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Abstract

During the late seventeenth century in France, the viol was beginning to emerge as one of the most important musical instruments of the day. French luthiers had created the quintessential French viol, which allowed violists in France to make their mark on viol playing, both as performers and teachers. So fervent was this enterprise that players soon formed cliques, creating two opposing schools of viol playing. One of the main protagonists who is the focus of this thesis, De Machy, led one of these schools.

Although we are fully aware of this historical dichotomy, it is widely assumed that De Machy’s rivals were the eventual victors of this conflict, and thus have become the model for modern violists to emulate. This has, however, encouraged modern violists to completely disregard the efforts of De Machy, which, as this thesis shall demonstrate, are as important as those of his contemporaries.

Chapter 1 discusses De Machy’s place in modern scholarship, giving readers an overall view of the kinds of biases and prejudices that currently exist. It also serves to act as a brief collation and analysis of modern writings that discuss De Machy.

Chapter 2 provides us with a historical account of the viol in France, giving special emphasis to solo viol playing. It also traces the evolution of musical style and playing technique as well as the development of the instrument within its social role.

Chapter 3 discusses French ornamentation on plucked instruments, keyboard instruments and the viol, giving special emphasis to De Machy’s own ideas on ornamentation. Possible explanations for the proper execution of these ornaments are also provided.

Chapter 4 revaluates Rousseau and the Traité de la Viole (1687), and seeks to determine its reliability as a credible source of information.
Chapter 5 describes and analyses the quarrel between De Machy and Rousseau as described by Rousseau in the *Réponse de Monsieur Rousseau* (1688). In addition to providing a more complete picture of the social interactions of the viol community of the late seventeenth century, this chapter seeks to better explain the issues that De Machy and Rousseau argued about.

Chapter 6 examines historical and modern writings and attempts to explain one of the main issues of aforementioned quarrel, the left hand position otherwise known as the *ports de main* as advocated by De Machy.

Appendix A reproduces the *avertissement* from De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle*. The facsimile of the original publication is presented alongside the English translation. This document is central to many of the issues discussed in this thesis. Appendix B is an English translation of the *Réponse de Monsieur Rousseau*.

One of the aims of this thesis is to re-examine the history of the viol in France, and more specifically, its use as a solo instrument. It is through De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle* and Rousseau’s *Réponse* that most of this information is centred.
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Chapter 1

De Machy in the Modern Writings

Introduction

When researching the modern writings concerning De Machy, one soon realises how little information is available. One is occasionally faced with a sense of incomplete scholarship, misunderstanding and sometimes downright disfavour. In my opinion, this widespread negativity is attributed to a general lack of understanding of the viol repertory of the seventeenth century and the difficulty experienced by present-day scholars and violists when interpreting the writings and pieces contained in De Machy’s Pièces de Violle (1685).¹

In addition, much of the information about De Machy is derived from Rousseau’s Traité de la Viole (1687)² and Réponse de Monsieur Rousseau (1688),³ which, as this thesis shall show, is an unreliable source of information. Unfortunately, this information has created a negative image of De Machy, influencing their opinions.

In this chapter, the modern writings discussing De Machy will be analysed. They will be presented in chronological order, so that it will be possible to observe how the views and opinions of De Machy have changed over the years.

¹ The avertissement to De Machy’s Pièces de Violle and its translation is reproduced in Appendix A.
² London: British Library Hirsch i. 513.
Examples in Recent Scholarship

Possibly one of the earliest articles (1944) on the viol and its solo repertoire, “The Music for Unaccompanied Bass Viol”\(^4\) by Charles. W. Hughes discusses De Machy:

> It is clear from what has been said above that the bass viol was variously employed. Perhaps no one has summarized these varieties more clearly than Le Sieur de Machy in the preface [avertissement] to his “Pièces de Violle” of 1685. \(^5\)

Hughes proceeds to describe De Machy’s purported ways of playing the viol, as proposed in De Machy’s avertissement.\(^6\) Concerning unaccompanied viol music with respect to De Machy’s viol pieces, Hughes writes:

> Thus the pieces [De Machy’s Pièces de Violle] under discussion here form a well-defined class characterized by their use of harmony. Harmony on any instrument with a fingerboard is limited both by the number of notes which are sufficiently close on the fingerboard to be grasped and by the fact that the structure of the human hand is easily adjusted only to certain of these possibilities. Thus a limited number of chords in a few easily available positions tend to reappear with such frequency as to give such music a special character.\(^7\)

However, Hughes misrepresents De Machy from the claim he makes on his books, being “the first up to now that have appeared”, on the title page of the Pièces de Violle (Fig. 1).\(^8\) Hughes writes:

> The title-page of Machy’s “Pièces de Violle” of 1685 bears the statement: “Elles…sont les premières qui jusque à présent ayent paru

\(^5\) Ibid., 150.
\(^6\) De Machy explained that there were four different ways of playing the viol: playing pieces of harmony, accompanying oneself while singing, playing with others in consort and plucking the strings. See chapter 2 on “De Machy”.
\(^7\) Hughes, 151.
au jour”. This statement, as readers of this study will understand, is not true unless we ignore the English literature with which the Sieur de Machy was evidently not familiar. If we restrict the field to music published in France, we must grant his claim.⁹

Fig. 1 De Machy, Pièces de Violle (1685), title page.

Clearly, De Machy’s claim was for having being the first to publish viol music in France. This statement was probably made in response to the request of certain “people of merit”:

Several people of merit have asked me why up to now no one has published a book of pieces for the viol, like those that have been published for other instruments….¹⁰

There has been so much published foreign solo music in the past that it is highly unlikely that De Machy had no knowledge of the English literature that Hughes refers to. De Machy’s comment on the practices of foreign violists is evidence of this fact.¹¹

---

⁹ Hughes, 156.
¹⁰ Sieur de Machy, 1: Plusieurs personnes de merite m’ont demandé pourquoi l’on n’avait pas mis jusqu’ici au jour quelque Livre de Pieces de Violle, comme on a fait pour les autres Instrument,¹¹ Ibid., 3: Les Italiens, les Allemans, les Polonois, les Suedois, les Danois & les Anglois ont toujours suvy cette maxime; & l’illustre Monsieur Hautemant s’en servoit aussi pour enseigner, comme on le peut justifier par plusieurs pieces écrites de sa main, qui se trouvent à Paris & ailleurs.
At this point in history, there is no sense of negativity detected. Hughes’ scholarship is mainly descriptive. As this article attempts to survey the entire solo viol repertory, it does not discuss De Machy’s music outside the context of its time and genre.

In 1960, François Lesure reproduces a modern edition of the Réponse in his article “Une querelle sur le jeu de la viole en 1688: J. Rousseau contre Demachy”. He also includes some biographical information on Rousseau and De Machy, as well as a summary of the issues discussed in the Réponse. The information provided by Lesure is brief (three pages) and is also mostly descriptive. The article, however, erroneously misdates De Machy’s Pièces de Violle to 1686.

Ten years later, in Die solistische Gambenmusik in Frankreich von 1650 bis 1740, Barbara Schwendowius discusses De Machy, including his use of diminutions (with a brief biographical mention in the footnotes), his instruction on the tenué, his use of multiple voice writing, his characteristic use of melodic and harmonic writing, his compositional style and his ideas on ornamentation. Schwendowius also describes the issues of the quarrel between De Machy and Rousseau. Although Schwendowius’ research is extensive, it is also mostly descriptive.

Gordon Kinney's article “A “Tempest in a Glass of Water” or a Conflict of Esthetic Attitudes” focuses on the argument between De Machy and Rousseau, and

---

13 Ibid., 182: Dans un article paru en 1953 j’avais suggéré que cette note visât l’Avertissement placé par Demachy en tête de ses Pièces (1686).
14 Barbara Schwendowius, Die solistische Gambenmusik in Frankreich von 1650 bis 1740 (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse Verlag, 1970), 66.
15 Ibid., 108.
16 Ibid., 111-114.
17 Ibid., 126-129.
18 Ibid., 131.
19 Ibid., 192-194.
20 Ibid., 159-162.
completely summarizes it. He discusses the one of the main topics of the argument, the left hand position on the viol or *port de main*, and incorporates useful historical examples. He does, however, not give the reader a definite conclusion concerning the argument. The article seems to be a description of an argument between the two men, rather than an analysis of the controversy.

In James R. Anthony's *French Baroque Music from Beaujoyeulx to Rameau*, Anthony devotes four pages towards “Suites for Viol”. In it, everything from the early seventeenth century until the mid-eighteenth century is summarised, essentially explaining the viol's place in Baroque France from André Maugars (early 17th century) to Jean-Baptiste Forqueray (mid-18th century). Concerning De Machy, he explains, “These *Pièces de Violles* were composed by De Machy, about whom little is known”. In this instance, a lack of attention towards the original source (De Machy’s work) can be observed. The title page (Fig. 1) of De Machy’s work states *Pièces de Violle*, not *Pièces de Violles* – a small but important difference.

There appears to be some variants to De Machy’s name. As a result of the engraver’s decision in typography, the cover page of the *Pièces de Violle* prints De Machy’s name in capital letters, appearing as “M’. DEMACHY” (Fig. 1).

It is clear, however, from the *Extrait du Privilege du Roy* (Fig. 2) that De Machy is addressed as “Sieur de Machy”. In Abraham du Pradel’s *Le livre commode* (1692), De Machy is mentioned amongst other “Maîtres pour la Violle” as Monsieur

---

23 Ibid., 340.
24 Sieur de Machy, 12.
25 The use of the honorific title Sieur was widespread during the time. According to the *Dictionnaire de L’Académie française* (Paris, 1694): SIEUR, s. m. (Il n'est que d'une syllable.) Especie de titre d'honneur, dont l'usage ordinaire est renfermé dans les plaidoyez, dans les actes publics, & autres écritures de même sorte. Je plaide pour le sieur Marquis de, &c. C'est aussi un titre qui se donne dans les lettres missives, & autres écritures particulières, par un supérieur à un inférieur. Vous direz au sieur tel qu'il fasse, &c.
“de Machy”.26 In the Capitation (1696), he is also mentioned amongst other violists, but this time simply as “Machy”.27 In the Réponse de Monsieur Rousseau, where Rousseau indirectly refers to him, he is called “Monsieur M”.28 Because of this inconsistency in historical sources and the need to address the composer in a reader-friendly way in the English language, the composer will simply be referred to as “De Machy” in the main text of this thesis.29

Fig. 2 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Extrait du Privilege du Roy.

Admittedly, as stated by Anthony, not much is known about De Machy; however, Anthony’s treatment of other parts of the French viol repertoire is disproportionate to what he gives as De Machy’s contribution, as will be demonstrated in the following sections of this thesis.

In the article, “Marin Marais and His Contemporaries”, Julie A. Sadie chooses to belittle the efforts of De Machy. When comparing Marais’ works to De Machy’s, she writes:

27 Capitation Archives Nationales Z1H657, Capitation 13, January 1696, Musiciens Simphonistes. Y sont listés entre autres: De La Grauveuse – Violes, Forcroy père, Forcroy fils, Machy, Rousseau, Le Moyne. I am indebted to Jonathan Dunford for this information.
29 This decision was made with the knowledge of the conventions of the time. For more information on French names at the time, see Lionel Sawkins, “An Encore to the Lexicographer’s dilemma, or de Lalande et du Bon Sens,” Fontes Artis Musicae 28, no. 4 (1981): 319-323.
Although Sadie provides no explanation for her decision to devalue De Machy’s work, it is clear that De Machy’s publication was significant in its time. Other than the efforts of Rousseau in the *Traité* and *Réponse* to criticise it, Marais includes information in the *avertissement* of his *Pièces à une et à deux violes* to persuade the users of Machy’s techniques to play his pieces.

Sadie may have misunderstood the intention of De Machy’s work. The didactic nature of De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle*, with its fourteen-page *avertissement*, clearly shows that it was intended as a learner’s handbook. This is in contrast with Marais’ *Pièces à une et à deux violes*, which was conceived as a book with varying pieces for the performing pleasure of violists. Naturally, this would allow Marais greater compositional liberties. In spite of this, De Machy’s *Pièces* are not simple pieces.

De Machy's and Marais’ music represent music written in different styles. During the time, a distinction was made between two styles of viol playing: the melodic style (playing a melodic line only) and the harmonic style (chords and polyphony).

While De Machy and Marais wrote their pieces in both harmonic and melodic styles, Marais’ solo pieces from the *Pièces à une et à deux violes* were probably conceived with a *basso continuo* accompaniment in mind; however, they may have been played unaccompanied because of the initial absence of a *basse continue* part. Furthermore,

---

32 See chapter 4 on “Rousseau and his *Traité*” and chapter 5 “Quarrel Over Viol Playing: Rousseau vs. De Machy” for a detailed analysis of Rousseau’s attempts at criticising De Machy’s work. See chapter 2 on “The Beginnings of Basso Continuo in France” for a discussion of Marais’ *avertissement*.
33 All of Marais’ *avertissements* in his books of viol pieces are brief, the longest being only four pages.
34 Jean Rousseau, *Traité de la viole* (Paris, 1687), 56–64. The terms *jeu de melodie* and *jeu d’harmonie* are first seen in Rousseau’s *Traité*.
35 This initial absence of a *basse continue* part from 1686–1689 suggests that the solo pieces from Marais’ *Pièces à une et à deux violes* were played unaccompanied. There is also evidence to suggest that
Marais’ pieces are usually presented accompanied, whereas De Machy’s are unaccompanied. Because of these differences, it is unfair to judge the works of these two composers by the same criterion. Unfortunately, it is clear that there has developed a negative view of De Machy on the part of Sadie.

*The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* also gives a meagre representation of De Machy. In the 1980 edition, Robert Donington writes:

> His music comprises eight suites of no special merit….

It is difficult to understand why Donington came to such a conclusion. Perhaps he made this comparison to viol music of the later eighteenth century, and not those of De Machy’s predecessors. He also explains:

> In the preface [avertissement] he claimed to be the first to publish music for the viol, which is in general untrue….

De Machy’s claim in the *avertissement* was not for having published music for the viol, but for being “the first made in print on this subject”. As discussed previously, it is highly unlikely that De Machy was unaware of the publications of viol music outside France, considering his experience. Therefore, it is more probable that De Machy was describing his position as either the first to publish a viol “treatise” in France (in the form of the *avertissement*) or the first to publish viol music in France. Donington further elaborates:

---

these pieces did not achieve widespread popularity until after the publication of *basse continue* part. See chapter 2 on “The Beginnings of Basso Continuo in France”.


37 Ibid.

38 Sieur de Machy, 11: *Estant le premier qui ait fait imprimer sur ce sujet*. 
[This] may refer in particular to that variety of solo music that includes sufficient chords to make it playable unaccompanied, which was already common practice among French and other viol players of the 17th century.\footnote{Robert Donington: “Machy, Sieur de”, The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians ed. S. Sadie (London: Macmillan 1980), xi, 440.}

This is untrue. Such “variety of solo music” does not exist at all. It has never been a requisite for solo viol music to have “sufficient chords” to enable it to be played unaccompanied. Music from French violists of the time was never constantly filled with chords, and neither were the suites of De Machy. Donington continues:

Machy’s preface also contains information on ornaments, which requires a certain caution because of his tendency to give unfamiliar names to familiar ornaments.\footnote{Ibid.}

Ornaments and their corresponding symbols were yet to be standardised during De Machy’s time. This can be easily observed in the works of other violists, where many of the same ornaments were often given different names and symbols.\footnote{A summary of symbols for ornaments and their intentions can be found in Schwendowius, 225-229.} Hence, it is unfair to attribute this irregularity to De Machy, since this issue was an ongoing one in seventeenth century France.\footnote{For an explanation of the symbols and intentions in De Machy’s table of ornaments, see chapter 3 on “Ornamentation according to De Machy”.}

In academic writings, we are also faced with similar negative attitudes towards De Machy. Lucy Robinson’s thesis, “The Forquerays and French Viol Tradition”, which was produced in the 1980s, states:

In 1686, when Marais published his first books of pièces de viole, he produced a volume of exquisitely polished compositions. The finesse of these pieces is in striking contrast to the comparatively rudimentary works of his predecessors – notably the Pièces de Violle of Demachy, which had been published the previous year.\footnote{Lucy Robinson, “The Forquerays and French Viol Tradition” (Ph.D., University of Cambridge, 1980-1981), 47.}
It is unclear why Robinson declares De Machy’s works as rudimentary. Perhaps, like Sadie, Robinson has also misunderstood the intention of De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle*.

It is clear that there is no mention of the simple nature of De Machy’s music amongst his contemporaries. In fact, his music, with its many chords, elaborate ornamentation and liberal use of the entire viol tessitura, seem to indicate that De Machy was a composer who knew how to exploit the abilities of the viol. Robinson also explains:

> There was however controversy over one issue: the placing of the left-hand thumb. The conservative faction, led by Demachy, clung close to the heritage of Hotman and the lutenists on this score, but the progressive group, who were to win the dispute, modelled their technique on Sainte Colombe.  

Robinson surprisingly claims victory on the side of the followers of Sainte Colombe. As will be demonstrated in later chapters, the dispute concerning the left hand position, the *port de main*, did not produce any clear victor. It appears Robinson is assuming that the success of later eighteenth-century French violists, like Marais, is an indication of the universal acceptance of Sainte Colombe’s technique.

Robinson also attempts to portray De Machy as an old-fashioned violist who was a product of Hotman’s influence. It is clear that De Machy did not completely align his views on viol playing with those of Hotman. De Machy’s pieces display a greater preference for chordal writing when compared to those of Hotman. The only comment De Machy made concerning Hotman is his use of tablature for teaching

---

44 Ibid., 72.
45 See chapter 2 on “Sainte Colombe” for an explanation on Sainte Colombe’s name.
46 Although Marais, Danoville and Rousseau’s publications advocate Sainte Colombe’s *port de main*, it is simplistic to conclude that all violists disregarded De Machy’s instructions. Rousseau’s *Réponce* reveals possible details about other musicians who were supporters of De Machy. This is further discussed in chapter 5.
47 See chapter 2 on “Maugars and Hotman” for an explanation on Hotman’s name.
beginners, simply referring to him as “the illustrious Monsieur Hautemant [sic]”. De Machy makes no particular effort to express his admiration for Hotman, despite having studied with him. In contrast, Rousseau mentions Hotman many times in his Traité and Réponse expressing his admiration for him.

