernist position that suggests that musical imitation in absolute music can adopt a new model, which can be evaluated, not as the handmaiden of words, but as a hybrid combining the best of both the French and Italian traditions, and rationally organized in a way that pleases the mind as well as the senses.

Petite Reprise

French accompanied keyboard music composed between the late 1730s and late 1750s has been largely misunderstood and underappreciated because it has frequently been evaluated, not on its own terms, but in terms of accompanied collections from other regions and also in terms of the substantial and substantially different repertories of keyboard music with optional accompanying instrument(s)\textsuperscript{344} that flooded the market during the second half of the eighteenth century. Early French accompanied keyboard music all has a written-out keyboard part with the obbligato parts notated above or below the keyboard score. My study has attempted to illustrate the distinctive qualities of this early French accompanied repertory and to highlight its relationship to the fascination with mixed style by French composers, the public, critics such as Jean-Laurent LeCerf de la Viéville (1674-1707) and Bollioud de Mermet (1709-1794), and philosophers such as Denis Diderot (1713-1784) and Charles Batteux (1713-1780). Together, these groups formulated an aesthetic of \textit{goûts réunis}, which encouraged composers to adhere chiefly to the French tradition, while experimenting with the tasteful incorporation of Italianate virtuosity, bold harmonic language, and form. This ideal of style mixture made French accompanied keyboard music distinctively French, characterized by a rich variety of internal details, elegant restraints, noble simplicity and clarity, a tasteful blend of French

\textsuperscript{344} Twentieth-century commentators frequently refer to this type of repertory as “accompanied keyboard music with ad libitum accompaniment,” where the part(s) of the accompanying instrument(s) are frequently not included in the keyboard score.
delicateness and sweetness with Italianate learnedness and boldness, never taken to excess.

For reasons of national pride, the French wanted to recapture the past glories of Lully’s music by advocating a new type of music mixing French and Italian styles in order to create “perfection in music,”345 which, in the words of Jacque Bonnet (d. 1724), would “surpass other nations.”346 Contemporary conservative critics increasingly abandoned their former support for the old Lullian style and now praised those who appreciated mixed style, whom they called “the wise ones,”347 or “people of taste.”348 These former conservatives also praised composers for their skillful blend of the Italian savant qualities (virtuosity, harmonic boldness and contrapuntal learnedness) with what they perceived as the sweet, natural, and noble simplicity of French music.

Mondonville’s presentation of a French delicate violin melody, accompanied by the

345 Composers and critics who advanced this notion include: Battistin Stuck (1680-1755) in the dedicatory note to Duke Philippe d’Orléans in his Cantates françaises: à voix seule, avec symphonies, Book 1 (Paris, 1706); Françoise Couperin (1668-1733) in the program for the 10th movement of his Apotheosis of Lully (Paris, 1725); and Cartaud de la Vilate (c. 1700-1737) in his Essai historique et philosophique sur le goût (Paris, 1736), 336.

346 Jacque Bonnet-Bourdelot, Histoire de la musique, et de ses effets (Paris, 1715), I: 293.

347 Mercure de France (Paris, Nov 1713), 38. The article also appears as Chapter 13 of the Histoire de la musique et de ses effets by Pierre Bonnet-Bourdelot (Paris, 1715), I: 291-317; here it is entitled “Dissertation sur le bon goût de la musique d’Italie, dela musique française et sur les opera.” For controversy over the author of this article, see Georgia Cowart, Origins of modern musical criticism, 176, fn. 9.

keyboard’s imitative right and left-hand parts, offers one of the many examples of this tasteful synthesis of French gentleness with Italianate learnedness.

A common method of style mixture for composers of accompanied music involved the juxtaposition or blending of such national genres as French overture, dance music, and pièces de clavecin with the Italian sonata and concerto in their collections. On a few occasions, these composers blended concerto elements within the French overture, featuring brief solo passages or an extended keyboard cadenza. Many accompanied keyboard composers adopted the Vivaldian concerto’s three-movement structure with fast-slow-fast tempi so consistently that it became an identifying characteristic of this new French repertory.