In the 2001 edition of The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Robinson writes:

De Machy was a conservative, committed to generating a rear-guard action against the new progressive school of viol playing in the hands of Sainte-Colombe’s pupils, notably Marais, Danoville and Rousseau.50

This statement demonstrates how De Machy is viewed out of context. The three pupils of Sainte Colombe mentioned by Robinson published their music and writings after De Machy; hence, it is unreasonable to view De Machy’s actions as a reaction against them.51

Even in the most recent writings, we are faced with misinterpretation and a lack of first-hand practical knowledge. Annette Otterstedt's book, The Viol,52 inaccurately explains De Machy’s description of two ornaments:

But there are also shakes that start slowly and accelerate. De Machy, for example, distinguished between a tremblement and a petit tremblement ('shake' and 'little shake'); of course, this might also mean a long or a short appoggiatura.53

---

49 Sieur de Machy, 3: l’illustre Monsieur Hautemant s’en servoit aussi pour enseigner.
51 De Machy’s Pièces de Viole was published in 1685. Marais’ Pièces à une et à deux violes was published in 1686. Danoville’s L’art de toucher le dessus et basse de viole and Rousseau’s Traité de la Viole were both published in 1687.
53 Ibid., 196.
De Machy's ornaments for the viol were the most complex for its time and he consciously tried to make sure that his readers understood their meaning. De Machy clearly explains:

It is necessary that the *tremblement* should be leant [*appuyer*]°4 on according to the value of the note, & played evenly. The *petit tremblement*, which is what is called a pull on the Lute, is made in the same way, except is not continued.°5

As explained by De Machy, the *tremblement* is a trill that begins on the upper auxiliary note (*appuyer*). The length of the auxiliary note is determined by that of the main note; hence, becoming a longer or shorter appoggiatura according to the situation. It is clear that the length of the appoggiatura is not dependant on it being called a *tremblement* or *petit tremblement*. Also, the trill should be executed “evenly”. Hence, an acceleration of the trill, as proposed by Otterstedt, is unlikely.°6

De Machy’s music is also neglected amongst performing violists. At the time of writing this thesis, there are only three compact discs available containing his music: those by Jonathan Dunford, Jordi Savall and Toshiko Shishido.°7 Dunford’s recording includes all the pieces from the second book (written in tablature), whereas both Savall's and Shishido's are a selection of pieces from both the first and second book (both music notation and tablature). No single performer has recorded the complete works of De Machy.

°4 The *appuyer* refers to the upper auxiliary note in a trill.
°5 Sieur de Machy, 8-9: *Il faut appuyer le tremblement selon la valuer de la note, & le faire égal. Le petit tremblement, qui est ce qu'on nomme un tiret sur le Luth, se fait de même, excepté qu'il n'est pas continué.*
°6 See chapter 3 on “Ornamentation according to De Machy”.
°7 I have not mentioned recordings with only selected movements by De Machy, such as in compilation albums.
Conclusion

The misconceptions and neglect demonstrated in the works of these modern writers demonstrate the need for a better understanding of the works of De Machy. Despite the overbearing prejudice seen, an alternative view of De Machy is provided by Robert Green, who writes:

In justice to De Machy, there is little question of his competence as a composer or the beauty of some of his music. Further, De Machy, in spite of his protests, did write very well in the melodic style.58

While there is an attempt to place De Machy somewhere within the seventeenth-century French school of viol playing, it is obvious that the historical information that has been handed down to us has yet to be examined objectively and thoroughly. Questions pertaining to the techniques advocated by De Machy have never been discussed or analysed fully by present-day scholars and violists. The following chapters will address these issues and this lack of attention toward De Machy, and better represent his contribution to the history and development of the viol.

---

58 Robert A. Green, “Annotated translation and commentary of the works of Jean Rousseau: a study of late seventeenth century musical thought and performance practice.” (Ph.D., Indiana University, 1979), 149-150.
Chapter 2

A Brief History of the Solo Viol Tradition in France

Introduction

Traditional accounts of the history of the viol in France have largely had a general focus, describing the developments of the viol from its introduction in the sixteenth century to its rise in the late seventeenth century and demise in the later part of the eighteenth century. These accounts have discussed the viol in every capacity: as an instrument in consort, solo and chamber music. However, the viol - like the lute, theorbo and harpsichord - had always been a self-sufficient instrument, being capable of performing music without accompaniment. It is through this mode of expression that De Machy, as well as many other violists, wrote their music. This re-examination of the history of the viol attempts to focus on the viol’s development as a solo instrument prior to the introduction of basso continuo. This will include primary and secondary sources as well as those derived from recent research. It is hoped that this chapter will highlight the importance of this genre of solo music for the viol, while understanding the importance of De Machy’s contribution towards the development of the instrument.

Beginnings in France

The viol in France began as an ensemble instrument. It was used in many kinds of situations, both in a secular and sacred context, from the court to the chamber. The role of the viol was predominantly that of an accompanying instrument for voices and other instruments. As described by the French theorist Pierre Trichet (c.1580-c.1640),
the viol was “highly suitable for consorts of music, whether one should want to mingle them with voices or to combine them with other kinds instruments”.\textsuperscript{59}

It is unclear exactly when the viol arrived in France. Activities during the sixteenth century suggest that the French royalty may have imported violists from Italy. François I (1494-1547), who was often referred to le Père et Restaurateur des Lettres, is known to have been a patron of the arts, supporting Italian and French artist, poets and musicians at his châteaux at Chambord and Fontainebleau. Notable musicians from the Maison du Roy include Antonius Divitis, Jean de Bouchefort and Rogier Pathie.\textsuperscript{60}

From the records of expenditure of music at the French court, we come across two Mantuan lutenists: Alberto da Ripa (c.1500-1551) and Albert Trame.\textsuperscript{61} It is conceivable that amongst these imported Italian musicians were violists. However, in 1543, when François I created the Musique de Chambre, it is clear that the viol had established its place in court, with the position of violiste du Roy held by Claude Gervaise (fl 1540-60).\textsuperscript{62}

During this period, in pictorial evidence, we observe viols being depicted in ensemble settings, as a drawing attributed to Nicolas Houel, dated 1538, clearly shows (Fig. 3):


\textsuperscript{60} Frank Dobbins: “François I, King of France”, \textit{Grove Music Online} ed. L. Macy (Accessed 23 April 2008), <http://www.grovemusic.com>

\textsuperscript{61} Robinson, “The Forquerays”, 1. I am unable to find information on Albert Trame. Robinson speculates that these lutenists may have played the viol.

Fig. 3 Detail of a consort of viols in a drawing from 1538. ⁶³

In another piece of pictorial evidence from 1608, during the funeral ceremonies for Charles III, Duke of Lorraine, a viol is shown in its capacity as an accompanying instrument (Fig. 4 & 5).

It was from the viol consort repertory that we first see pieces written specifically for the viol. This musical tradition, which was common throughout England, grew to become extremely popular in France. By the 1540s, Gervaise was said to have written a *Premier livre de violle contenant dix chansons*, but this has unfortunately been lost. Other works of the time include the *fantaisies* of Claude Le

---

64 Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale F-Pn, Estampes, Pe 52, f. 7 & f.25. Engraving by Herman de Loye after Friedrich Brentel (1580–1651) and Claude de la Ruelle, *Pourtraict de la Sale funèbre preparées à Nancy en l'Hostel Ducal, pour le corps de feuë Son Altesse de Lorraine Monseigneur le Duc Charles 3e du Nom, lors de ses obseques & funerailles in Pompe funèbre de Charles III Duc de Lorraine* (detail).

65 Ibid.

66 Contained in the *Table biographique des auteurs et compositeurs de musique dont les ouvrages sont a la Bibliothéque Nationale* [5 voll. mss., F-Bn (Reserve Vmd. 22-26)] by Paulle-Louis Roualle de Boisgelou (1734-1806): *Ir Livre de jeu de Viole (en tablature et en notes) contenant 10 chansons avec l’introduction de l’accorder et appliquer les doigts selon la manière qu’on accoutumé de jouer. par Cl. Gervaise.*
Jeune (c.1529-c.1600) from his *Second Livre des Meslanges* (1612), the fantasies of Eustache du Caurroy (1549-1609) and Charles Guillet (c.1575-1654) dated 1610, the préludes of Henry Du Mont (c.1610-1684) from his *Meslanges* (1657), *Fugues et caprices* (1660) of François Roberday (1624-1680) and the fantasies for 2 viols of Louis Couperin (c.1626-1661).

While the French were initially content with this role for the viol as an ensemble instrument, the Italians had already adopted the viol for solo playing. Far earlier than the French, by the middle of the sixteenth century, we see the emergence of viol tutors, namely those by Sylvestro di Ganassi dal Fontego (c.1492-c.1550) and Diego Ortiz (c.1510-c.1570). Italian violists had already established the viol as a virtuosic instrument, being capable of performing both solo and ensemble music.

One of the earliest references to the viol in France comes from Philibert Jambe de Fer (c.1515-c.1566). In his *Epitome Musical* (Lyons, 1556), he describes the viol and discusses topics such as its tuning, construction and application. On the social position of viols in France he writes:

> Why do we call these viols, and the others violins? We call viols those with which gentlemen, merchants and other men of virtue pass their time.

Unlike violins, which were “rough”, viols were the more dignified instruments that were played by people of a higher social class. Viols were the instruments of the
nobility, while violins were those of the working musician. Jambe de Fer also distinguishes between the six-string Italian and the five-string French viol (Fig. 6), noting how the Italian type shared a greater similarity to the lute:

The viol in use in France has only five strings, and those in Italy have six, the French viol is strung in fourths from string to string, without any exception. Those of Italy are strung just like the lute, namely in thirds and fourths.75

This information is corroborated by Marin Mersenne (1588-1648), who writes:

But before giving the figure of the viol which is used now, I give the figure of that which was used earlier, which had only five strings.76

---

75 Ibid., 58-59: La Viole à l’usage de France n’a que cinq cordes, & celle d’Italie en à six, la viole Frácoise s’accorde à la quarte de corde en corde sans exception aucune. Celle d’Italie d’accorde iustemèt come le lucz, assauoir quarte, & tierce.

Fig. 6 An early five-string viol.\textsuperscript{77}

According to the Mersenne:

Although viols are capable of all kinds of music, such as those in the examples which I gave for the concert of violins, they do however require pieces that are more sad and more serious and whose measure is longer and later; and as such they are suitable to accompany the voice. However one can play all kinds of pieces, not only those with five parts, as is done ordinarily on the violins, but even six, seven, twelve, and as many parts as one wants; which can similarly be executed by all the other instruments, to a certain extent. But it is enough to put here at beginning of a Composition of six parts, which has two Dessus, two Basses, one Taille & one Haute-contre.\(^7^8\)

It is this very activity of playing pieces with many different parts in the form of the viol consort that may have occurred at the concerts by Jacques Mauduit (1557-1627). From around 1589-1610, according to the French historian Henri Sauval (1623-1676), Mauduit directed the *Académie de poésie et de musique* and was responsible for a multitude of large-scale concerts in France.\(^7^9\) This major enterprise undoubtedly brought about advancements to the viol, allowing Mauduit to add “the sixth string to viols which had only five previously.”\(^8^0\) Mersenne also attributes to Mauduit the introduction of the viol consort in France, but this may not be true, as seen in the iconographical evidence.\(^8^1\)

Other information of viols from this period is derived from Jean Rousseau, albeit writing at a much later time:

---

\(^7^8\) Mersenne, *Harmonie Universelle*, vol. 3, book 4, prop. vii, 198: *Encore que les Violes soient capables de toutes sortes de Musique, & que les exemples que l'ai donné pour le concert des Violons leur puissent servir, neantmoins elles demandent des pieces plus triste et plus graves et dont la mesure soit plus longue et plus tardive; de là vient qu'elles sont propres pour accompagner les voix. Or l'on peut ioüer toutes sortes de pieces non seulement à cinq parties, comme l'on fait ordinairement sur les Violons, mais à six, à sept, à douze, & à tout autant de parties que l'on veut; ce qui peut semblablement estre executé par tous les autres instrumens, qui ont assez d'estendue. Mais il suffit de mettre icy le commencement d'une Composition à six parties, laquelle a deux Dessus, deux Basses, une Taille & une Haute-contre;* trans. R. E. Chapman.


\(^8^0\) Mersenne, *Harmonie Universelle*, vol. 1, Première préface générale au lecteur: *à sçavoir que Jacques Mauduit a joué la 6 chord aux violes, qui n'en avoient que cinq auparavant.*

\(^8^1\) See Fig. 3, 4 & 5.
The viol appears to us as one of the newest instruments, because it has been esteemed in France for only a short time and because the lute, guitar, and other instruments seem to us to be much older.\footnote{Rousseau, Traité, 1: Quoique la Viole nous paroisse un Instrument des plus nouveaux, parce qu’il y peu de temps qu’elle est estimée en France, & que le Luth, la Guitarre, & plusieurs autres Instruments nous semblent beaucoup plus anciens; the following translations of the Traité de la viole (footnotes 85-86) are from Robert A. Green, “Annotated translation and commentary of the works of Jean Rousseau: a study of late seventeenth century musical thought and performance practice” (Ph.D., Indiana University, 1979), 280-430.}

Rousseau also mentions the older five-string instrument and describes its musical use:

\begin{quote}
[T]he viols played in France had five very big strings and were used for accompanying.\footnote{Ibid., 19: les première Violes dont on a joyé en France estoient à cinq cordes & fort grandes, leur usage estoit d’accompagner.}
\end{quote}

He also claims that the French viol was in fact an innovation of its own, despite admitting to the English’s initial advancement in viol construction:

\begin{quote}
It is true that the English reduced their viols to a convenient size before the French, as is easy to tell from the old English viols for which we have particular esteem in France, but it must be admitted that French makers gave the final perfection to the viol when they found the secret of pulling the neck back a little and making it thinner.\footnote{Ibid., 22: Il est vray que les Anglois ont reduit leurs Violes à une grandeur commode, devant les François, comme il est facile d’en juger par les Anciennes Violes d’Angleterre, dont nous faisons une estime particulière en France: mais aussi il faut avouer que les Faiseurs d’Instruments Français ont donné la dernière perfection à la Viole, lors qu’il ont trouvé le secret de renverser un peu le Manche en arriere, & d’en diminuer l’espaisseur.}
\end{quote}

The development of the viol in France was primitive in comparison to the advancements of the rest of Western Europe. For reasons unknown, French viols resisted modernisation and remained in this old-fashioned state for far longer than the Italian viols.

The English, on the other hand, made more progress. Many musicians from Italy travelled to England, bringing their musical traditions with them. Alfonso Ferraboso (1543-1588), the Bolognese madrigalist, who commuted between Italy and
England, was attributed to being the first person to bring the viol to England.\textsuperscript{85} His son, Alfonso Ferrabosco the Younger (c.1575-1628) went on to become one of the most important and influential violists in England. Similarly, the Englishman John Cooper (c.1570-1626), who had his name Italianised to Coprario, spent some of his time in Italy. He, like Ferrabosco the Younger, also wrote a large amount pieces for the viol consort.\textsuperscript{86}

As for solo music, the English developed a style of playing called the \textit{Lyra-way}. This was a type of music that was played with a smaller bass viol that was called a \textit{Lyra} viol.\textsuperscript{87} Notable composers who wrote in this style include Tobias Hume (c.1579-1645), Christopher Simpson (c.1602-1669), William Corkine (fl 1610–17) and Charles Coleman (d.1664). It is unsurprising that this activity paved the way for an English school of viol making. This golden period of English viol making was led by makers such as Henry Jaye (c.1610-67) and John Rose (fl 1552-61), making English viols one of the most highly regarded instruments of the time.\textsuperscript{88}

The developments of the French violists were closely related to the activities of the English. Although the solo viol tradition had begun in Italy by the mid-sixteenth century, the influence of the solo viol tradition arrived from England rather than from Italy.\textsuperscript{89} Rousseau writes:

\begin{quote}
[The Viol] has passed from the Egyptians to the Greeks, from the Greeks to the Italians, and from the Italians to the English, who were the first to compose and play pieces in the harmonic style on the viol. Some have carried this knowledge to other kingdoms, like Walderon to the court of Saxony, Boulder to the Spanish court, Joung
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{85} Ernest Thoinan, \textit{Maugars Réponse faite à un curieux sur le sentiment de la musique d'Italie escrit à Rome le premier Octobre 1639} (London: H. Baron, 1965), 34.
\textsuperscript{87} John Playford, \textit{An Introduction to the Skill of Music} (London, 1674), 101.
\textsuperscript{89} Maugars had travelled and stayed in England in the 1620s. While in exile in Italy, he explains that there is “no one in Italy now who excels at it [the viol]”. De Machy had specific knowledge of the English \textit{lyra-way} style. More details will be revealed in the following section of this chapter.
associated with the Count of Innsbruck, Preis to Vienna, and several other different places.\textsuperscript{90}

Although this information concerning the transmission process from the Egyptians to the Greeks is dubious, the English tradition of writing “pieces in the harmonic style”, i.e. the lyra-way, had firmly placed the viol in the forefront of the solo instrumental genre in England as the repertoire shows.\textsuperscript{91} The French were soon to follow suit.

\textbf{André Maugars and Nicolas Hotman}

The beginnings of the solo viol tradition in France can be traced back to two men: André Maugars (c.1580-c.1645) and Nicolas Hotman (c.1610-1663).\textsuperscript{92} Mersenne praises both as outstanding violists of their day:

\textit{[T]here be none in France to compare either to Maugars or to Hotman… who excel in so many divisions, & such delicate, & and sweet bowing, [and] there is nothing in harmony which they do not express perfectly, especially when someone else is simultaneously playing the Clavichord [harpischord?] with them.}\textsuperscript{93}

Rousseau agrees with Mersenne and states:

\textsuperscript{90} Rousseau, \textit{Traité}, 17-18: \textit{car elle a passé des Egyptiens aux Grecs, des Grecs aux Italiens, & des Italiens aux Anglois qui ont commencé les premiers à composer & à joüer des pieces d’harmonie sur la Viole, & qui en ont porté la connoissance dans les autres Royaumes, tels qu’on esté VVALDERAN à la Cour de Saxe, BOULDER à la Cour d’Espagne, JOUNG auprés du Comte d’Inspruk, PREIS à Vienne, & plusieurs autres en différent endroits;} trans. R. A. Green. Rousseau refers to Walter Rowe (Walderon), Henry Butler (Boulder), William Young (Joung) and John Price (Preis).

\textsuperscript{91} Frank Traficante: “Lyra viol”, \textit{Grove Music Online} ed. L. Macy (Accessed 23 April 2008), \textit{<http://www.grovemusic.com>}

\textsuperscript{92} Although both men are discussed together, there is no evidence linking a connection between them. Mersenne and Rousseau simply decide to discuss them in the same context. Despite the many variants of Maugars’ and Hotman’s name in historical sources, these violists will simply be referred to as “Maugars” and “Hotman” in the main text of this thesis as is commonly used in modern publications.

\textsuperscript{93} Mersenne, \textit{Harmonicorum Libri XII} (Paris, 1648), De Instrumentis Harmonicis, Liber Primus, prop. xxx, 47: \textit{nullum esse in Gallia quem cum Maugardo, atque Hotmanno viris in arte peritissmis comparare queas, quippe qui tanti diminutionibus, & arcus tractibus adeo delicatis, & suadibus vuntur, nihil vt in Harmonia quod perfectè non exprimant, omittere videatur, praesertim cum alius simul Clavichordio cum illis canit;} translations of the \textit{Harmonicorum Libri} are from Annette Otterstedt, \textit{The Viol: History of an Instrument}, trans. H. Reiners (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2002).
Maugars, who went to England in the 1620s and remained in the service of King James I for at least four years, was acquainted with the improvisational and ornamental style of the violists in England, such as Ferrabosco. This style was foreign to the French. Mersenne observes:

By himself he [Maugars] performs two, three, and more parts simultaneously on his bass viol, and so much ornamented, & with such stupendous celerity of hand in all kinds of music, I dare say unheard-of-before.

This sentiment is echoed by Rousseau:

The first [Maugars] possessed so much knowledge and technique that he could provide variations in an infinity of different ways on a subject of five or six notes given to him on the spot until all that could be done with chords as well as diminutions had been exhausted.

Maugars then returned to France and from the 1630s was under the service Cardinal Richelieu. In addition to being a court violist, he was an English interpreter to Louis XIII. He is also known to have been a translator, having translated Francis Bacon’s (1561-1626) *Advancement of Learning* (1624) and *Considerations Touching on a War with Spain* (1634). His time in France was short-lived, as he was soon dismissed and

---


95 Thoinan, 32.


97 Rousseau, *Traité*, 23: car le premier avoit tant de science & d’execution, que sur un Sujet de cinq ou six notes qu’on lui donnoit sur le champ, il le diverseroit en une infinité de manières différentes, jusqu’a épouiser tout ce que l’on y pouvoit faire, tant par accords que par diminutions; trans. R. A. Green.

exiled to Italy. In Rome, he wrote his *Response faite à un curieux sur le sentiment de la musique d’Italie* as a reply to those interested in his appraisal of Italian music.99

Concerning an Italian violist and the practices of “some Frenchmen”, Maugars writes:

As for the viol there is no one in Italy now who excels at it, and indeed it is very little cultivated in Rome. I was particularly astonished by this, seeing that they had in former times Horatio da Parma, who did wonders with it, and who left to posterity some very fine pieces – which some Frenchmen have astutely adapted for other instruments, presenting them as their own – and also in view of the fact that it was an Italian, the father of the great Ferrabosco, who first brought the use of the viol to the English, who since then have surpassed all other nations.100

Maugars also reports on his Italian listeners after being persuaded to display his abilities in improvisation:

It was in this talented household that I was first obliged, at the request of these choice persons, to display in Rome the talent which it has pleased God to give me, in the presence of ten or twelve of the most intelligent people in all of Italy. They listened attentively and then made a few flattering remarks, not untinged with jealousy. To test me further, they had Signora Leonora keep my viol and ask me to return the following day, which I did; and having been informed by a friend that they said that I did very well with artistically worked-out pieces, I gave them so many preludes and fantasies on this second occasion that they thought more highly of me than they had on the first.101

99 André Maugars, *Response faite à un curieux sur le sentiment de la musique d’Italie, escrite à Rome le premier octobre 1639* (Rome, 1639).

100 Thoinan, 33-34: *Quant à la Viole, il n’y a personne maintenant dans l’Italie qui y excellé, et même elle est fort peu exercée dans Rome: c’est de quoy je me suis fort étonné, veu qu’ils ont eu autrefois un Horatio de Parme, qui en a fait merveille, et qui en a laissé à la postérité de fort bonnes pièces, dont quelques uns des nostres se sont servis finement sur d’autres instrumens, comme de leur propre; et aussi que le père de ce grand Farabosco, Italien, en a apporté la premier l’usage aux Anglois, qui depuis ont surpassé toutes les nations;* the following translations of the *Response* (footnotes 103-106) are from Walter H. Bishop, “Maugar’s *Response faite a un curieux sur le sentiment de la Musique d’Italie,*” *Journal of the Viola da Gamba Society of America* 8 (1971).

101 Ibid., 38: *Ce fut dans cette vertueuse maison, où je fus premièremen obligé à la priere de ces rares personnes, de faire paroistre dans Rome le talent qu’il a pleu à Dieu me donner, en présence encore des dix ou douze des plus intelligens de toute l’Italie, lesquels après m’avoient ouy attentivement me flattérer de quelques loüanges; mais ce ne fut pas sans jalousy. Pour m’esprouver davantage, ils obligèrent la Signora Leonora, de garder ma Viole, et de me prier de revenir le lendemain; ce que je fisis: et ayant esté adverty par un amy, qu’ils disoient que je jouis fort bien des pieces estudiées; je leur donnay tant de sortes de preludes et de fantasies cette seconde fois, que véritablement ils m’estimèrent plus qu’ils n’avoient pas fait la première.*
While Maugars appears to have been well received by most of his Italian audience, the professional musicians required a greater deal of persuasion:

After winning the esteem of society people, I still had some way to go before obtaining that of the professionals, a bit too refined and much too reluctant to give any praise to foreigners. I was told they admitted that I played very well solo, and that they had never heard so many parts played on the viol; but they doubted that I, being French, was able to improvise on a theme. You know, sir, that this is not where I shine least.\(^{102}\)

To prove his ability, Maugars was asked to perform solo in church in the presence of twenty-three cardinals. Maugars boasts:

I was given fifteen or twenty notes on a little organ, after the Kyrie Eleison, and I improvised on them with so much variety that they were quite happy, and had the cardinals ask me to play again after the Agnus Dei.\(^{103}\)

After being sent another theme to improvise upon, Maugars proclaims:

I varied [it] with so much imagination and with so many different rhythms and tempos that they were quite astonished, and came immediately to compliment me, but I withdrew to my room to rest.\(^{104}\)

Both Mersenne and Rousseau are keen to point out the differences between Maugars and Hotman. Mersenne portrays Maugars as the technical virtuoso and Hotman as the lesser:

\(^{102}\) Ibid., 38: Après l’estime des honnestes gens, cela ne fut pas encore assez, pour gagner absolument celle des gens du mestier, un peu trop raffinez, et par trop retenus à applaudir les estrangers. On me donna avis qu’ils confessoient que je jouois fort bien seul, et qu’ils n’avoient jamais ouy toucher tant de parties sur la Viole; mais qu’ils doutoient qu’estant François, je fusse capable de traitter et diversifier un subjet à l’improviste. Vous sçavez, Monsieur, que c’est là où je ne réussis pas le moins.

\(^{103}\) Ibid., 39: on me donna quinze ou vingt notes pour sonner avec un petit Orgue, après le troisième Kyrie Eleison, lesquels je traittay avec tant de variétz, qu’ils en demeurèrent très satisfais, et me firent prier de la part des Cardinaux de joüer encore une fois après l’Agnus Dei.

\(^{104}\) Ibid., 39: je diversifiay avec tant de sortes d’inventions, de différens mouvemens et de vistesse, qu’ils en furent très-estonnez, et vindrent aussitost pour me payer de complimens, mais je me retiray en ma chambre pour me reposer.
What the other sounded on the bass viol, or any other instrument whatsoever, he [Maugars] emulated at once, so that he also often surpassed the latter [Hotman], & with more than sagacious ingenuity even seemed to intuit the imagination itself of him who was playing.  

Rousseau, while acknowledging Maugars’ superiority, exalts Hotman’s compositional style, praising him for his beautiful and tender playing, which, in Rousseau’s opinion, brought perfection to the viol. Rousseau declares:

The second [Hotman] is the one in France who began composition of harmonic pieces suited to the viol and to write beautiful melodies and imitate the voice so that the tender performance of a little Chansonette was often more admired than the most complicated and learned pieces. The tenderness of his playing came from his beautiful bow strokes, which he enlivened, or sweetened with so much skill and appropriateness that he charmed all who heard him. It is this, which began to give perfection to the viol, and to make it valued above all other instruments.

For the first time, it appears that we can positively identify the beginnings of a French style in viol playing in Hotman, one that did not pride itself in the creation of clever diminutions, but in the expression of a natural lyricism.

Hotman was equally significant in the development of the theorbo. Accredited to being the first person to introduce the theorbo to France, he was probably also the first person in France to write for the theorbo as a solo instrument.

---

105 Mersenne, Harmonicorum Libri XII, De Instrumentis Harmonicis, Liber Primus, prop. xxx, 47: Quas alius Barbito, vel alius quóuis instrumento cecinerit, congestim aemulatur, vt illis etiam sepemunero prae & ingenio plusquam sagaci ipsam canentium imaginationem atque mentem intueri videatur; trans. A. Otterstedt.

106 Rousseau, Traité, 23: & le second est celuy qui a commence en France à composer des Pieces d’Harmonie reglées sur La Viole, à faire de beaux Chants, & à imiter la Voix, en sorte qu’on l’admiroit souvent advantage dans l’exécution tendre d’une petite Chansonette, que dans les Pieces les plus remplies & les plus sçavantes. La tendresse de son Jeu venoit de ces beaux coups d’Archet qu’il animoit, & qu’il adouscioit avec tant d’adresse & si à propos, qu’il charmait tous ceux qui l’entendoient, & c’est ce qui a commence à donner la perfection à la Viole, & à la faire estimer préférablement à tous les autres Instrument; trans. R. A. Green.

107 These are however comments by Rousseau, which will be shown in the next chapters to be of questionable reliability.

108 Sébastien de Brossard, Dictionaire de musique, contenant une explication des termes grecs, latins, italiens et français (Paris, 1703/ R, 2/1705): Theorbo: C’est instrument qui depuis environs 50 ou 60 ans a succedé au Luth pour jouer les Basses-Continuës. D’ou les italiens prennent souvent occasion d’intituler leurs basses-continuë du mot theorba. On pretend que c’est le Sieur Hotteman, si fameux
Unfortunately, none of Maugars’ music has survived. The skill that impressed both Mersenne and Rousseau so greatly was possibly one of spontaneous creation, so it is quite conceivable that Maugars never wrote any of his music down. Fortunately, a small amount of music for voice, viol, lute and theorbo by Hotman is extant. Hotman’s music mostly remains in manuscript,\(^{110}\) except for his *Airs à boire à 3 parties* (1664),\(^{111}\) which was published posthumously by Ballard. His surviving pieces for solo viol are unaccompanied dances, portraying a more simple and melodious style than that typical of the English.


\(^{111}\) Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale Rés. Vm7 290
Recent research by Manuel Couvreur has disclosed a great amount of valuable information concerning Hotman. Concerning Hotman’s provenance, Couvreur writes:

Nicolas Hotman was born in Brussels, between 1610 and 1614. Although his baptism extract could not be found, a marriage certificate from the Notre-Dame-de-la-Chapelle tells us that his parents married in the cathedral of Sainte-Gudule on the 4th of February 1610. His father was actually called Mathys Hofman and he may have belonged to an important family of Antwerpen luthiers. As for his mother, Jeanne de Sainte-Hubert, native of Namur, she was related to the famous dynasty of dinandiers and bell casters. Widowed by 1626, she went to Paris where, on the 14th of May, she obtained, for her son and herself, letters of naturalisation. Their name was changed to that of Hotman, which was extremely famous in the capital since it was a name synonymous with that of luthiers as well as famous lawyers. There is little reason to think that Nicolas had any family ties with them.

Couvreur also uncovers information about Hotman’s marriage and finances:

At the time of his marriage, 17 October 1639, Nicolas Hotman was a bourgeois de Paris and lived at en I'lle Notre-Dame paroisse Saint-Louis. His financial assets, which were small, were supplemented by that of his wife’s, Anne Paris, daughter of the clerk of the Grand Conseil. Loans with carefully authorized interests ensured their financial ease.

Hotman is discovered to also have been a painter, who had connections with court professionals. His activities are described by Couvreur:

---

112 Manuel Couvreur, program notes to Nicolas Hotman, Pièce de viole, pièces de théorbe, airs à boire (Belgium: Musique en Wallonie, CYP 3607)
113 Ibid., 4: Nicolas Hotman est né à Bruxelles, entre 1610 et 1614. Si son extrait baptismaire n’a pu être retrouvé, une publication de bans à l’église Notre-Dame-de-la-Chapelle nous apprend que ses parents se sont mariés en la cathédrale Sainte-Gudule le 4 fevrier 1610. Son père s’appelait en réalité Mathys Hofman et appartenait peut-être à l’importante famille de luthier anversois. Quant à sa mère, Jeanne de Sainte-Hubert, native de Namur, elle était alliée à la célèbre dynastie de dinandiers et fondeurs de cloches. Veuve au plus tard en 1626, elle se rendit à Paris où, le 14 mai, elle obtint, pour elle et son fils, des lettres de naturalité. Leur nom se changea en celui d’Hotman, fort réputé dans la capitale puisqu’il était celui de luthiers et surtout de célèbres jurisconsultes. Rien n’autorise à penser que Nicolas ait eu avec le moindre lien de parenté.
He had on many occasions met with Jacques Amelot of Mauregard, the first president of the cour des Aides. Tallemant des Réaux claims that this is only because Amelot "is not one for discourse, and has to resort to the symphony to amuse people". Living well, he knew how to season food well by mixing music. An air à boire by Hotman preserves the memory of these dinners where the president invited "three or four girls, very nice and very mouchées, who danced, sang and played the lute." An amateur painter, Hotman attached himself to the Liégeois Bertholet Flémalle that asked from him "an hour during three days for his portrait". The musician replied by another drinking air: A painter who is knowledgeable without a brush illuminates me: it is the wine that paints me, & which returns to me more beautiful". Hotman frequented the environment of the médecins ordinaires du roi: Bon de Billy, witness to his marriage, Jacques Perreau, his brother-in-law, future head of the faculty of medicine, and Charles de Saint-Germain, author of many medical and religious works, was surrogate guardian of two of his children.115

Unsurprisingly, Hotman’s fame and success grew throughout France, both as lutenist and violist:

In 1643, in the Entretien des musiciens, Annibal Gantez proclaims that the "sieur Autheman is unique" both for the lute and the viol. The official posts from this time increased numerously. In 1655, Hotman is "treble viol and theorbo player" to the Duke of Orleans with 600 pounds of wages annually. In March 1661, Hotman - "who is esteemed, although German, the best in the field of the viol, which is agreed by everyone" - and Étienne Moulinié, maître de la musique de Monsieur, participated in the famous office of the Augustins to the memory of their ancient protector.116

115 Ibid., 4-5: Il fréquente Jacques Amelot de Mauregard, premier président a la cour des Aides. Tallemant des Réaux prétend que c’est uniquement parce qu’Amelot « n’a point d’entretien, qu’il a recours a la symphonie pour divertir les gens ». Bon vivant, il savait assaisonner la bonne chère en y mêlant la musique. Un air à boire d’Hotman nous a conservé le souvenir de ces soupers fins où le président invitait « trois ou quatre filles fort jolies et fort mouchées, qui dansaient, chantaient et jouaient du luth ». Amateur de peinture, Hotman se lia avec le Liégeois Bertholet Flémalle qui lui demanda « une heure durant trois jours pour son portrait ». Le musicien répondit par un autre air bachique : « un peintre plus savant sans pinceau m’enlumine : c’est le vin qui me peint, & qui me rend plus beau ». Hotman fréquentait encore le milieu des médecins ordinaires du roi : Bon de Billy, témoin à son mariage, Jacques Perreau, son beau-frère, futur doyen de la faculté de médecine, et Charles de Saint-Germain, auteur de nombreux ouvrages médicaux et religieux, qui sera subrogé tuteur de ses deux enfants mineurs.

116 Ibid., 5: En 1643, dans son Entretien des musiciens, Annibal Gantez peut affirmer désormais que le « sieur Autheman est l’unique » tant pour le luth que pour la viole. Les postes officiels vont dès lors se multiplier. En 1655, Hotman est « dessus de viole et théorbist » du duc d’Orleans avec 600 livres de gages annuels. En mars 1661, Hotman - « qu’on estime, quoiqu’Allemand, le meilleur en cas de viole, qui soit de l’un à l’autre pôles » - et Étienne Moulinié, maître de la musique de Monsieur, participeront à un office célèbre aux Augustins à la mémoire de leur ancien protecteur.
Later in his career, Hotman expanded his responsibilities as a court musician in the staging of ballets. He may also have been associated with eminent dramaturges of the time.