The French penchant for programmatic music, following the Classicist principle of mimesis, is duly represented in the accompanied repertory. In the handful of “ad libitum” settings, whose accompanying instruments twentieth-century commentators frequently have dismissed as optional, the accompanying instruments frequently served an extra-musical function related to their descriptive titles. In the case of Rameau’s (1683-1764) La Boucon, the stringed instruments double the harpsichord’s right and left-hand parts, not only for exquisite coloristic effect, but also to invoke the French performance practice of having a violin play softly along with the harpsichordist during performances in large concert halls. The simple, sweet string doubling is also used in several minuet movements to allude to the sound of the very popular aristocratic danse de bal, an orchestral genre that accompanies the ball room minuet. The violin appears in all
the French overtures of accompanied keyboard collections to create a unity of effect, an important feature of the French overture since Lully’s day. Simon Simon (ca. 1735-after 1780) afforded an especially nice touch by positioning his accompanied French overture (marked “Introduction”) in the middle of his Op. 1 collection (Suite no. 4) to create a contrast with the noble Allemande for solo harpsichord that serves as an overture to the beginning of the collection. Both share an introductory function, signifying beginnings: one belongs to the old genre of pièces de clavecin, while the other belongs to the new genre of Italianized accompanied keyboard music.

Charles Batteux (1713-1780) advanced the notion of la belle nature as a new aesthetic model, which all artists should imitate by selecting, transforming, transposing, and embellishing materials that reside in the real world of nature—a nature that included French and Italian music. By citing la belle nature in the dedicatory note to his Op. 3 collection, Mondonville not only called attention to this important aesthetic theory, but, as I have suggested, also effectively linked this theory to his notion of goûts réunis, the fashionable musical concept that used a similarly selective process of synthesizing and juxtaposing national styles, which is the fundamental principle behind the genesis of French accompanied keyboard music.

In addition, the contemporary aesthetic principle of beauty that embraced an appeal to the mind and the senses, to reason and truth is on full display in this repertory. It is richly manifest in composers’ treatment of their entire collections as an open field for the working out of style mixture. We find varied instances of structural symmetry and
order created by delightful pairing of movements with generic references to national styles, by the strategic organization of textual indications for tempi and character, by overall key schemes, and by the increased use of imitative or concertante textures toward the end of collections to create a progressively more balanced interplay of instruments from the beginning to the end of the collection. Composers of this repertory conveyed the notion of *goûts réunis* to their listeners by skillfully utilizing all the elements of the aural, the visual (verbal markings), and the intellectual (structural organization) to create a unified ensemble appealing both to the senses and to the mind: an artistic objective that was quintessentially French.
APPENDIX A: French Accompanied Keyboard Music Published ca.1738 -1760\textsuperscript{349}

**Mondonville, Jean-Joseph-Cassanéa de** (1711-72)

*Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre 3\textsuperscript{e} (1738): 6 sonatas.*

**Rameau, Jean-Philippe** (1683-1764)

*Pièces de clavecin en concert, (1741): 5 concerts.*

**Boismortier, J. Bodin de** (1689-1755)

*Sonates pour un clavecin et une flûte traversière, œuvre quatre-vingt onzième (1742): 6 sonatas.*

**Corrette, Michel** (1709-95)

*Sonates pour le clavecin avec un accompagnement de violon, opera XXV (1742): 6 sonatas.*

**Dupuits, Jean-Baptiste** (*fl.* 1741-57)

*Sonates pour un clavecin et une viéle, œuvre III (1743): 6 sonatas.*

**Clément, Charles-François** (*c.*1720-after 1782)

*Sonates en trio pour un clavecin et un violon, (1743): 6 sonatas.*

**Guillemain, Louis-Gabriel** (1705-70)

*Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre XIII\textsuperscript{e} (1745): 6 sonatas. This collection was later arranged for flute, violin, viol, and continuo and published as Op. 17 (1756).*