Since 1657, Hotman, however, had housing at the l’hôtel de Guise, Mécène éclairé, Henri II de Lorraine, fifth duke of Guise, where he had put up several ballets at the court that had protected the playwrights Tristan L’Hermite and Philippe Quinault. In 1662, he was also invited by Pierre Corneille to take up residence in his hotel where Hotman had surely the occasion to frequent.\(^\text{117}\)

Hotman’s activities at the church of the Val-de-Grâce, as described by the writer Jean Loret (1595-1665) in his Muse historique, recount his interaction with other musicians, placing him amongst the most important of French musicians of the time.

In April 1662, in the presence of the king and the entire court, Hotman took part in the office of the ténèbres aux Feuillants at the Val-de-Grâce: Michel Lambert accompanied on the theorbo: Hilaire Dupuy, Anne Fonteaux de Sercamanan and Anna Bergerotti. According to the gazetier Loret, “extraordinary Hotman…preceded their famous songs, by such touching preludes, that when it comes to symphonies, one sees few similar geniuses”. The following year, with Pierre de La Barre, Jean-Baptiste Boësset, Jean-Baptiste Lully, Michel Lambert et Louis de Mollier, Hotman accompanied mesdemoiselles Hilaire, de La Barre, Saint-Christophe et Sercamanan. He did, however, not have many days to live: it was in the l’hôtel de Guise that he met his end, on the first days of April 1663.\(^\text{118}\)

It is not known with whom Hotman studied the viol, but since Hotman’s extant music bears little resemblance to the English style, it is highly improbable that Hotman and Maugars were ever in contact. On sending Dutch violist Constantijn Huygens

\(^{117}\) Ibid.: Depuis 1657, Hotman avait cependant un logement à l’hôtel de Guise, Mécène éclairé, Henri II de Lorraine, cinquième duc de Guise, avait monté lui-même plusieurs ballets à la cour et protégé les dramaturges Tristan L’Hermite et Philippe Quinault. En 1662, il devait inviter Pierre Corneille à s’installer lui aussi en son hôtel ou Hotman eut sûrement l’occasion de fréquenter.

\(^{118}\) Ibid.: En avril 1662, en présence de roi et de toute la cour, Hotman participa à l’office des ténèbres aux Feuillants et au Val-de-Grâce: Michel Lambert y accompagnait au théorbe Hilaire Dupuy, Anne Fonteaux de Sercamanan et Anna Bergerotti. Selon le gazatier Loret, le « rare Hotman […] précédait leurs illustres chants, par des préludes si touchants, qu’en matières de symphonies on voit peu de pareils génies ». L’année suivante, avec Pierre de La Barre, Jean-Baptiste Boësset, Jean-Baptiste Lully, Michel Lambert et Louis de Mollier, Hotman accompagna mesdemoiselles Hilaire, de La Barre, Saint-Christophe et Sercamanan. Il ne lui restait pourtant plus que quelques jours à vivre : c’est en l’hôtel de Guise qu’il rendit l’esprit, aux premiers jours d’avril 1663.
(1596-1687) his viol and theorbo pieces in 1659, Hotman was met with scorn and ridicule as his simpler musical style was received as an insult towards Huygens’ virtuosic capacities. A letter to French organist Henry du Mont (c.1610-1684) while in Paris, dated Oct. 7, 1660, describes how violists like Huygens, Walter Röes (1584 or 1585-1671)\textsuperscript{119} and Dietrich Steffkins (c.1610-1673), all trained in the English style were used to more challenging music.\textsuperscript{120}

Despite the misunderstanding with Huygens, it seems that Hotman’s reputation in France and the Low Countries remained untarnished. The existing Göess manuscript, copied in Utrecht in 1660, contains 26 pieces for viol and 8 for theorbo.\textsuperscript{121} While in Paris, he remained an active performer and teacher, with De Machy and Sainte Colombe being his two most famous students. In 1661, on the death of Louis Couperin, the position of ordinaire de la musique de la chambre as violists to the king was divided between Hotman and Sébastien Le Camus.\textsuperscript{122} Hotman died in 1663 leaving behind two bass viols, a treble viol, three theorbos and a lute.\textsuperscript{123}

**Dubuisson**

Like Hotman, Dubuisson (1622 or 3-1680 or 81)\textsuperscript{124} was proficient on both the viol and plucked instruments. Very few biographical details are available of him. Like

\textsuperscript{120} Hans Bol, *La Basse de viole du temps de Marin Marais et d’Antoine Forqueray* (Blithoven: A.B. Creighton, 1973), 44-45.
\textsuperscript{121} Austria (Schloss Ebenthal): Göess Manuscript. The Göess manuscript also contains works of other composers of the lute, theorbo and viol.
\textsuperscript{124} In main text of this thesis, the composer will be referred to as “Dubuisson”, as seen in the manuscript from the Library of Congress and Rousseau’s Réponse.
most violists of the later part of the seventeenth century, he never used his first name.

From a manuscript in the Library of Congress, we discover:

Dubuisson lives in the middle of the rue du Fort l’eveque near the pier - In the Vallée de Misère at the sign of the magpie in front of a marshall[’s office] or else one will know his house at the entrance of the rue de la Harpe at [the shop of] a lute maker named monsieur Colichon. 

Through his acquaintance with luthier Michel Colichon (fl c.1666–93), it is certain that he came into contact with other violists and lutenists of this time, notably Rousseau, Sainte Colombe and De Machy. Another mention of Dubuisson appears in the Mercure galant of 1680, which describes a performance involving Dubuisson:

You may have already spoken about a concert, where all who are curious have been found here for several days. It was quite extraordinary and the first that had ever been done of this kind. It was composed of three bass viols. Messieurs du Buisson, Ronsin and Pierrot are the authors of such a rare thing. The approval which they received manifests with how much pleasure the connoisseurs listened to them.

In a letter from the same year, Jean Le Gallois writes:

The late Hotteman [sic] used to excel on the viol, but Messieurs de Ste Colombe [sic], Desmarets & du Buisson [sic] do so now.

125 Washington: Library of Congress, M2.1 Book T2 17c: Dubuisson demeure au milieu de la Rue du fort l’eveque proche du quay— de La vallee de misere, a l’enseigne de La pie devant un mareschal ou bien on saura sa demeure a l’entrée de La Rue de La harpe chez, un faiseur de Lupt nommé monsieur Colichon.


127 Mercure galant (Paris, 1680), 52: On vous aura peut-estre déjà parlé d’un concert où tout ce qu’il y a icy de curieux se sont trouvez depuis quelques jours. Il estoit fort extraordinaire, & le premier qu’on eust jamais fait de cette sorte. Trois Basses de Viole le composoient. Messieurs du Buisson, Ronsin, & Pierrot sont les Auteurs d’une chose si singuliere. L’approbation qu’ils ont reçue, fait connoistre avec combien de plaisir les Connoisseurs les ont écoutez.

128 Gallois is referring to Marin Marais.

The other reference to Dubuisson comes from Rousseau’s *Réponse*. De Machy is said to have held Dubuisson in high regard. On the other hand, Rousseau criticises him saying, “he carried the hand very badly”.

Recent research by Stuart Cheney has uncovered information that suggests that “Dubuisson” may have been a pseudonym for Jean Lacquemant. Cheney explains:

Research begun by Jonathan Dunford has shown that he was almost certainly one Jean Lacquemant, a *maître de musique* born in 1622 or 1623 in Picardie, and the son of Noël Lacquemant, a royal constable for the town of Roye. By 1655, the year he married Anne de Vertreuil, Jean Lacquemant had established himself in Paris as a music teacher, inhabiting the neighborhood east of the Louvre where Sainte-Colombe, Marais, and other musicians would live. He later benefited from income generated by renting houses (as did his contemporary Nicolas Hotman) and the cultivation of land near the small Picard town of Pertain, which may be his birthplace. His circle of friends - whose names are found as witnesses to notarial acts and as godparents to his children - include painters, parliamentary counsellors, the celebrated harpsichordist Jacques Hardel, and the organist of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont, Marin des Lions. In official documents beginning from 1670, Lacquemant begins to append “dit DuBuisson, Bourgeois de Paris” to his name. It may be that the land in Pertain was named DuBuisson and gave rise to his pseudonym, in the fashion of feigned nobility common at the time (as practiced, for instance, by the celebrated contemporaneous harpsichordist Jacques Champion, who added the name of his family's estate in Brie -- Chambonnières -- to his name). In any case, DuBuisson was a common family name in the seventeenth century, as well as one that people adopted for one reason or another, including the lutenist Etienne Houzelot (flourished 1615-31) and the writer François-Nicolas Baudot (died 1652).

Concerning Jean Lacquemant’s family, Cheney writes:

At least eight children were born of the marriage of Jean Lacquemant and Anne de Vertreuil, although how many survived infancy is difficult to determine. His daughter Magdeleine seemingly inherited a large part, if not all, of her deceased parents' property upon her marriage in 1681 to Raphael Boyer, another *maître de musique*.

---

130 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 5: *Il y a environ quinze ou seize ans que l'Auteur du Libelle faisoit grand cas de feu le vieux Dubuisson.*

131 Ibid., 5: *Il portrait le main très mal*; trans. M. van der Beken.


133 Ibid.
The viol pieces of Dubuisson that have reached us today are all for unaccompanied solo viol. They are housed in libraries in Austria, France, Germany, Poland, The United Kingdom and The United States of America. Altogether, there are over 116 dance movements by him. The earliest manuscript (1666), that is housed in the Library of Congress, deserves special mention for being the first pieces for viol that are arranged according to key in the “classical” French suite form: *prélude, allemande, courante, sarabande* and *gigue*.

While there is very little information to ascertain Dubuisson’s importance in the development of the viol in France, his contribution to the viol repertory represents a transition between the varied arbitrary pieces of the lutenists and the new suite forms of the later generation of violists. After Dubuisson, we begin to see an emergence of new styles and forms in the well-structured suites of *pièces* for viol.

De Machy

De Machy (fl second half the 17th century) was originally from Abbeville, the capital of the province of Pontieu. He moved to Paris and eventually became a student of Hotman. While in Paris, he taught the viol in the Fauxbourg St. Germain district at rue Neuve-des-Fossez.

He was the first person in France to publish a book of solo pieces. In it, he

---


136 Like Dubuisson, De Machy’s first name is unknown.

137 Pontieu is known as Ponthieu today. A castle 20km North of Abbeville is called Machy, and may have a connection to the composer. I am indebted to Jonathan Dunford for this information.

138 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 5: *Dans ce mesme temps l’Auteur du Libelle, qui se dit écolier de Monsieur Hotteman*.

139 Fauxbourg St. Germain is known as Faubourg St. Germain today.
included a lengthy *avertissement*, which is considered the first published treatise on viol playing in France. Like many of the violists preceding De Machy, he composed unaccompanied dances. De Machy used the “classical” French suite form as first used by Dubuisson, but added the *Gavotte* and *Menuet*, which he used throughout the eight solo viol suites he included in his *Pièces de Violle*.

De Machy was the first and only French violist to publish pieces in both music notation and tablature. They are separated into two books. The first book contains four suites in music notation, and the second contains four suites in tablature. Although he preferred to use tablature as a method for reading and learning music, he also included music in staff notation for those who did not read the former. In doing so, he improved the general popularity and saleability of his book.

In his publication, he included a table of ornaments, thereby emulating the harpsichord tradition. This table of ornaments remains the most complex ever devised for the viol. His thorough knowledge of ornamentation suggests that De Machy was well aware of the latest advances and trends in ornamentation of the time, including those of other instruments. His references to specific ornaments and their applications on the lute suggest that De Machy, like many of his contemporaries, may also have been proficient on plucked instruments.

His approach to viol playing demonstrates the overall versatility of violists at that time. He asserted that there were four different ways of playing the viol: playing pieces of harmony, accompanying oneself while singing, playing with others in consort and plucking the strings.

His awareness of these different ways of playing the viol is a strong indication of his knowledge of the English style as these are the very same techniques that are

---

140 Only in his fourth suite, does he depart from his model: *prélude, allemande, courante, sarabande, gigue, gavotte, minuet*, with a substitution of the minuet with a *chaconne*.

141 Sieur de Machy, 8-9: *Le petit tremblement, qui est ce qu'on nomme un tiret sur le Luth, se fait de même, excepté qu'il n'est pas continué.*
used on the lyra viol. Because of this knowledge, he was a fervent advocate in
treating the viol as a self-sufficient solo instrument without the need for
accompaniment, just as in the lute, theorbo or harpsichord. He was against reducing the
viol to playing melody alone, his reasoning being that it had never been the custom for
the viol to play simple solo parts, comparing it to “a man who plays perfectly on the
harpsichord, or organ, with only one hand”.

His pieces suggest a highly progressive musical style, incorporating the prélude non mesuré into his suites, something that was more commonly done on the lute and
harpsichord.

His suggestion to play “the Préludes as one wishes, slowly or
quickly” gives us an insight into the stylistic approach required for these préludes.

His contribution to viol technique is invaluable, having developed two ports de main. For the first port de main, the thumb is placed in the middle of the neck, opposite
the first finger, with the elbow rounded and raised. The second port de main is used
when an extension is required. The thumb is brought closer towards the edge of the
neck and placed opposite the second finger. The first finger then extends backwards,
while the elbow is brought downwards and outwards.

Above all, he was a dedicated teacher, inviting those who owned his books -
and even those who did not - to visit him on Saturdays between three to six o’clock, so
that he could demonstrate the rules that he advocated in his avertissement.

142 Tobias Hume, The First Part of Ayres (London, 1605). This publication for lyra viol includes all De Machy’s purported ways of playing the viol.
143 Sieur de Machy, 7: Un home qui joüeroit parfaitement du Clavessin, ou de l’Orgue, d’une seule main.
144 Hotman, Dubuisson and Marais wrote their préludes with a measure. Sainte Colombe préludes are
written both with and without measure.
145 Sieur de Machy, 4: On peut jouër les Préludes comme l’on voudra, lentement ou viste.
146 Sieur de Machy, 11: Je declare enfin à toutes les personnes qui auront de mes Livres, & à ceux même qui n’en auront pas, qu’ils me feront honneur lors qu’ils voudront conférer avec moy sur mes Pieces, &
sur ce que je mets en avant. Je seray tous les Samedys en état de les recevoir chez moy, depuis trois heures jusqu’à six, où je leur seray voir la pratique de toutes les regles dont j’ay parlé, & la nécessité qu’il y a de les observer sur la Violle, qui n’est pas moindre que les autres Instrumens où elles sont en usage.
Sainte Colombe

Sainte Colombe\(^{147}\) (fl 1658-87; d by 1701), like Hotman and Dubuisson, was proficient on both the viol and plucked instruments.\(^{148}\) Rousseau describes Sainte Colombe as Hotman’s best student:

> Of all those who learned to play the viol from Monsieur Hotman, it can be said that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe was his most excellent student.\(^{149}\)

The earliest mention (c.1665) of Sainte Colombe is found in one of Bénigne de Bacilly’s (c.1625-1690) collections, where a Sarabande de M. de Sainte Colombe appears with words set by an anonymous poet.\(^{150}\) In 1678, in an anecdote in the Mercure de France, Sainte Colombe was described as being “so famous for the viol”.\(^{151}\) In 1680, Le Gallois, along with Dubuisson and Desmarets, describe Sainte Colombe amongst those who “now excel” on the viol.\(^{152}\)

From a much later date, details of Sainte Colombe’s viol-playing activities are mentioned by Evrard Titon du Tillet (1677-1762):

> It is true before Marais, Sainte Colombe was known for the viol; he gave concerts at his place, where two of his daughters played, one on the treble viol, and the other on the bass, and formed with their father a concert of three viols…\(^{153}\)

---

\(^{147}\) The composer will be referred to as “Sainte Colombe” in the main text of this thesis, as used in almost all historical publications. He is however often referred to as “Sainte-Colombe” in modern writings.

\(^{148}\) Rousseau, Réponse, 9: *Il dit que je n’ay point parlé de pincer la viole, je n’ay pas cru le devoir faire, parce que ce n’est pas un jeu de la Viole qui soit en usage & qui n’y doit estre, j’avoue que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe s’y fait admirer, mais c’est un divertissement particulier qu’il se donne par l’usage qu’il a des Instrument a pincer*; trans. M. van der Beken.

\(^{149}\) Rousseau, Traité, 24: *De tous qui ont appris à joüer de la Viole de Monsieur HOTMAN, on peut dire que Monsieur de SAINTE COLOMBE a esté son Ecolier par excellence*; trans. R. A. Green.

\(^{150}\) Bénigne de Bacilly, Recueil des plus beaux vers qui ont esté mis en chant (Paris, c.1665), Troisieme partie, 139. There is no music to the words included.

\(^{151}\) Mercure galant (Paris, 1678), 132: *Monsieur de Sainte-Colombe, si celebre pour la Viole.*

\(^{152}\) Gallois, 62.

Further information, possibly concerning Sainte Colombe and his family, has surfaced recently in the *Insinuations de Châtelet*\textsuperscript{154} in the French National Archives. Jonathan Dunford writes:

I discovered a Françoise de Sainte-Colombe [sic] who married in 1669.\textsuperscript{155} Her father was a certain “Jean de Sainte Colombe bourgeois de Paris” and one of the witnesses to her marriage was an organist by the name of Nicolas Caron (organist at St. Thomas de Louvre and at the Eglise St Oppurtune). Later I discovered that Jean de Saint Colombe had stood as witness to Caron’s own marriage in 1658. Looking further I found that in the 1650’s and 1660’s Jean de Sainte Colombe had two daughters, Brigide and Françoise and lived on the Rue de Betizy (today the Rue de Rivoli) in the Saint Germain l’Auxerrois district. This street intersects the Rue de la Monnaie and the Rue Bertin Poirée, curiously enough two of the first addresses of the young Marin Marais. Moreover on the Rue Saint Germain l'Auxerrois, one street over, was the residence of the celebrated violist Du Buisson’s.\textsuperscript{156}

Despite this evidence, it is not completely clear if this “Jean de Sainte Colombe bourgeois de Paris” is indeed Sainte Colombe, as Dunford explains:

These many documents all make a strong case for Jean de Sainte Colombe and yet, in my many years of searching through the French archives I have never found Jean de Sainte Colombe referred to as a musician but consistently as a “bourgeois de Paris”. The possible protestant connection is an important one; antagonism against non-Catholics was quite prevalent after the 1685 revocation d’Edit de Nantes. Could Sainte Colombe have been protestant and, consequently, slighted in the official registers? Until we find at least one document referring to the musician as Jean, or referring to Jean as a musician, we cannot be certain that this was the revered French musician.\textsuperscript{157}

The *Almanach de Brioude*, an annual publication from the city of Brioude since 1919, mentions a Sainte Colombe in Claude Astor’s article “Musique et Musiciens à Saint Julien au XVIIe siècle, Un Sainte Colombe à Brioude”.\textsuperscript{158} This article includes

\begin{footnotesize}\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{154} Paris: Archives Nationales Série Y.
\item\textsuperscript{155} Paris: Archives Nationales, Minutier Central XCI (365) 22 September 1669.
\item\textsuperscript{157} Ibid.
\end{itemize}\end{footnotesize}
the testament and inventory of Marie d’Estoupe, the widow of Sainte Colombe. It states that Sainte Colombe had been buried in Brioude at the Saint Julien church. These documents are dated 13 November 1688, indicating that this Sainte Colombe died some time before. This Sainte Colombe, who arrived in Brioude at an unknown date, is said to have owned a large number of musical instruments, including two portative organs, two spinets, four bass viols, three treble viols and a lute. While this information may refer to the Sainte Colombe, the dubious source and lack of information makes this unlikely.

Sainte Colombe is principally remembered for his ideas on the port de main, his beautiful viol playing and his invention: the addition of the silver-wound seventh string, the low A:

[I]t is from him in particular that we possess the fine hand position [port de main] which gave the last perfection to the viol, made its playing easier and freer as a result of which it imitates all the beautiful agréments of the voice.... It is also to Monsieur de Sainte Colombe that we are indebted for the seventh string which he added to the viol and in this way extended its range a fourth. It is he who finally introduced the use of strings wound with silver to France and works continually to find anything, which would increase the perfection of this instrument, if that were possible.160

---

159 Testatment of Marie d’Estoupe, widow of Le Sieur de Sainte-Colombe, 13 November, 1688: A esté présente honeste femme Marie d’Estoupe, veuve de feu M (en blanc) Saincte-Colombe, vivant maistre de musique de l’esglise Sainct Julien de ceste ville de Brioude... Prie et supplie humblement Madame de Brinai vouloir faire enterrer sondict corps au tumbeau où est enterré ledict feu sieur de Saincte-Colombe dans le cimetiere de ladicte eglise Sainct-Julien... Donne et légue à nos seigneurs les comptes et chapitre de ladicte eglise Sainct Julien pour l’entretien de leur maistrise et instruction des enfans de chœur, tous les instrumens de musique qu’elle a en ladicte mestrise, consistans en deux orgues, trois basses et trois dessus et d’un autre. Donne aussi à Messire Louis Eyssamas, prebstre semi-prebandé de ladicte esglise, à présent maistre de ladicte mestrise, pour les agréables services qu’elle a reçus et reçoit journellement de lay, d’une paire d’espinettes, autre basse de violon qu’il pourra choisir entre toutes celles qu’elle a en ladicte mestrise... et le travail de musique dudict feu de Saincte Colombe. Inventory before the death of Marie d’Estoupe, 14 November, 1688: ‘...2 paires d’orgues, ...une paire d’espinettes, 4 violes, 3 dessus, un luc [luth]. I am indebted to Jonathan Dunford for this information.

160 Rousseau, Traité, 24-25: c’est de lui en particulier que nous tenons ce beau port de main, qui a donné la derniere perfection à la Viole, a rendu l’exécution plus facile & plus degagée, & à la faveur duquel elle imite tous les plus beaux agréements de la Voix.... C’est aussi à Monsieur de SAINTE COLOMBE que nous sommes obligez de la septième chorde qu’il a ajoutée à la Viole, & dont il a par ce moyen augmenté l’estendue d’une Quarte. C’est lui enfin qui a mis les chordes filées d’argent en usage en France, & qui travaille continuellement à rechercher tout ce qui est capable d’ajouter une plus grande perfection à cet Instrument, s’il est possible; trans. R. A. Green.
Today, Sainte Colombe is mostly known for his music for two viols, *Concerts à deux violes égales*.\(^{161}\) Although these 67 pieces are a substantial contribution to the French bass viol repertory, they misrepresent Sainte Colombe’s oeuvre, since most of his compositions are for solo viol. This unaccompanied music remains in three manuscripts, one in Tournus, France\(^{162}\) and the other two in Edinburgh, Scotland\(^{163}\). Altogether, Sainte Colombe’s solo works comprise of more than 180 pieces. His music, compared to any of his contemporaries, exhibit peculiar harmonic qualities such as consecutive fifths and unresolved dissonances. In his suites, he produced relatively long préludes and doubles, which occasionally did not correspond with the original dance.\(^{164}\)

In this respect, Sainte Colombe could be viewed as one of the most radical viol composers of his time.

However, it is equally possible to view Sainte Colombe as a successful dilettante, one who was not thoroughly skilled in the arts of harmony and composition. As none of his music was published during his lifetime, it is difficult to ascertain his reputation as a composer. A revealing note appears in his *Concerts à deux violes égales* in the piece *Le Changé* stating, “the Sr. de Ste colombe [sic] ruined it by changes. I have restored it”.\(^{165}\) This may be alluding to his lack of ability as a composer. Even modern violists have noticed Sainte Colombe’s inadequacies. Wieland Kuijken comments:

> Many times you get the impression that he’s a very brilliant man, with many beautiful ideas, but he can’t write proper music, he can’t compose really.\(^{166}\)

---


\(^{162}\) Tournus: Bibliothèque municipale, M.3

\(^{163}\) Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland, Ms. 9468 & 9469.


\(^{165}\) Sainte Colombe, *Concert à deux violes égales*, Table alphabétique des Concerts: *Le Sr de Ste colombe le ruinoit par des changements [sic]. Ie l’ay restably.*

This, however, did not deter any of his well-known students from praising him. Being the teacher of Marin Marais (1656-1728), Danoville (fl 1687)\(^\text{167}\) and Jean Rousseau (1644-1699), Sainte Colombe was definitely an important figure in the French viol school. Danoville in his *L’art de toucher de le dessus et basse de viole* states:

\[
\text{One can cast one’s eyes upon Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, whom one can with justice call the Orpheus of our time.}\(^\text{168}\)
\]

Rousseau, when writing about “the players who have excelled on this instrument [the viol] and who presently excel on it,” explains:

\[
\text{All those, finally, who have the gift of pleasing have an obligation for it to the principles of Monsieur de Sainte Colombe. If someone wished to search for the perfection of viol playing in other ways, they would diverge so that they would never find it.}\(^\text{169}\)
\]

It is curious why Marais, clearly an excellent court violist, does not mention Sainte Colombe with the same enthusiasm as Rousseau or Danoville. Instead of dedicating his first book of viol pieces to Sainte Colombe, he dedicates it to Jean-Baptiste Lully (1632-1687). Only in his second book, published in 1701, does Marais mention Sainte Colombe in the form of a musical epitaph in his *Tombeau pour M. de Sainte Colombe*.\(^\text{170}\)

\(^{167}\) First name unknown.
\(^{169}\) Rousseau, *Traité* 25: *Tous ceux enfin qui ont l’avantage de plaire, en ont l’obligation aux principes de Monsieur de SAINTE COLOMBE, & si quelqu’un voulait chercher la perfection de Jeu de la Viole par d’autres moyens il s’en éloignerait, en sorte qu’il ne la trouverait jamais;* trans. R. A. Green.
The Beginnings of Basso Continuo in France

After De Machy, no other French composer wrote exclusively for the solo viol. Instead, we find a new genre in France, that of the solo viol with *basso continuo* accompaniment.

*Basso continuo* in France, when compared to Italy, had begun relatively late. With the inception of opera in Italy around the 1600’s, *basso continuo* was firmly established as a ubiquitous musical practice throughout music making. However, in as early as 1553, we see the appearance of solo viol pieces with accompaniment in Ortiz’s *Tratado de glosas*, which are in essence realised *basso continuo* parts.

Early developments in *basso continuo* practice in France can be seen in the works of Pierre Guédron (c.1564 - c.1619 or 20) in his *Troisième livre* (1617), where the lute is used to support a dramatic dialogue, and Antoine Boësset (1586-1643), whose *VII Livre* (1630), includes a five-part air with a “basse continue pour les instruments”. However, these instances were exceptions, rather than the norm. Instead, the written-out lute accompaniments of the of court lute song, the *air de cour*, remain the closest likeness to a *basso continuo* accompaniment. Until the publication of French treatises for theorbo in the 1660s, the practice of instrumental accompaniment in France remained undeveloped, and its public acceptance and use unclear.

The first collection of viol pieces in France with *basso continuo* accompaniment is Marais’ *Pièces à une et à deux violes*. Published in 1686, it first existed without a *basso continuo* part until 1689, when the *Basse-continues des Pièces à une et à deux violes* was published.

In the *avertissement* of the *basse continue* part, Marais explains:

---

When I published my book of pieces for one and two viols [Pièces à une et à deux violes], I had intended to add the continuo [basse continue] parts, which are essential.\footnote{Marais, Basse-continues des Pièces à une et à deux violes, 1er livre (Paris, 1689), 2: Lorsque je donnai au Public mon Livre de Pièces a Une et deux Violes, j'avais bien dessein d'y joindre aussi les Basse-continues, qui en sont la partie essentielle; translations of the Basse-continues des Pièces à une et à deux viole are from Marin Marais, Pièces à une et à deux violes (1686-89), ed. John Hsu (New York: Broude Brothers, 1980).}

Marais claims that he intended to publish both the solo and basse continue parts together, but remarks that “since engraving is a very lengthy undertaking”,\footnote{Ibid: Mais comme la gravure est une entreprise très longue; trans. J. Hsu.} he was compelled to delay the appearance of the basse continue part. As this explanation only appears in the 1689 basse continue part, and there is no indication in the 1686 publication of any intention of having the pieces accompanied, it seems probable that Marais may have initially intended his pieces to be played unaccompanied.

Marais’ Pièces à une et à deux violes was written with widespread appeal in mind. He had included all kinds of pieces, both melodic and harmonic, essentially to please everyone. In the hope of attracting customers who were followers of De Machy, Marais writes:

> Although [the fingerings] are marked according to the hand position [port de main] now in use, nevertheless those who use a different hand position and would find it difficult to change need not be impeded by this new method, provided they play the chords that are written.\footnote{Marais, Pièces à une et à deux violes (Paris: 1686), 5: mais quoy qu’ils soient marqués selon le port de main qui est à présent en usage, ceux neantmoins qui auront contracté une habitude contraire, et qu’il leur seroit difficile de reformer, ne doivent pas s’arrester à cette nouvelle maniere, pourveu qu’ils fassent les accords qu’ils trouveront marqués; translations of Pièces à une et à deux violes are from Marin Marais, Pièces à une et à deux violes (1686-89), ed. John Hsu (New York: Broude Brothers, 1980).}

These words were intended to persuade De Machy’s followers to buy Marais’ book, in spite of the different ports de main that they may have acquired through study with De Machy. These words may suggest that there was a considerable number of violists who had accepted De Machy’s ideas on the ports de main. Such inclusivity to varying viol
techniques may have encouraged the initial sales of Marais’ books.

The unaccompanied style of viol playing was one that all violists of the time would have been accustomed to. It would be no surprise if violists should choose to play Marais’ book unaccompanied. After all, the solo part is perfectly intelligible without the *basse continue* part.\(^{175}\) This practice is suggested in Rousseau’s claim, made a year before the publication of the *basse continue* part (1688): [T]hose [pieces] of Monsieur Marais… everybody is playing them.\(^{176}\)

To propose that these pieces were played with some kind of *basso continuo* accompaniment, whether realised or improvised, before the publication of *basse continue* part, is to overstate the practice of *basso continuo* during this time. Providing accompaniment for a viol, in the manner of the highly stylised *Basse-continues des Pièces à une et à deux violes*, would have been a very unusual and difficult task at the time. As seen in the previous section of this chapter, the tradition of playing unaccompanied solo music on the bass viol was a well-established one. The decision to later add a *basse continue* part was a profound step, marking the beginnings of *basso continuo* accompaniment for solo viol music in France.

The introduction of a *basse continue* part can also be seen as a promotional tactic to increase sales and public awareness. Having witnessed the success of the treatises for accompanying on the theorbo,\(^{177}\) Marais must have realised that *basso continuo* practice was on the rise. It has been suggested by John Hsu, that the *Pièces à une et à deux violes* did not achieve its popularity until the *basse continue* part was issued. Hsu writes:

\(^{175}\) This unaccompanied style of writing is also observed in the works of Antoine Forqueray. See chapter 2 on “Forqueray”.
\(^{176}\) Rousseau, *Réponse*, 6: *il a dit de celles de Monsieur Marais qu’elles n’estoient pas faites pour la main, il ne les execute pourtant pas avec le pied, & tout le monde les joue.*
\(^{177}\) There had been 3 French theorbo treatises published by 1689, those of Nicolas Fleury, Angelo Michele Bartolomi and Henry Grenerin.
In the case of the first volume of Marais’s *Pièces de violes*, however, sales of the viol part-book probably peaked not in 1686, when it first appeared in print, but 1689, when the continuo part-book was published; almost half of the collated copies bear addresses indicating that they were assembled in mid 1689.  

This suggests that the *Pièces à une et à deux violes* may not have generated much interest after its initial publication, and that the addition of the *basse continue* part played an important role in the success of Marais’ first book of pieces.

In Marais third book of viol pieces, he appears to employ another strategy to attract players:

> The pieces in it are fashioned in a manner different from those in my first book. In composing them, I took care to make them playable on all kinds of instruments, such as the organ, harpsichord, theorbo, lute, violin and German flute, and I dare pride myself with success, having tried them on the last two instruments.

Whatever Marais’ intentions may have been, it seems certain that he urgently wanted to publish his *Pièces à une et à deux violes* immediately after De Machy’s publication. Perhaps he felt that it was necessary to publish in reaction to the demand that was created. As seen in the later parts of this thesis, viol playing was an extremely important activity in which many musicians were involved.

**Marais**

Marin Marais was born in Paris on the 31st of May 1656. The son of a shoemaker, he entered the choir school of St. Germain-l'Auxerrois in 1667 where he

---

remained until 1672, under the direction of François Chaperon. He is said to have studied with Sainte Colombe. Titon du Tillet states:

Sainte colombe [sic] was the teacher of Marais; but having seen that at the end of six months his pupil could surpass him, he said that he did not have anything more to show him.  

It is interesting to note that details of Marais’ studies with Sainte Colombe only appear in sources other than Marais’.

By 1675, he was playing with the opera orchestra in Paris, and in 1679, he was appointed an *Ordinaire de la chambre du Roy pour la viole* while in the service of the king. While a court violist, he benefited from the study of composition with the *Surintendants de Musique de Chambre*, Jean-Baptiste Lully. This association with Lully likely paved the way for Marais to compose his four operas: Alcide (1693), Ariane et Bacchus (1696), Alcyone (1706) and Sémélé (1709).

After his first publication of the *Pièces à une et à deux violes* in 1686, he published four more books of viol pieces, which were published in 1701, 1711, 1717 and 1725 respectively, all with *basso continuo* accompaniment. He also published works for chamber music, such as a volume of *Pièces en trio* (1692) for two treble instruments (violins, flutes or treble viols) and *basso continuo*, and *La Gamme* (1723), a collection of sonatas for violin and *basso continuo*.

After Marais, almost all later publications for the viol included *basso continuo* accompaniment. Composers who published after Marais like Louis de Caix d’Hervelois (c.1680-1755), Jacques Morel (c.1690-1740), Roland Marais (1685-1750), Charles Dollé (c.1700-1755) and Antoine Forqueray (1672-1745), published music in this new style. It appears that the French solo viol tradition of playing the viol unaccompanied,

---

181 Titon du Tillet, 625: *Sainte colombe fut le maître de Marais; mais s’étant aperçu au bout de six mois que son Élève pouvait le surpasser, il lui dit qu’il n’avait plus rien à lui montrer.*
182 Lesure, “Marais”: 132.
which began in France with Maugars and Hotman, and flourished for at least fifty years, disappeared practically overnight as soon as Marais’ pieces were published.

Fortunately, this was not completely the case. Although it was clear that this style of unaccompanied playing was no longer in demand in published music, there is reason to believe that violists continued writing and playing music in this manner. There is evidence to believe that unaccompanied music was still written and performed by members of the Forqueray and Sainte Colombe families, which will be further explained.183

Forqueray

Antoine Forqueray (1672-1745) was born in Paris in September 1672.184 His initial musical education probably came from his father, whose musical taste was probably akin to unaccompanied works of the earlier part of the seventeenth century.185 There is no evidence that he studied with Marais or any of the other violists who published pieces with *basso continuo* accompaniment.

Forqueray received his official court appointment as a *Musicien Ordinaire de la Chambre du Roy* on 31st December 1689.186 He was employed by the house of Orléans, where he taught the *Duc d’Orléans*, Phillippe II, and his son, Louis d’Orléans.187 The Duke became one of the most important patrons of the Italian style at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries.