**Mondonville, Jean-Joseph-Cassanéa de** (1711-72)

*Pièces de clavecin avec voix ou violon, œuvre V\textsuperscript{e} (1748): 8 pieces on psalm texts.*
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Marchand, (Simon-)Luc (1709-99)

_Pièces de clavecin avec accompagnement de violon, hautbois, violoncelle ou viole, œuvre 1ère_ (1747): 6 suites. The instrumentation varies in each suite: Suite no. 1 has violin, Suite no. 2 has oboe, Suite no. 3 and 4 have cello or viol, Suite no. 6 (last movement) has cello and/or violin.

Damoreau, (des Aulnais) Jean-François 'le jeune' (fl. 1754-c.1775)

_Pièces de clavecin avec accompagnement de violon et sans accompagnement, (1754): 17 pieces in 5 key groups; 13 pieces have a violin part—nos. 1-1a, 5-8, 8a-14.

Papavoine (c.1720-93)

_Pièces de clavecin en trio avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre II (1754) (Lost)_

Clément, Charles-François (c.1720-after 1782)

_Nouvelles Pièces de clavecin avec un accompagnement de violon & de basse, fait en concert & gravé séparément, [œuvre III] (1755) (Lost): Unknown number of pieces issued in parts. “On peut jouer les pieces de clavecin seules, sans accompagnement, & sans que cela nuise à leur harmonie.”

Legrand (fl. c.1753-58)

_Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre Ier (1753): 6 sonatas.

Duphly, Jacques (1715-89)

_Troisième livre de pièces de clavecin (1756): 5 groups of character pieces; 6 pieces have a violin part—nos. 1-3, 10-12.

Herbain, Chevalier d' (c.1730/4-1769)

_VI sonates de clavecin avec un violon ou flûte d'accompagnement en forme de dialogue (1756): 6 sonatas._
APPENDIX A – Continued

Noblet, Charles (c.1715-69)

_Nouvelles Suites de pièces de clavecin et trois sonates avec accompagnement de violon_ (1756): 2 suites with 3 sonatas inserted within the suites; the sonatas have a violin part.

Maucourt père (d. before 1753)

_Pièce[s] de clavecin avec accompagnement de violon_ (1758) (Lost): ?6 sonatas.

Simon, Simon (c.1735-after 1780)

_Pièces de clavecin dans tous le Genres avec et sans accompagnement de violon.avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre 1ère_ (composed ca. 1755, published 1761): 6 suites.
APPENDIX B: Collections grouped by settings

**Hybrid settings** (with two genres listed in title):

**Mondonville, Jean-Joseph-Cassanéa de** (1711-72)

*Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre 3e* (1738): 6 sonatas.

**Rameau, Jean-Philippe** (1683-1764)

*Pièces de clavecin en concert,* (1741): 5 concerts.

**Guillemain, Louis-Gabriel** (1705-70)

*Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre XIIIe* (1745): 6 sonatas.

**Legrand (fl. c.1753-58)**

*Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre Ier* (1753): 6 sonatas.

**Noblet, Charles** (c.1715-69)

*Nouvelles Suittes de pièces de clavecin et trois sonates avec accompagnement de violon* (1756): 2 suites with 3 sonatas inserted within the suites; the sonatas have a violin part.

**********************************************************************

**Sonata settings:**

**Boismortier, J. Bodin de** (1689-1755)

*Sonates pour un clavecin et une flûte traversière,* œuvre quatre-vingt onzième (1742): 6 sonatas.
APPENDIX B – Continued

Corrette, Michel (1709-95)

Sonates pour le clavécin avec un accompagnement de violon, opera XXV (1742): 6 sonatas.

Dupuits, Jean-Baptiste (fl. 1741-57)

Sonates pour un clavécin et une viéle, œuvre III (1743): 6 sonatas.

Clément, Charles-François (c.1720-after 1782)

Sonates en trio pour un clavécin et un violon, (1743): 6 sonatas.