---

183 See chapter 2 on “Forqueray” and “Sainte Colombe le fils”.
186 Benoit and Norbert, 118.
In 1747, two years after the death of Antoine Forqueray, Jean-Baptiste Forqueray (1699-1782), the son of Antoine, published his father’s music posthumously under the title *Pièces de viole avec la basse continuë composées par M’. Forqueray le père*. It consists of 32 pieces divided into five suites according to key, mostly titled after well-known personalities of the period, such as composers/performers (La Leclair, La Couperin, La Rameau), patrons (La Régente, La Ferrand), relations (La Buisson, La Boisson) and men of science (La Montigny, La Silva, La Tronchin). Unlike the common trend of writing character pieces as seen in the later viol pièces of Marais, there are only two such works (Le Carillon de Passy, Jupiter). According to Forqueray’s obituary, he may have written as many as 300 pieces, hence these published pieces may represent a small fraction of what he wrote.

Although these viol pieces exist with basso continuo accompaniment, they were originally conceived without it. Prior to publication Jean-Baptiste added a basse continue part. In the avertissement to the *Pièces de viole*, he explains:

> I have decided in making the bass a very simple one, in order to refrain from the confusion which one will find with the bass in the pieces for harpsichord, which I have decorated as much as possible.

Jean-Baptiste was also responsible for adding the fingering to the pieces:

> I have attached a good fingering to his pieces, to make it easier to execute.

The solo viol part in the *Pièces de viole* possesses much of the characteristics of unaccompanied music. If one were to compare the solo and basse continue parts, one would realise that the bass line doubles the solo part more than half the time.

---

188 Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale D 4019(1).
189 *Suite d’un goût étranger* from Marais’ fourth book (1717) contains many such character pieces.
190 La Laurencie, 1252.
191 Antoine Forqueray, *Pièces de viole avec la basse continue* (Paris, 1747), 1: J’ai juge a propos d’en faire la Basse tres simple, afin d’éviter la confusion qui se trouveroit avec la Basse des piece de Clavecin que j’ai ornée autant qu’ils m’a été possible.
192 Ibid.: Je me suis attaché a bien doigter ses pièces, pour en rendre l’Exection plus facile.
Furthermore, the chordal nature of the music ensures the harmony is mostly complete.

In fact, it can be said that Antoine’s pieces are written in the harmonic style. It is important to note that extant pieces in manuscript by Antoine — allemande, la girouette, muzette and bransle — also do not contain basse continue parts.  

These pieces in manuscript are said to have been written around 1685-1716. Robinson explains:

[T]here is a theorbo transcription of the muzette by Antoine’s colleague Robert de Visée (c. 1655-1732/3) in the Vaudry de Saizenay manuscript, which Claude Chauvel dates between 1685 and 1716.

The allemande (Fig. 8), which is derived from the manuscript, is an example of Forqueray’s style of writing during this time.

193 Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale F-Pn Vm7 6296  
Fig. 8 Forqueray (Focroi in the manuscript), Allemande. (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale F-Pn Vm7 6296)
Although the *allemande* (Fig. 8) is written in a simpler style compared to the pieces in the *Pièces de viole*, it exhibits the unmistakable qualities of harmonic writing in the use of chords and double stops. In addition to the Italianate technique of the repetition of motifs, certain compositional devices that are found in the *Pièces de viole* are present in the *allemande*. The following examples illustrate this:

*Fig. 9* Forqueray, *Allemande*, bar 5 and *Pièces de viole* (1747), *Allemande La La Borde*, page 1, bar 13.
Fig. 10 Forqueray, *Allemande*, bar 6-7 and *Pièces de viole, La Regente*, page 16, bar 14-15.

Fig. 11 Forqueray, *Allemande*, bar 8 and *Pièces de viole, Allemande La La Borde*, page 1, bar 22.

Fig. 12 Forqueray, *Allemande*, bar 14 and *Pièces de viole, La Eynaud*, page 19, bar 7-8.
In addition to these musical characteristics, there is also strong evidence for the authorship of these unpublished pieces proving that it is indeed the work of Antoine.\textsuperscript{195}

\textbf{Authorship of the Pièces de viole}

Some modern scholars believe that these \textit{Pièces de viole} are the compositions of Jean-Baptiste. This hypothesis was conceived by Lucy Robinson in the thesis “The

\textsuperscript{195}Ibid.
An article on this topic was later published in 2006 titled “Forqueray Pieces de Viole (Paris, 1747): an enigma of authorship between father and son”.

In an effort to dissociate the above allemande from the works in the Pièces de viole, Robinson writes:

The allemande demonstrates the style of Antoine’s pieces. The use of harmony is simple and straightforward; the harmonic progressions are often discursive, as if improvised: for example, the use of the same sequential point eight times in the second half of the piece (bars 12-20, 22-4). Antoine’s modulations hold no surprises and are solely to closely related keys; as a result the allemande extends to only 26 bars. There is an elementary attempt to unite the movement through the new Italian technique of developing melodic motives. In all four manuscript pieces the time signatures and tempo markings are typical of works written in the late 17th and early 18th century; no extra clues are given as to tempo or articulation save those inherent in the title.

Despite this information, Robinson acknowledges the virtuosity of Antoine, which is clearly shown in La girouette and the Pièces de viole, but nevertheless makes a distinction between them. Robinson explains:

However, Antoine’s pieces demonstrate a noticeable interest in virtuosity. There are early instance of progressive fingerings across the strings in high positions, and some sequences are fingered sequentially…. But there are no examples of typically Italianate passage work and the viol writing is not strongly chordal.

Robinson suggests that they do not belong to the generation of Marais and owe their influence to the later French violin school, led by Jean-Marie Leclair (1697-1764). Robinson explains:

---

198 Ibid., 259.
199 Ibid., 259-262.
But my close examination of the evidence has led me to conclude that these pieces are largely the work of JBF [Jean-Baptiste Forqueray], that they were not only printed the last years of the French viol tradition but also belong there musically and technically. There are two types of evidence for my belief. One kind comes from stylistic and technical analysis of the pieces.... The second kind of evidence is far easier to obtain: it stems from JBF’s remarks in the avertissement to the printed edition. 200

The stylistic and technical analysis of the pieces by Robinson do provide an indication that these works may have been influenced by eighteenth-century composers. However, this analysis is based on the work including the basse continue part, which was added prior to publication by Jean-Baptiste (1747). The result is that some of the chords and harmonies in the music reflect those of later eighteenth-century works, leading Robinson to her conclusion.

Robinson’s lack of attention towards the unaccompanied repertoire of the seventeenth century results in an incomplete view of the development of the French viol. Features of harmonic writing, which are clearly exhibited in Forqueray’s music, are not discussed as such by Robinson. Robinson explains:

JBF’s doubling of the bass of three- and four-part chords in the solo part on the continuo creates a wonderfully rich texture which is particularly characteristic of the composer. 201

This “anomaly”, the doubling of the bass, in Forqueray’s compositions is made to appear as a special effect by Robinson. In reality, this is the result of an added basse continue part to a piece originally conceived in the harmonic style.

This “peculiarity” of harmonic writing and doubling of the bass in Forqueray’s works can be observed more clearly when viewed amongst the works of contemporary violists. Robinson writes:

---

201 Ibid., 244.
Three- and four-part chords (whether doubled in the bass or not) occur far more often in the solo part of JBF’s Pièces de viole than in the compositions of Marais, who rarely used them for concentrated passages such as one finds repeatedly in the works of JBF. Their use is hardly more common in the rococo pièces de viole of Caix d’Hervelois but a thicker texture is noticeable in Dollé’s Pièces de viole. Be that as it may, Dollé’s use of three- and four-part chords is only significant in Carillon and even in this piece his usage cannot be considered extensive in comparison to the works of JBF.²⁰²

Concerning the evidence that Robinson presents in respect to Forqueray’s avertissement:

Furthermore, if the harmony can be proved to be the work of JBF then many of the chords in the solo part, which reflect the choice of the harmony, must also have been written by him.²⁰³

While this may have very well been the case, it disregards the aforementioned assertion by Jean-Baptiste Forqueray that he only added the basse continue part. He also states in the avertissement:

As the third suite was not found with the complete number of pieces, I was obliged to add three of mine, which are marked with a star.²⁰⁴

When scrutinising Jean-Baptiste’s pieces (La Angrave, La Du Vaucel, Chaconne. La Morangis ou La Plissay), it is clear that it is written in a style more akin to the melodic style. There is a far less reliance on the melody being bound by the bass line, as would be expected of music with basso continuo accompaniment. This is especially noticeable in La Du Vaucel.

²⁰² Ibid., 245.
²⁰³ Ibid., 127.
²⁰⁴ Forqueray, Pièces de viole: La troisieme suite ne s’étant pas trouvée complete pour le nombre des pieces, j’ai été oblige d’en ajouter trios des miennes, lesquelles sont marquées d’une Etoile.
In spite of this, Jean-Baptiste makes an effort to align his style with the harmonic style. He includes many chords and double stops, often doubling the bass line in *La Angrave* and *Chaconne. La Morangis ou La Plissay*, in order to emulate the style of his father.

It is hard to accept Robinson’s claim as the evidence provided is in conflict with what was said by Jean-Baptiste Forqueray about his contribution in the *avertissement.* The style of the music written, albeit in a more modern style, is clearly written in the idiom of unaccompanied solo viol music in the harmonic style of the later seventeenth century. Robinson’s attempt in dissociating the unpublished pieces of Antoine with those in the *Pièces de viole* in an effort to prove they are the work of Jean-Baptiste is unconvincing. This action is analogous to disregarding the later works of a composer because of stylistic differences in his earlier works.

It also seems unlikely that Forqueray would have been able to publish his own music under his father’s name undetected, as his father’s reputation would have been greater than his own. Other historical violists would have easily detected if any of the pieces that were attributed to his father were in fact not by him. Perhaps this explains why he made sure to mark his own compositions with a star.
The Italian Sonata and the Harmonic Style

During the first half of the eighteenth century, musical life in France was experiencing the incursion of the Italian style. In respect to viol music, we observe the Italian sonata being associated with the harmonic style. In 1740, Hubert Le Blanc writes:

To clarify what the merit of the sonata consists of, and consequently what it has excelled in, there are two very important remarks to make. The first is that in music, just as in discourse, there is a distinction to be made between poetry and prose. The second is the notable difference between harmony and melody. The Italians seek the one above all; the French sacrifice everything for the other. The character of musical poetry is Melody. It is found in all French pièces [suites?] for the viol and for the harpsichord. The property of musical prose is harmony, without which the Sonata would merely be on par with the low level of music of a children’s choir.205

Le Blanc claims Antoine Forqueray rejected the French melodic style, essentially advocating the harmonic style:

At the same time, if the viola da gamba had a fine support in the person of Marais senior, she also had a solid one in Focroi [Forqueray] senior. He felt very seriously that all the Galbavons, with their infatuation for playing pièces, were very wrong not to follow the example of the lute, harp, guitar, and dulcimer, which were out of use.206

Likewise, Marais, in what appears to be a personal revolt against the harmonic (and Italian) style, disregards the sonata:

205 Hubert Le Blanc, Défense de la basse de viole (Amsterdam, 1740), 9-10: Pour éclaircir ce fait consistant dans le mérite de la Sonate, & par conséquent de celui qui y a excellé, il y a deux remarques à faire très importantes. La première que dans la Musique, de même que dans le Discours, il y a à distinguer Poésie & Prose. La seconde est la notable différence entre l’Harmonie & le Chant. Les Italiens recherchent par dessus tout, l’une, & les François sacrissent tout à l’autre. La caractére de la Poésie Musical est le Chant. Il se trouve dans toutes les Pièces Françoises de Viole & de Clavecin. L’apparage de la Prose Musique est l’Harmonie, sans laquelle la Sonate ne se tire pas de pair d’avec la platitude d’une Musique d’Enfant de Choeur; the following translations of the Défense de la basse de viole (footnotes 208-210) are from Barbara G. Jackson, “Hubert Le Blanc’s Defense of the viole,” Journal of the Viola da Gamba Society of America 10 (1973), 11-28.

206 Ibid., 4: Cependant, si la Basse de Viole avait un beau soutien en la personne du Père Marais, elle en eut un solide en celle de Forcroi le Père. Il considéra très sérieusement que tous les Galbavons, avec leur entêtement de faire jouer des Pièces, avoient grand tort de ne pas prendre exemple sur le Luth, la Harpe, la Guitare, & la Timpanon, qui étoient hors d’usage.
Marais senior was quite able to play his own pièces without being subject to nervousness, and was able execute those of others, except for sonatas.\textsuperscript{207}

With this knowledge, Le Blanc’s anecdote of Marais and Forqueray carries far more meaning than a simple description of the differences between both men:

The Viol was regarded with favour by King Louis XIV, who prized the Marais senior, for his Pièces, and the Forcroi [Forqueray] senior, for his Préludes in the manner of the sonata. One had been said to play like an angel, and the other like a devil.\textsuperscript{208}

Le Blanc is describing the preference Forqueray had for the harmonic style, something that even at this late date (1740) is reported to be in favour amongst some violists.

It would be no surprise that Antoine Forqueray should choose to write unaccompanied solo viol music in the harmonic style. He grew up in the later part of the seventeenth century, and must have been familiar with the works of De Machy as well as other viol composers of the earlier seventeenth century. Even Jean-Baptiste Forqueray is said to have written a large number of unaccompanied pieces.\textsuperscript{209}

**Sainte Colombe le fils**

Sainte Colombe le fils is the son of the aforementioned Sainte Colombe. There are even fewer details concerning Sainte Colombe le fils than there are of Sainte Colombe le père. He is said to have left France to settle in Britain, and his activities in Britain uncover most of the information we have of him.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid., 3: Le Père Marais fut en possession de jouer ses Pièces, non sujet à être inquieté, d’exécuter celles des autres, ni les Sonates.
\textsuperscript{208} Ibid., 59: La Viole s’étoit vue favorisée par le Roi Louis XIV dans ses Nourissons, le Père Marais pour ses Pièces, & Focroi le Père pour ses Préludes tirans sur la Sonate. L’un avoit été déclaré jouer comme un Ange, & l’autre jouer comme un Diable.
\end{flushright}
“St Culume” was in Edinburgh in 1707, where he was working as a viol teacher to the Scottish Lady Grizel Baillie (1692-1732) of Mellerstain House in Berwickshire.²¹⁰ Incidentally, this is the same city where some of Sainte Colombe le père’s manuscripts are currently housed, after been brought back from France by the Scottish Maule brothers.²¹¹ There is also mention of a “Mr Sinkolm” or “Mr St Columb” amongst the violists in a concert in Edinburgh.²¹² He is also said to have spent some time in London. According to Dunford:

We know also that according to the London newspaper "The Daily Courant," a "concert benefice for Mr Sainte Colombe" was held at the Hickford Room in London in 1713. We also find a viol teacher, "Mr Cynelum," in London in 1716. The name would seem to be an anglicized version of the difficult to pronounce for English speakers Sainte-Colombe.”²¹³

The only possible reference to Sainte Colombe le fils in French sources is from Rémont de Saint Mard who, in 1742, claims to know him. Dunford writes:

Remond de Saint Mard, an eighteenth century writer, describes a natural son of Sainte Colombe, possibly our composer, as a "simple man...who had not enough imagination to lie," recounting how his father moved a listener to tears with a sarabande.²¹⁴

Sainte Colombe le fils never published any music during his lifetime. The only pieces that remain are six suites for viol, which exist in manuscript. This manuscript, which is housed in the Durham Cathedral Library, is a compilation of viol pieces by

²¹⁴ Ibid.
many different composers from the seventeenth and eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{215} Copied by Philip Falle (1656-1742), the prebendary of Durham Cathedral from 1700, this manuscript represents much of the musical taste of an amateur violist in the eighteenth century.

Most of the pieces are by Marais and Johann Schenk (c.1660-1710). Of the pieces by Schenk, they were mostly copied from his Sonatas Opus 2 and the \textit{Scherzi Musicali} Opus 6. Those by Marais are from the \textit{Pièces à une et à deux violes} (1686), the solo pieces from the \textit{Basse-Continues des Pièces à une et à deux violes} (1689) and the \textit{Pièces de Viole, 2e Livre} (1701). The other composers that make up the manuscript are of various nationalities. From England, Christopher Simpson, Thomas Mace (c.1612-c.1706), Anthony Poole (fl. c.1670–90); from the Low Countries, Carolus Hacquart (c.1640-c.1701) and Johan Snep (1659-1719); from France, Dubuisson, De Machy,\textsuperscript{216} Louis Heudeline (fl. 1700-1710), François du Faut (c.1604-c.1672); from Germany, Godfrey Finger (c.1660-1730) and Frederick Steffkins;\textsuperscript{217} and from Italy, Angelo Maria Fiore (c.1660-1723). The vast variety of composers, as well as the existence of music for both unaccompanied and accompanied viol pieces, is evidence that playing unaccompanied viol solos from the seventeenth century was still desirable despite the great popular of accompanied pieces such as those by Marais and Schenk.

The six suites by Sainte Colombe \textit{le fils}, unlike the works of his father, were written for a six-string bass viol. This information possibly reveals his inclination towards English viols. This also points towards the early date (1700s), since the seventh string would have been unlikely to be in common use in England by the early eighteenth century. Dunford explains:

\textsuperscript{215} Durham: Durham Cathedral Library, MS A 27.
\textsuperscript{216} The work on page 250 of the MS A 27 has been previously unrecognised as the \textit{chaconne} by Machy from his \textit{Pièces de Viole}.
\textsuperscript{217} It is likely that Falle may have very well have meant Dietrich Steffkins (c.1620-1673), instead of Frederick.
They are written for a six-string viol, which strongly indicates composition in England where the violists had not taken up the seventh string introduced by his father and common in France by the early 1700s. The manuscript...was probably compiled between 1703 and 1707, starting after the elder Sainte Colombe died, in 1701 at the latest. The younger Sainte-Colombe might have come to England by this time.\footnote{Jonathan Dunford, “The Younger Sainte-Colombe” http://jonathan.dunford.free.fr/html/ste-fils.htm (accessed 23 April 2008).}

The six suites are collected according to key, and somewhat following the traditional “classical” suite form that was first used by De Machy. However, the \textit{Tombeau pour Mf. de Ste Colombe le père} deserves special mention, since it is the only piece amongst the six suites that include the harmonic and rhythmic irregularities reminiscent of Sainte Colombe \textit{le père} works, essentially imitating the style of his father in this musical tribute.