Herbain, Chevalier d’ (c.1730/4-1769)

VI sonates de clavécin avec un violon ou flûte d'accompagnement en forme de dialogue (1756): 6 sonatas.

Maucourt père (d. before 1753)

Pièce[s] de clavécin avec accompagnement de violon (1758) (Lost): ?6 sonatas.

*********************************************************************

Pièces de Clavecin settings:

Mondonville, Jean-Joseph-Cassanéa de (1711-72)

Pièces de clavécin avec voix ou violon, œuvre Ve (1748): 8 pieces on psalm texts.

Marchand, (Simon-)Luc (1709-99)

Pièces de clavécin avec accompagnement de violon, hautbois, violonvelle ou viole, œuvre 1ère (1747): 6 suites. The instrumentation varies in each suite: Suite no. 1 has violin, Suite no. 2 has oboe, Suite no. 3 and 4 have cello, Suite no. 6 (last movement) has cello and/or violin.)
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Damoreau, (des Aulnais) Jean-François 'le jeune' (fl. 1754-c.1775)

*Pièces de clavecín avec accompagnement de violon et sans accompagnement,*
(1754): 17 pieces in 5 key groups; 13 pieces have a violin part—nos. 1-1a, 5-8, 8a-14.

Clément, Charles-François (c.1720-after 1782)

*Sonates en trio pour un clavécin et un violon,* (1743): 6 sonatas.

Duphly, Jacques (1715-89)

*Troisième livre de pièces de clavécin* (1756): 5 groups of character pieces; 6 pieces
have a violin part—nos. 1-3, 10-12.

Simon, Simon (c.1735-after 1780)

*Pièces de clavécin dans tous le Genres avec et sans accompagnement de violon avec
accompagnement de violon, œuvre 1ère* (composed ca. 1755, published 1761): 6
suites.

Papavoine (c.1720-93)

*Pièces de clavécin en trio avec accompagnement de violon, œuvre II* (1754) *(Lost)*
## APPENDIX C: Textural Types