Although not written in France, Sainte Colombe \textit{le fils’} suites can be considered to be the last French pieces written for the solo viol in the harmonic style.

\section*{Solo Viol Works Outside France}

Notable works for the unaccompanied viol include those written by Schenk, Georg Philipp Telemann (1681-1767) and Karl Friedrich Abel (1723-1787).

Dutch violist Schenk published his \textit{L’Écho du Danube} in 1704. In this collection, which mostly includes works for viol and \textit{basso continuo}, Schenk includes two solos for unaccompanied viol: sonatas V and VI. These works are clearly influenced by the Italian style, possibly through the then the violin sonatas (Opus 5) of Arcangelo Corelli (1653-1713), which were published in 1700.

Telemann wrote twelve \textit{Fantaisies pour basse de viole}, which are unfortunately lost.\footnote{TWV 40:26-37.} Despite their French title, it is unlikely that they were written in a French suite.
style. The solo fantaisies written for the flute, violin and harpsichord attest to this fact. There is, however, a solo sonata that appears in the periodical Der getreue Music-Meister. Published in Hamburg during June 1729 in Lessons 15 and 16, it is simply titled, “Viola di Gamba senza Cembalo”.

Karl Friedrich Abel’s solo pieces can be found in manuscript in the British Library\textsuperscript{220} and the New York Public Library\textsuperscript{221}. The British manuscript was compiled by Lady Pembroke and bears her signature. This collection also includes solos with basso continuo.

The New York manuscript appears to be an autograph. Most of the solos are of complete pieces, though some shorter solos appear to be written-out improvisations or cadenzas. While these pieces do not exhibit any qualities of the French style, it is interesting to note that some solos utilise the low A string, suggesting that Abel may have owned a seven-string instrument. This may be proof of the eventual acceptance of the seventh string outside France.

Conclusion

The activities of Maugars were probably partly responsible for the transmission of ideas of solo viol playing into France. While Hotman appears not to have been influenced by the English style, he seems to have developed a style of solo viol playing that violists of the time identify as the French style. Other violists of the next generation, like Dubuisson and Sainte Colombe, contributed enormously towards the development of this genre, enriching the solo viol repertoire in this period. In time, this undoubtedly led De Machy to publish his Pièces de Violle.

De Machy’s Pièces de Violle is one of the most important contributions to the

\textsuperscript{220} London: British Library, Ms. Add. 31697.
\textsuperscript{221} New York: New York Public Library, Drexel 5871.
viol repertory. In comparison to his contemporaries, De Machy was something of a revolutionary. He was the first to publish both a treatise and a book of pieces for the viol in France. His ideas on ornamentation were the most complex of its time. His contribution towards viol technique is an invaluable one, merging the established ideas of the English *lyra-way* of viol playing with the newer French style.

De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle* represent a culmination of musical ideas on viol playing that were developed in France during the early and mid-seventeenth century. This highly informative document shows the viol to be an instrument that was developed through a synthesis of ideas that were commonly shared with the lute, theorbo and harpsichord.

The onset of *basso continuo* in France may have changed music making amongst those that favoured this new genre, but unaccompanied viol playing appears to have remained in fashion, at least amongst those that were supporters of De Machy’s style. While we cannot be certain if Antoine Forqueray was one of these supporters, his *Pièces de viole* represent the last few works written for the solo viol in France. Sainte Colombe *le fils* provides us with solo viol music written in a French style outside France, suggesting that new solo viol music in the French style may have still been in favour even as late as the early eighteenth century.

After the decline of the viol during Karl Friedrich Abel’s time, viol playing enters a period of non-activity for nearly 150 years until the revival of early music in the late nineteenth century. The tradition of the solo French viol playing, which began with Hotman, ends after two generations of Sainte Colombes. This is the testimony to the popularity of the instrument throughout the Baroque era, and the early success of a single bowed string instrument in performing music alone.
Chapter 3

French Ornamentation and De Machy

Ornaments, otherwise known in French as *agrément*, can be regarded as one of the most important aspect of performing music of the French Baroque, since without these ornaments, French music loses much of its character, style and grace. *Bon goût*, which for many musicians defines much of the essence of French music, describes the relationship between what is appropriate and what is not; the balance between the proper and the excessively adorned. This is contrasted with that of Italian music of the early Baroque period, which is characterised by ornate embellishments and virtuosity. This is an attitude that is outlined by the French writer Le Cerf de la Viéville (1674-1707):

Let us make it a habit and a merit to have contempt, distaste, and aversion without quarter for all that contains anything superfluous.
Let us hate even an expression which is of the right character but which goes beyond the appropriate degree of force.

When *bon goût* is applied to ornamentation, it refers to the practice of ornamentation within the stylistic conventions and traditions of French Baroque music. Beginning the third part the *Traité de viole*, Rousseau thoroughly explains the purpose of ornamentation:

* Agréments are to the voice and to instruments what ornaments are to a building. Ornaments are not necessary for the structure of the

---

building as they serve only to make it more agreeable to the eye. Likewise an air for the voice and a piece for instruments can be fundamentally correct, yet it will not satisfy the ear if it is not ornamented with appropriate agréments. Still too great a quantity of ornaments will produce a type of confusion which will make the building less agreeable; similarly, the confusion of agréments in airs and in pieces serve only to diminish their beauty.\footnote{Rousseau, \textit{Traité}, 74-75: \textit{Les Agrémens sont à la Voix & aux Instruments ce que les Ornements sont à un Edifice, & comme les Ornements ne sont pas necessaires pour la subsistence du Bastiment, mais qu’ils servent seulement à le rendre plus agreable à la veuë; ainsi un Air pour la Voix, & une Piece pour les Instruments peuvent ester reguliers quant au fond, qui pourrant ne satisfieroient point l’oïïye, s’ils n’estoient ornez des Agrémens convenables, & de mesme que la trop grande quantité d’Ornements produiroit une especie de confusion qui rendroit l’Edifice moins agreeable; ainsi la confusion des Agrémens dans les Airs & dans les Pieces ne sert que pour en diminuer la beauté}; trans. R. A. Green.\footnote{A summary of symbols for ornaments and their intentions can be found in Schwendowius, 225-229.}

Ornaments for the viol and their corresponding symbols were not yet standardized during De Machy’s time. This can easily be observed in the numerous tables of ornaments and writings of other composers after De Machy’s time, often using different names for the same ornaments or giving them completely different meanings altogether.\footnote{A summary of symbols for ornaments and their intentions can be found in Schwendowius, 225-229.}

The intention of this chapter is to give a clear understanding of the development of instrumental ornamentation in France before and during the time of De Machy, comparing his efforts to that of other composers for the lute, theorbo and harpsichord, while interpreting his table of ornaments based on this information.

The Lute and Theorbo

The fact that so many violists also played plucked string instruments, such as the lute, guitar and theorbo, strongly suggest that many of the ideas for viol ornamentation originated from their experiences with these instruments. Likewise, the similarities between the viol and lute, both being fretted instruments, suggest the possibility of a cross application of technical and musical ideas of ornamentation.

Considering these connections, it is important that other sources beyond the viol are
examined. Because of the comparatively older origins of the lute, ideas of ornamentation that display congruency with later viol sources show the direct influence of these instruments.

During the mid-seventeenth century, the lute was at the forefront of its development in France. This is clearly documented in the Burwell Lute Tutor (c.1661-72), where many aspects of the lute and lute playing are discussed. The tutor states:

It is easy to find by this discourse that the French are in possession of the lute, that it is their instrument – as the viol is the instrument of England, the guitar that of Spain, the theorbo that of Italy, the virginal or harpsichord that of Germany, the harp that of Ireland and so of others according to the genius of each nation.

As there is an enormous variety of instrument designs for both the lute and theorbo, it is first necessary to clarify the instruments being discussed. The lute that was used during this period in France had a varying number of courses.

Of all the instruments of music the lute pleaseth most of the French…. The lute hath had a long time but thirteen strings, then fifteen, then seventeen, then nineteen, where he hath remained a long time - that is, nine doubled strings and the treble (for ‘tis but of late that we use but one second). All that while the lute had but one head.

The French had gradually altered the lute, adding bass strings to increase its range downwards. Eventually, an additional course was added to the 10-course lute. The 11-course lute remained the most popular lute of the day, despite the efforts of Jacques Gaultier (c. 1630) to extend the lute even further.

\[226\] Ibid., 14.
\[227\] Ibid., 13. On the lute during this time, each course would usually hold two strings, except for the first course. Hence, a ten-course lute would have 19 strings.
English Gaultier hath been of another opinion and hath caused two heads to be made to the lute. All England hath accepted that augmentation, and France at first; but soon after that alteration hath been condemned by all the French masters, who are returned to their old fashion, keeping only the small eleventh.\textsuperscript{228}

During the early part of the seventeenth century, the lute was an important accompaniment instrument for the \textit{airs de cour}, which were songs performed at court. The lute was also used with other plucked string instruments, like citterns, guitars, theorboes and keyboard instruments, like spinets and harpsichords. Last but not least, solo music, often characterised by the modern usage of the term \textit{style brisé},\textsuperscript{229} featured an important role in the musical and social development of the lute through the works of composers such as the Ennemond Gaultier (1575-1651), Denis Gaultier (c.1600-1672), Jacques Gallot (\textit{d} c.1690) and Charles Mouton (1617-c.1699).

Of the many tunings for the lute that existed, the standard tuning that was adopted during this time for solo music was the “Baroque” or “d minor” tuning, where the first six courses are tuned to A D F a d’ f’ with the rest of the courses descending diatonically.\textsuperscript{230} However, a vast majority of \textit{airs de cour} required the lute to be tuned to the old renaissance tuning, otherwise known as \textit{vieil ton}, where the first six courses are tuned to G C f a d’ g’.

Due to its musical popularity, anyone who could play the lute was held in high esteem, and its musical artistry was greatly appreciated by many. Those with royal and aristocratic connections further encouraged this practice. Louis XIII was said to have

\textsuperscript{228}Ibid., 58-59.
had lessons on the lute with Robert Ballard (c.1575-c.1649),\textsuperscript{231} as did Cardinal Richelieu with Ennemond Gaultier.\textsuperscript{232}

In 1705, theorist Sébastien de Brossard (1655-1730) writes of the theorbo:

\textbf{Theorbo}: It is this instrument, since around 50 or 60 years, which has succeeded the lute in playing \textit{Basses-Continuës}. The Italians often title their \textit{basses-continuë} sheets with the word \textit{theorba} [sic]. It is claimed that it is Sieur Hotteman [sic], so famous for his playing and pieces for the bass viol, was its inventor in France, where its use was introduced from Italy and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{233}

If Brossard is correct in assuming that Hotman brought the theorbo to France, he may have also been responsible for its modification. The French theorbo had existed in two forms: one for playing solo music and the other for playing \textit{basso continuo}. James Talbot (1664-1708) in his manuscript for plucked strings mentions two different sizes and types of French theorbo.\textsuperscript{234}

Both forms of theorbo had fourteen courses, the first six courses were tuned in renaissance tuning, and the rest, as with the 11-course lute, were tuned diatonically downwards. The solo theorbo (\textit{theorbe de pièces}) was a smaller instrument and was tuned in d (d, g, c’, e’, a, d’), and the continuo theorbo a fourth lower in a (A, D, g, b, e, a), both with re-entrant tunings with the two upper courses down an octave. Because of Hotman’s connection to the French solo theorbo repertory, it is conceivable that the instrument he may have invented was in fact the small solo French theorbo, since the

\textsuperscript{233} Brossard, \textit{Dictionnaire: Theorbo}: C’est instrument qui depuis environ 50 ou 60 ans a succédé au Luth pour jouer les Basses-Continuës. D’ou les italiens prennent souvent occasion d’intituler leurs basses-continuë du mot theorba On pretend que c’est le Sieur Hotteman, si fameux d’ailleurs pour le jeu, et les pièces de la basse de violle, qui a on été l’Inventeur en France, d’ou l’usage s’en est introduit en Italie et ailleurs.
larger continuo theorbo is far too similar in design to the already familiar Italian theorbo.\textsuperscript{235}

The accompaniment capacity of the theorbo was thoroughly exploited, as seen in the many treatises that were published during the seventeenth century. Nicolas Fleury (c.1630-c.1678) published his \textit{Méthode pour apprendre facilement à toucher le théorbe sur la basse-continuë} (1660), which was soon followed by Angelo Michele Bartolomi (c.1668) with his \textit{Table pour apprendre facilement à toucher le théorbe sur la basse-continuë} (1669). Only one year later, Henry Grenerin (fl mid-17th century) published his \textit{Livre de théorbe contenant plusieurs pièces sur différents tons, avec une nouvelle méthode tres facile pour apprendre à jouer sur la partie les basses continues et toutes sortes d’airs} (1670). Finally, a more general \textit{basso continuo} treatise for both theorbo and harpsichord, Denis Delair’s (d after 1727) \textit{Traité d’accompagnement pour le théorbe et le clavessin} (1690) appeared.

Similarly, the French solo theorbo repertory is particularly extensive. Composers who wrote for the solo theorbo, other than Hotman, include Robert de Visée (c.1655-c.1732),\textsuperscript{236} Charles Hurel (fl c.1665-1692) and Estienne Le Moine (c.1640-c.1715). Most theorbo music remains in manuscript. While \textit{Manuscrit Vaudry de Saizenay}\textsuperscript{237} contains most of De Visée’s music, he also published his \textit{Pièces de théorbe et de luth mises en partition dessus et basse} (1716). Hurel’s manuscript is

\textsuperscript{235} Although there are no existing theorbos of this form, iconographical evidence suggests that a larger theorbo would have had a similarly long string length to that of an Italian theorbo; however, with a far shorter second pegbox for the \textit{diapasons}. Surviving \textit{angéliques}, such as the one in The Yale University Collection of Musical Instruments, which was converted from a lute by Venere, suggest that the internal structure of Italian instruments were identical to French ones; hence, it is only the question of string length that determines the structure of the French theorbo. Since James Talbot (1664-1708) describes the “lesser French theorbo for lessons” with strings lengths of 76cm and \textit{diapasons} of 129.2cm, one can only assume that the French continuo theorbo was simply larger (possibly proportionately). Stopped string lengths for Italian theorbos vary from 75cm to over 90cm. I am indebted to Dr. Lynda Sayce for this information.

\textsuperscript{236} Although the composer is often referred to De Visée in modern publications, for the sake of continuity, he will be referred to as “De Visé” when discussed in the context of Rousseau’s \textit{Réponse}.

\textsuperscript{237} Besançon: Bibliothèque municipale, 279.152 and 279.153.
housed in the Pierpont Morgan Library\textsuperscript{238} and Le Moine’s is in the Bibliothèque Nationale\textsuperscript{239}.

Ornamentation According to Mersenne

One of the earliest detailed discussions of ornamentation (1636) for the lute in France appears in Mersenne’s \textit{Harmonie Universelle}. At the request of Mersenne, Jehan Basset,\textsuperscript{240} a well-known lute teacher in Paris, presented his treatise as part of Mersenne’s book. Concerning ornamentation, he first mentions the \textit{tremblement}:

\begin{quote}
Now the one which is formed in this fashion: ( , ) is called the ordinary \textit{tremblement}, and most people use no other character to express all the different sorts; that is why I have not wished to change it, since it is familiar to everyone, so as not to use any novelty if it is not useful.\textsuperscript{241}
\end{quote}

This \textit{tremblement} was probably the most widespread ornament of its time, and perhaps the first ornament to be codified in this manner. It does, however, have a slightly different meaning from its later seventeenth-century counterpart. Instead of a being a trill that begins on the upper auxiliary, it begins on the main note and is not executed continuously. Using modern terminology, we would refer to it as an upper mordent. Basset also takes care to introduce a ( - ) above the ( , ) to signify an upper mordent over a semitone, in the event that this ornament should be executed on an open string. In every other situation, the absence of the ( - ) above the ( , ) denotes an upper mordent over a tone.

\textsuperscript{238} New York: The Pierpont Morgan Library, PLM 17524 BDG.
\textsuperscript{239} Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, F-B 279.152, Rés.1106, Vm 76265, D-Bsb 40601, US-BEm 775.
\textsuperscript{240} I am unable to find the dates of birth and death for Basset.
\textsuperscript{241} Mersenne, \textit{Harmonie Universelle}, vol. 3, Livre second des Instrumens, prop. ix, 79: \textit{Or celuy qui est formé en cette façon, s'appelle vulgairement tremblement, \& la plus part ne se servent point d'autre charactere pour en exprimer toutes les différentes especes; c'est pourquoi je ne l'ay pas voulu changer, puis qu'il est si familier à tout le monde, afin de n'user d'aucune nouveauté si elle n'est utile;} the following translation of \textit{Harmonie Universelle} (Footnotes 246-249) are by R. E. Chapman.
The accent plaintif, which is basically an appoggiatura from below, is also written with a ( , ), but with a ( . ) preceding the letter of the note in tablature. As with the tremblement, the ( - ) above the ( , ) signifies an appoggiatura over a semitone, and the absence of the ( - ) refers to an appoggiatura over a tone. For obvious reasons, this ornament is never executed on an open string.

As for the martelments [sic], there are two sorts. Signified with a ( * ), the first sort is a continuous lower mordent that is made only with the first finger, either on the first or second fret (notated with an a or b in tablature). When finishing the trill, the finger must return to the original note and allow it to sound. The other kind of martelment, which is indicated with a ( Λ ), refers to the same action; however, executed with two fingers. This occurs in every situation where the lower note of the mordent is not an open string. Similarly, a ( - ) above the ( Λ ) denotes a lower mordent over a semitone.

As to the verre cassé, I am adding it here, although it is not used so much now as it was in the past, inasmuch as it has very great charm when it is made quite properly. And one of the reasons that the moderns have rejected it is because the older ones used it almost all the time.