### C.1: Imitative Trio Texture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville (1738)</td>
<td>Op. 3/no. 1/I (“Allegro” of “Ouverture”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/no. 3/II (also in C.2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville (1748)</td>
<td>Op. 5/ Psalm no. 1/instrumental intro--fugal (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert no. 2/III (mostly between violin and viol and R.H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert no. 3/III--first and second <em>Tambourin</em> (all three voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert no. 4/I (right hand and violin; then violin and viol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert no. 4/III (all three voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert no. 5/I (“Fugue”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert no. 5/II (violin and viol--see also C.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert no. 5/III (violin and right hand--see also C.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boismortier (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/II (right hand and flute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/III (Flute and right hand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 3/I (“Gayement” section of the Rondement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 4/II (right hand and left hand--see also C.2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/I (left hand and right hand--see also C.2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrette (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/I (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/I (right hand and violin--imitation does not start until m. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 4/I (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/I (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 6/III “Giga” (right hand and violin; short, like concertante exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 4/I “Fuga da capella” (all three voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/III “Canone” (Viéle and left hand)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C.1 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 3/IV “Giga” (right hand and left hand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/II “Aria Ia and IIa” (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/III (loose imitation right hand and violin; point of imitation between right and left hand in Reprises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillemain (1745)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/III (right hand and left hand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/III (head motif only in opening phrases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 6/I (points of imitation in first three phrases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand (1747)</td>
<td>Suite no. 1/I “Gay” section of “Ouverture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 1/III (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 2/II (loose imitation between right hand and left hand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 2/V (right hand and oboe/violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 2/VII (right hand and oboe/violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 4/I (loose imitation in all three voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 4/II (second “Bourée”–right hand and cello)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 4/V (“Musette en Canon”–all three voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 4/VI (“L’Affectueux Menuet” (section B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoreau (1754)</td>
<td>Pièce no 13 La Calliope (loose imitation in all three voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pièce no 14 (“Concert ouverture”–second section, loose imitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legrand (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/I (“Gaïment of Ouverture”—imitative only in head motif)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/III (loose and brief imitation between right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/III (brief imitation at beginning [right hand and violin] that becomes longer in modulating section in 2nd half)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 6/II “musette” (imitative in reprises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly (1756)</td>
<td>“Suite” no. 1/I (“Viste” of “Ouverture”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Suite’ no. 1/III (all three voices—see also C.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Suite’ no 2/II (both hands and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Herbain (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/II “Allegro” (right hand and violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Suite IV/I (“Vivement” of “Introduction”—all three voices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C.2a: Non-imitative trio texture--melody instrument dominated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 3/4/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1738)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/5/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 5/7a * (ritornello form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1748)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert 1/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 3/II (1st reprise) (see also “equal voice texture” for 2nd. Reprise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 4/II (see also C.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 5/II (opening phrases--see also imitative texture)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boismortier (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/I (“sicilienne”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 1/IV (in D.C. aria form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/I (“Rondement”--see also C.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/I *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/III* (menuet I and II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuïts (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 2/I* (keyboard with figured bass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/II * (keyboard with figured bass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/II (Aria I and II)* (right hand plays discant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 2/III*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/II (aria II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Asterisk denotes a clear-cut melody/accompaniment texture similar to that of the solo violin sonatas.*
**APPENDIX C.2a – Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Marchand (1747) | Suite 1/2 (violin has melody, but lots of motivic exchange)  
                Suite 2/1 ("cavalcade"--Ob. plays fanfare tune)*  
                Suite 2/8 (Theme: Ob./violin melody with figured bass)*  
                Var. 1: Ob. or Clavecin melody with varied bass line  
                Var. 2: Cl. et Violon si l’on veut--varied melody and bass line--see also ad libitum texture (see also C.6)  
                Suite 3/9 (two-part writing with melody marked “violoncelle”)  
                Suite 6 (all pieces are for solo harpsichord except for the last theme and variation)  
                Theme--violoncelle melody with fig. bass accompaniment*  
                Var. 1, 5, 7-- violoncelle melody with varied accompaniment  
                Var. 2, 4--variation for solo cello  
                Var. 3, 6--variation for solo harpsichord |

| Damoreau (1754) | No. 1 violin melody & accompaniment*  
                 No. 9 violin stays mostly on top  
                 No. 10 violin melody with right hand playing discant*  
                 No. 11 violin stays mostly on top--with unison between right hand and violin at end of phrases  
                 No. 16 (2nd. menuet)* |

| Legrand (ca.1755) | Sonata 1/II (violin melody & continuous clave. accompaniment)*  
                   (see Mondonville, Op. 3/5/II--also in G minor.) |

| D’Herbain (1756) | Sonata 3/II “Adagio” mostly parallel third (violin on top) |
APPENDIX C.2b: Non-imitative trio texture--keyboard dominated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville (1738)</td>
<td>Op. 3/2/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/2/II* (violin discant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert 1/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 1/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 2/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 3/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boismortier (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata 4/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrette (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/I (opening phrases--see also imitative texture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/II (musette)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuïts (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 4/II* (vièle plays discant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 6/III (Unison opening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillemain (1745)</td>
<td>Sonata 2/II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/II (altro--violin accompaniment mostly on top)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/III (see also C.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand (1747)</td>
<td>Suite 4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoreau (1754)</td>
<td>No. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legrand (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Sonata 3/II (right hand melody &amp; accompaniment*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly (1756)</td>
<td>“Suite” 2/I (violin participates in alternating rhythmic pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHerbain (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata 3/I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C.2b - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noblet (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/II “Gavotte” (right hand plays melody)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/II (violin plays discant melody)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Suite 6/II “Gavotte” (violin mostly plays secondary melody)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C.2c: Non-imitative trio texture—equal voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 3/1/II (imitative R.H/L.H); lots of voice exchange )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1738)</td>
<td>Op. 3/1/III (lots of voice pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/2/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/3/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/3/III (lots of voice exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/5/I (alternating voice pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3/5/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 5/1 (Da Capo Aria with fugal instrumental introduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1748)</td>
<td>Op. 5/2 (D. Segno aria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 5/4 (D. S. aria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 5/6 (D.S. aria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 5/7b (in Simple binary—lots of alternations between voice and keyboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 5/8 (D.S. aria with instrumental ritornello—ends with long unison passage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert 3/II (Rondeau I &amp; II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boismortier (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/III (for 2nd. reprise—see also C.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C.2c – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrette (1742)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/II (Musette)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/II (has voice exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/III (has voice exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/II (has exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/I (alternating voice pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/I (Unison opening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 1/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 1/III (has voice exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/I (has voice exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/II (alternating voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/I (an assortment of textures--unison opening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/II (aria I--rhythmic alternations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/II (like theme &amp; variations on Rondeau theme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Guillemain (1745) | Sonata 1/I (has voice exchange)  
Sonata 1/II (alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 1/II (altro)  
Sonata 1/III (unison at end of phrases)  
Sonata 2/I (Voice exchange)  
Sonata 2/III (alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 3/I (voice exchange)  
Sonata 3/II (“allegro”--alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 3/II (altro--alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 4/I (alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 4/II  
Sonata 4/III (alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 5/I (voice exchange, alternating voices)  
Sonata 5/II (alternating voice pairings)  
Sonata 5/II (altro-voice exchange)  
Sonata 5/III (constant voice exchange)  
Sonata 6/II |
| Marchand (1747) | Suite 1/3 (“carillon”)  
Suite 2/3 (lots of melodic exchange)  
Suite 2/4 (alternating voice pairings)  
Suite 2/5 (for descriptive purpose)  
Suite 2/6 (voice exchange)  
Suite 4/1 (lots of voice exchange)  
Suite 4/2 (1st Bourée—lots of melodic exchange)  
Suite no. 4/VI (“L’Affectueux Menuet” (Imitation starts in section B) |
| Damoreau (1754) | No. 2 (for 2 violins and clave.--violin and right hand have independent melodies)  
No. 15 (loose melodic and rhythmic voice exchange)  
No. 17 |
## APPENDIX C.2c – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legrand (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/I (melodic exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 3/III (unison opening, violin and right hand take turns to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be the top of parallel thirds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/I (voice exchange and alternating voice pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/III (“Tambourin” Mostly parallel thirds--right hand on top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in major and violin on top in mineur.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/II (violin is used to open up space a la Guillemain (1745))-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-(lots of melodic exchange in 2nd. reprise.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/III (alternating voice pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/II “musette” lots of parallel thirds (right hand on top);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>violin becomes more important in 1st reprise (imitative); 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reprise (canonic with left hand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/III (lots of rapid exchange in all three parts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (c.1755)</td>
<td>Suite 2/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 4/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly (1756)</td>
<td>“Suite” 2/III (alternating voice pairings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Herbain (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata 5/II “Adagio” (violin enters at the end in parallel thirds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noblet (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/I (lots of voice exchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 1/III “Tambourin” parallel sixths (violin on top)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/I “Les Bouffons” (alternating voice pairings--unison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passage at end of sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/II (right hand has main melody; violin plays secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>melody)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 2/III (alternating voice pairings with bits of imitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>texture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C.3: Concertante texture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 3/no. 4/I (mixed influence from trio sonata and concerto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1738)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert no. 5/II (also imitative texture)(more like trio sonata than concerto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 5/III (melody/accomp switch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 1/II (In Rondeau sections. Viele solo + fig. bass; then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keyboard repeats same melody + viele accomp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Suite 2/II/Air I  like Dupuits (1743) (violin solo accompanied by figured bass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 2/II/Air II (melody/accomp switch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly (1756)</td>
<td>‘Suite’ no. 1/III (true concertante writing in free voiced texture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Herbain (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/II (also in C.4) with brief keyboard cadenza,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 3/II (also in C.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 4/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 4/II “Allegro Moderato”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 6/II “Allegro”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C.4: Concerto texture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 3/I, II, and III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1738)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 5/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1748)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 1/I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 3/I (in Rondeau form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/I (<em>Rondeau</em>, not marked as “concerto,” but shows many features characteristic of a concerto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 5/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Suite no. 4/III (not marked as “concerto”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 6/1 (concerto for violin, Clavecin, and bass).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite no. 6/III (Figured keyboard part in violin solo sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Herbain (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata no. 2/II (also in Appendix C.3) (not marked as “concerto.” Has brief keyboard cadenza)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX C.5: Idiomatic keyboard texture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 3/no. 3/II (Violin and keyboard--see also “Imitative texture”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1738)</td>
<td>Op. 3/no. 3/III (Lots of exchange between violin and keyboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 5/no. 1 “Adagio” (voice and keyboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1748)</td>
<td>Op. 5/no. 8 (Ritornello 3 &amp; 4--voice and keyboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert 1/III (m.22 --Closing material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 3/I (m. 12--Second group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 4/II (strings and keyboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 5/I (All Episodic sections--see also “Imitative texture”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C.5 – Continued

Boismortier (1742)  
Sonata 1/III (m. 24--2nd. Reprise)  
Sonata 2/I (m. 13--Trans. to V)  
Sonata 3/I (opening period)  
Sonata 4/I (m. 11--sequence)  
Sonata no. 4/II (right hand and left hand--see also “Imitative texture”)  
Sonata no. 4/III (m. 12--Second group)  
Sonata no. 5/I (left hand and right hand--see also “Imitative texture”)  
Sonata no. 6/I (m.21--chromatic passing from vii° to V)

Corrette (1742)  
Sonata 2/I (m.56--Retrans.)  
Sonata 3/III (m. 64--Retrans.)  
Sonata 5/I (m. 38--sequence)  
Sonata 6/I (m.55--Codetta of 2nd. Reprise)  
Sonata 6/III (m.51--sequence)

Dupuits (1743)  
Sonata 6/I (vièle and keyboard)

Guillemain (1745)  
All except 2/I, II; 3/III; 4/II; 5/II; 6/II  
(frequently on Dominant pedal.)  
(See especially no. 6/III)

Marchand (1747)  
Suite 1/III “Carillon”  
Suite 2/I  
Suite 6/V--variation 3, 7

Damoreau (1754)  
Piéce 1 (“Double” m. 13--sequence)  
Piéce 10 (“Double” opening measures)

Legrand (ca.1755)  
Sonata 2/I (opening measures--prevalent throughout the movement)  
Sonata 2/II (opening measures--see also imitative texture)  
Sonata 4/I (Cadenza-like on V 4/2)  
Sonata 4/II (One-part texture--atmospheric)  
Sonata 5/I (lots of hand crossing technique)
**APPENDIX C.5 – Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon (ca.1755)</td>
<td>Suite 2/I (m. 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 4/I (scale passages and batterie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 4/III (scale passages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly (1756)</td>
<td>‘Suite’ 2/I (m. 76--Closing material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Herbain (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata 3/II (“Allegro” m. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata no. 3/II (also in IIId)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 4/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 5/I (opening measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 6/II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C.6: “Ad Libitum” Texture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>Op. 5/no. 3 (voice and then violin doubles right hand melody except for mm. 37--47, and mm. 83--86) Op. 5/no. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1748)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau (1741)</td>
<td>Concert 2/II “La Boucon”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert 2/IV 1st Menuet (String doubles the keyboard entirely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Menuet (String doubles the keyboard entirely except for the brief “call and response” texture in the opening measures which is repeated later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément (1743)</td>
<td>Sonata 3/II “Largo é affectuoso” (violin doubles keyboard mostly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata 3/III “minueto I” (violin doubles right hand throughout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“minueto II” (violin has its own independent part, but occasionally doubles the keyboard in unison or in thirds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand (1747)</td>
<td>Suite 2/8 (variation 2-- “clavecin et violon si l’on veut”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 3 (most of the violoncelle part is subordinate accompaniment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 9 “clavecin et violoncelle” in two-part notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 10--1st Badine “violoncelle et clave.” in two-part notation, although the melodic style and the articulation markings are idiomatic to cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoreau (1754)</td>
<td>No. 12 “L’Angelique” two-part writing--le violon peut jouier a l’unisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 16 (1st Menuet) two-part writing--le violon peut jouier a l’unisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Menuet--violin has the melody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly (1756)</td>
<td>“Suite” 1/II in triple meter—violin doubles right hand in section A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noblet (1756)</td>
<td>Sonata 2/III “menuet” I--violin alternately doubles left hand and right hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“menuet” II--sans violon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D: French overture in French accompanied keyboard collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Mvt title</th>
<th>Solo passages</th>
<th>Location of mvt.</th>
<th>Length and tempo</th>
<th>Formal Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville Pc en Sonates</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Has cadenza like passage at end of fast section</td>
<td>Sonata I, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>Grave (22mm)</td>
<td>Allegro fermata (40mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.1738)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand Pc de Clv (1747)</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Has soloistic passages in violin and keyboard (Grave)</td>
<td>Premiere Suite, 1st mvt</td>
<td>Gravement (34mm)</td>
<td>Gay end on slow note values of 3/2 meter (2mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoreau Pc de Clv (1754)</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin</td>
<td>CONCERT ouverture</td>
<td>Has cadenza-like keyboard solo passage (5mm) ending in unison with violin. (2nd section)</td>
<td>No. 12 in 5th key group</td>
<td>No tempo (22mm)</td>
<td>Fermata on a VI chord (116mm) Has cadenza-like keyboard solo passage (5mm), ending in unison with violin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legrand Pc de Clv en Sonates</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata Prm, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>Rondeau (12mm)</td>
<td>Gaïment rounded binary form (26mm + 62mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1755)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly Pc de Clv (1756)</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Head of collection (w violin)</td>
<td>Grave (22mm)</td>
<td>Viste (86mm)</td>
<td>Lent 3mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Pc de Clv (1761)</td>
<td>Pièces de clavecin</td>
<td>Introduction (ouverture in avertis'm')</td>
<td>Has soloistic keyboard runs (Grave)</td>
<td>1st mvt in Suite no. 4</td>
<td>Grave (20mm)</td>
<td>Reprise Vivement (95mm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX E: Instrumental choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>ca.1738</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rameau</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin + Viol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boismortier</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>ca.1742</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrette</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuits</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>ca.1741</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Vielle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clément</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillemain</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite II: mvt. 1-7,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mvt. 8: Thm, Variation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite II: mvt. 8: Variation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite III: mvt. 1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite III: mvt. 5a (Minuet I)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite III: mvt. 5b (Minuet II)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite III: mvt. 6-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite VI: mvt 1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite VI: mvt. 5 (Theme &amp; Variations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + cello + Violin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondonville</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Voice + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoreau</td>
<td>Mvt. 1,5-8, 8a-14</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mvt. 1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mvt. 1b,2,3,4,15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord + 2 Violins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legrand</td>
<td>Mvt. 1a</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duphly</td>
<td>Mvt. 1-3, 10-12</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mvt. 4-9, 13-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbain</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noblet</td>
<td>Suite I: Mvt. 6-8</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite II: Mvt. 7-9, 13-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite I: Mvt. 1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite II: Mvt. 1-6, 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Suite II: Mvt. 1-3</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Harpsichord + Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite III: Mvt. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite IV: Mvt. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite VI: Mvt. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-17, 21-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite I: Mvt. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite II: Mvt. 4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite III: Mvt. 1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite V: Mvt. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite VI: Mvt. 4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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