The verre cassé, notated with a ( . ) placed before the ( , ) of the tremblement, refers to a somewhat modern equivalent to a vibrato. How this is achieved is by swinging the left hand with “great violence”, while releasing the thumb from the neck to free the hand. This surprising evidence of vibrato by early seventeenth-century lutenists has caused later lutenists to refrain from this ornament. However, according to Mersenne:

---

242 Ibid., 81: Quant au verre cassé, je l'adiouste icy, encore qu'il ne soit pas maintenant si usité que par le passé, dautant qu'il a fort bonne grace, quand on le fait bien à propos: & l'une des raisons pour laquelle les modernes l'ont reietté, est parce que les anciens en usoient presque partout.

243 Ibid., 81: grande violence.
But since it is as vicious to use it not at all as to perform it too much, it must be used in moderation.\textsuperscript{244}

Indicated with a (Z), the \textit{battement} can be described as trill beginning on the upper auxiliary note; however, its execution is slightly more involved. One is first required to pluck the upper note with the right hand. After that, the left hand is used to pluck the string, making the lower note sound. Then, for the remaining value of the note, the upper note should be continuously beaten with the finger, as with a trill. As this kind of continuous ornament would be executed more successfully on an instrument with a continuous sound, Mersenne acknowledges:

\begin{quote}
The \textit{battement} is more practicable on the violin than on the lute; but because I do not wish to omit anything….\textsuperscript{245}
\end{quote}

The remaining ornaments are made up of a combination of the above ornaments. An unnamed ornament, signified with a (.) before a (Z), is in principle an \textit{accent plaintif} followed by a \textit{battement}. One is required to first begin appoggiatura from below followed by a trill. In this case, there is no indication to use a finger from the left hand to pluck the string. As with the other ornaments, a (-) above would simply imply that the trill would be executed over a semitone.

The final ornament, signified with a (.) before and after the (.) is a combination of the \textit{accent plaintif} and the \textit{verre cassé}. The ornament is to begin with an appoggiatura from below and end with a vibrato on the upper note. As with the previous ornaments, a (-) above would denote an appoggiatura beginning a semitone below.

\textsuperscript{244} Ibid., 81; \textit{Mais puis qu’il est aussi vitieux de n’en point faire du tout, comme d’en faire trop souvent, il faut user de mediocrité.}
\textsuperscript{245} Ibid., 81, \textit{Le battement est plus pratiqué sur le Violon que sur le Luth: mais parce que je ne veux rien omettre, tant qu’il me sera.}
These ornaments for the lute by Basset represent the basis on which later lutenists developed their ideas. While some of the names and symbols used for these ornaments are appear different from those of later lutenists, they represent the beginnings of a tradition of codified ornamentation.

Lute Ornamentation in the later seventeenth century

The ornamentation for the lute during this time have direct implications to ornamentation for the viol, as it is very likely that some of these lutenists were in contact with the French violists who have already been discussed. Some viol ornaments during this period have similar symbols and intentions, suggesting that the ideas for these ornaments were derived from the French lute tradition.

Most of the information concerning ornamentation is exhibited in the works of the solo lutenists, namely Ennemond Gaultier, Denis Gaultier, Jacques Gallot, Charles Mouton and Perrine²⁴⁶ (d after 1698).

The Gaultiers were extremely active in bringing the lute to the forefront of the solo instrumental genre. To distinguish between both, Ennemond was often known as Gaultier le vieux or Gaultier de Lyon, and Denis was known as Gaultier le jeune or Gaultier de Paris. Unlike Denis, Ennemond never published any of his music. Denis who published La rhétorique des dieux (c.1662), Pièces de luth sur trois diffèrens modes (c.1669) and Livre de tablature des pieces de luth (c.1672), never held any official court position, unlike Ennemond, who served as valet de chambre to Henri IV’s queen from 1600 to 1631.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁶ First name unknown.
Since Denis and Ennemond have both the same last name, confusion arises when a manuscript source is identified with only “Gaultier” mentioned. Stylistic differences between the two men are indeed small, and any attempt to differentiate between them is difficult. To confine Denis Gaultier’s ornamentation to those that are used in his published works alone would be an over simplification, since his work also appears in manuscript.

Gallot was also a student of Ennemond Gaultier, and used similar symbols and names for his ornamentation. As seen in his *Pièces de luth composées sur différens modes*, his ideas are identical to that of the Gaultiers. Although there is no evidence that Mouton studied with the Gaultiers, his ideas are also similar. Because of this fortunate uniformity of ornament symbols amongst lutenists of this period, this discussion concerning ornamentation below applies to the both Gaultiers, as well as Gallot and Mouton.

The use of a ( , ) indicates the *tremblement*. The *tremblement* is now used to signify the trill from an upper auxiliary note, as is usually done for most works from the later seventeenth century onwards. Only Mouton uses the ( x ) for this ornament, but the ( , ) for an appoggiatura from above.

As for the *chute* or *tombé*, it is marked with a ( Λ ) or ( _ ), and refers to an appoggiatura from below. The *martellement*, which has now the ubiquitous meaning of the lower mordent, has the unfortunate problem with an inconsistent use of symbols, since ( V ) ( x ) ( > ) ( Λ ) often mean the same thing. As for the ( * ) or ( # ), it refers to the vibrato but is given no name. According to Mersenne, “It is not used so much now as it was in the past.”

---

248 Not dated.
Ornamentation for the Harpsichord

While there does not appear to be a connection between the activities of the harpsichordists and violists, the onset of publishing *pièces* and the eventual necessity to include instruction on ornamentation brought about the creation of the *Table des agréments*.

Harpsichordists were the first to create *Table des agréments*. The first one appears in the *Pièces de clavessin* (1670) of Jacques Champion de Chambonnières (1601 or 2-1672) (Fig. 16).

![Fig. 16 Chambonnières, Pièces de clavessin (1670), Table des agréments.](image)

The success of this method of transmission saw the emergence of other *Table des agréments* by other harpsichordists. This may have possibly inspired De Machy to create a table of ornaments for his own *Pièces de Violle*.

One of the most important contributions to harpsichord ornamentation is seen in the work of d’Anglebert. His *Pièces de clavecin* (1689)\(^{250}\) included a new *Table des agréments* (Fig. 17), similar to that of his predecessor; however, with many new additions. It is well known that Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750) copied this very

This undoubtedly paved the way for other later harpsichordist and instrumentalists to include their own ideas on ornamentation in their publications.

Fig. 17 d’Angelbert, Pièces de Clavecin (1689), Table des agréments.

While many of the ornaments used in harpsichord music differ in name as well as in execution from those in viol music, it can be said that almost all the ornaments that have developed by d’Anglebert can reproduced from De Machy’s table of ornaments (with the exception of those techniques specific to the keyboard such as execution of chords). A discussion of De Machy’s ornament table and his intentions will be discussed in the next section.

Ornamentation for the Viol

The table of ornaments proposed by De Machy in his *Pièces de Violle* can be considered the most complex devised for the viol. Hotman, Dubuisson and Sainte Colombe never wrote out any tables of ornaments nor made any explanations concerning ornamentation.\(^252\) They limited their musical intentions to a few symbols.

The most common of symbols used is the ( , ). Hotman, Dubuisson and Sainte Colombe all used this symbol for a trill, which by this time, usually begins on the upper auxiliary note depending on the situation. Although there are no directions for how long this trill should remain, or how long the upper auxiliary note should last, in most cases the trill can only last for no longer than an instant. While there is no name given to this ornament at this time (1660-1680), it was probably called a tremblement.

Rousseau, however, uses the ( + ) for such a trill, and generally refers to it as a cadence, and makes a distinction between one with an upper auxiliary (avec appuy) and one without (sans appuy).\(^253\)

As for the symbol ( + ), other than Rousseau, most composers have used it to signify the lower mordent. There has been, however, a great inconsistency in naming this ornament. Hotman, Dubuisson and Sainte Colombe do not give it a name. De Machy calls it a martellement, as does Etienne Loulié (1654-1702).\(^254\) Danoville calls it a pincé, while Marais refers to it as a batement, but uses the symbol ( × ) instead.\(^255\)

After Marais, there is a clear preference for the term battement; however, the use of a ( + ) or a ( × ) seems undecided amongst all viol composers.

---


\(^{253}\) Rousseau, *Traité*, 79-82.


As for the vibrato, the symbols used are as varied. De Machy, who uses a (∫), calls it an *aspiration*, but explains that he is aware that it is also called a *plainte*. Marais, as well as most of the composers of the eighteenth century have generally preferred the term *plainte*, using the symbol (∫). The only exception is with Rousseau and Danoville. Rousseau calls the vibrato a *longeur*, and Danoville a *balancement de main*. As for the symbols, Danoville uses a (, ), while Rousseau does not mention one at all.

Another kind of vibrato, which is achieved with two fingers, with the higher one touching the string over the fret, was commonly designated with the (~~) symbol. In this case, De Machy chooses to use the (, ) symbol, calling it a *tremblement sans appuïer* (sic), placing it above or below the note, instead of placing it beside the note, as with the *tremblement*. The remaining viol composers have used the (~~) symbol, but have been inconsistent in naming it. Marais calls it a *pincé ou flatement*, as do the other viol composers of the eighteenth century such as Morel and Thomas Marc (fl 1724). Loulié seems to prefer *flatté*, while both Roland Marais and Caix d’Hervelois prefer *pincé*. Strangely, Rousseau and Danoville use the terms *batement* (sic) and *battement* respectively, which, as previously discussed, is more commonly used to describe the lower mordent.

Other ornaments that are specific to the viol music of Marais are the *coulé de doigt*, *enflé* and *harpègement*. The *coulé de doigt*, which is notated with a (√), refers to a glissando, which typically is done over a semitone. The *enflé*, which is notated with an (e), implies a swell to the sound and is typically done over a long note. However, it

---

256 Marais, *Pièces à une et à deux violes*, 5.
259 Marais, *Pièces à une et à deux violes*, 5.
can also apply to a short note, probably implying an accent. The harpègement, which is possibly derived from lute ornamentation, is executed with an upward separation of a chord into several short and detached notes, just as one would arpeggiate a chord on the lute. As these later ornaments do not appear in any sources before Marais’, it is highly conceivable that he was the first to incorporate these musical gestures into ornaments. These ornaments were continued to be used by his students, which suggest a direct influence in musical style from Marais. This of course does not imply that such ornaments did not exist in the style of viol playing prior to Marais.

Ornamentation according to De Machy

We are presented with 11 ornaments in De Machy’s avertissement, some of which do not appear in the works of any composers other than his (Fig. 18). Accompanying these ornaments are very specific instructions in De Machy’s avertissement concerning their execution. De Machy’s avertissement may be considered the foundation for later ideas of viol ornamentation, which are seen throughout the works of other composers of the later 17th and 18th centuries.

---

260 Marais, Pièces de viole, 3e livre. (Paris, 1711), avertissement.
261 Perrine, Pieces de luth en musique avec des regles pour les toucher parfaitement sur le luth et sur le clavecin (Paris, 1680), avertissement.
262 Marais, Pièces de viole, 3e livre. (Paris, 1711), avertissement.
263 A summary of symbols for ornaments and their intentions can be found in Schwendowius, 225-229.
Of the tremblement there are three kinds: the tremblement, the petit tremblement and the tremblement sans appuier (sic). The tremblement is notated with a large (, ).

De Machy explains:

It is necessary that the tremblement should be leant on according to the value of the note, & played evenly.  

This vital piece of information concerning the most basic of trills, one that starts on the upper auxiliary note, describes an action that is not commonly heard in modern performances, since we very rarely hear trills that are made evenly, without gradually

---

264 Sieur de Machy, 8: Il faut appuyer le tremblement selon la valeur de la notte, & le faire égal.
speeding up or slowing down, as is often done. This practice of even repetitions of the trill is typical, but not exclusive, to music of this time. Loulié explains:

The *appuy* of the *tremblement* should be longer or shorter in proportion to the duration of the note that is being trilled. The *tremblement* should begin within the beat [dans le Temps] on which the trilled note begins, unless marked otherwise.\(^{265}\)

The rhythmic evenness of the trill is emphasised by Loulié. The treatment of the upper auxiliary note is, interestingly, almost identical to De Machy’s explanation, and was perhaps influenced by him. The English theorist, Roger North (1651-1734), similarly describes in his writings:

Like a squirrell [sic] scratching her ear, but swifter or slower, without government as to measure. Now it seems that a trill is but a species of devision [sic], and ought to keep time, and fall in with that of the consort.\(^{266}\)

Even by the mid-eighteenth century, flutist Joachim Quantz (1697-1773) is of the same opinion.

If the trill is to be beautiful, it must be made equal or at an equal speed and at a moderate rate.\(^{267}\)

Most of the tables of ornaments from the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) centuries, especially of the keyboard players, notate trills and similar ornaments in a very strict rhythmic pattern. The evidence for this rhythmic regularity may be a stylistic feature specific to a certain


\(^{266}\) John Wilson, ed. *Roger North on Music: Being a Selection from His Essays Written During the Years, C. 1695-1728* (London, 1959), 166.

\(^{267}\) Joachim Quantz, *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752), ix, 5: *Soll der Triller recht schön seyn; so muß er egal, oder in eine gleichen, und dabey mäßigen Geschwindigkeit, geschlagen werden.*
musicians or national schools of the past. There is, however, evidence for varying the speeds of trill. For example, with harpsichordist Saint Lambert (fl Paris, c. 1700):

When the tremblement must be long, it is more beautiful to strike it slowly at first, and to speed it up only at the end, but when it is short it must always be quick.  

François Couperin (1668-1733) likewise refers to accelerating trills. From his L'art de toucher le Clavecin, he explains:

Although the trills [tremblements] are written in equal note values in the table of ornaments in my first book, they should, however begin more slowly than they end, but this gradation should be imperceptible.  

This can, however, be viewed as a later practice and would not apply to the works of earlier composers such as De Machy. Couperin may be viewed differently from his French contemporaries, as his particular interest in foreign styles of music - especially that of the Italian’s - must have had an influence on his ideas of ornamentation. His new ideas of ornamentation, such as the point-d’arêt, which has no mention in any other musical source other than his, could simply have been his own invention.

268 Saint Lambert, Les principes du clavecin contenant une explication exacte de tout ce qui concerne la tablature & le clavier (Paris, 1702), 43: Quand le Tremblement doit être long, il est plus beau de battre lentement d’abord, & de ne le presser qu’à la fin; mais quand il est court il doit toujours être prompt.  

269 François Couperin, L’art de toucher le Clavecin (Paris, 1717), 23: Quoi que les tremblements soient marques égaux, dans la table des agréments de mon livre de pièces, ils doivent cependant commencer plus lentement qu’ils ne finissent; mais, cette gradation doit être imperceptible; translations of the L’art de toucher le Clavecin are from François Couperin, L’Art de toucher le Clavecin, ed. Margery Halford, trans. Margery Halford (New York: Alfred Publishing Company, 1974).

270 Couperin, 19: Tout pincè doit être fixé sur la note où il est pose: et pour me faire entendre, je me sers du terme de, Point-d’arêt, qui est marqué cy-dessous par une petite étoile; ainsi les batemens; et la note où L’on s’arête, doivent tous être compris dans la valeur de la note essentielle.
It may also have been the result of foreign influence, since it is especially in the works Italian composers of the later eighteenth century, such as Giuseppe Tartini (1692-1770), where we see explicitly discussing the accelerated trill.\(^{271}\)

De Machy appears not to have been concerned with the issue of the termination of the *tremblement*. This may suggest that one is not always required to make a *point-d’arêt* in De Machy’s music. This is demonstrated below (Ex. 1).

As to the treatment of the length of the upper auxiliary note, this seems to be a more ambiguous matter. The only thing certain is that the length of the main note determines the length of the upper auxiliary note. Hence, a longer main note will require a longer upper auxiliary. However, this explanation is still unclear, as we do not know what proportion the upper auxiliary note will be to the main note when it is applied to a long note. We can only be certain that in situations when the main note is short, the upper auxiliary note is also short, giving almost no time to the upper auxiliary note, making it as short as the oscillations of the trill itself.

---

**Fig. 20** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Menuet*, first book, page 25, bar 1-8.

**Ex. 1** A suggested performance of Fig. 20, bar 1-2.

---

Petit Tremblement

Fig. 21 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments, Petit tremblement, page 13.

Another kind of tremblement, the petit tremblement, is notated with a small ( , ) and is explained as follows:

The petit tremblement, which is what is called a pull on the Lute, is made in the same way [as the tremblement], except is not continued.272

The petit tremblement refers to an ornament that begins like the tremblement; however, is not continued.273 An ornament called “pull” (tiret) is not to be found in any of the treatises concerning the lute. There are, however, references to the verb tiret. Denis Gaultier says that the indication ( , ) after a letter:

Signifies that it is necessary to pull the string with the finger of the left hand.274

Mouton explains that a ( _ ) connecting two letters (in tablature) on the same string or a ( , ) after a letter mean the same thing:

272 Sieur de Machy, 9: Le petit tremblement, qui est ce qu’on nomme un tiret sur le Luth, se fait de même, excepté qu’il n’est pas continué.

273 De Machy uses the word continued (continué) to refer to the oscillations of an ornament. Therefore, the petit tremblement has no trill.

274 Denis Gaultier, Livre de tablature des pièces de Mr. Gaultier Sr. de Nève et de Mr. Gaultier son cousin (Paris, ca.1672): Signifie qu’il faut tirer la corde de quelque doigt de la main gauche.
To pull the string of the left hand after having touched it with the right hand once.\textsuperscript{275}

From the above examples, the most plausible meaning of the *petit tremblement* is an appoggiatura from the note above. It is interesting to note that Denis Gaultier uses the same symbol for this ornament as De Machy. The *petit tremblement* is demonstrated below (Ex. 2).

**Fig. 22** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Allemande*, first book, page 17, bar 1-4.

![Ex. 2 A suggested performance of Fig. 22, bar 1-3.](image)

**Tremblement sans appuyer**

**Fig. 23** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments, Tremblement sans appuyer*, page 13.

\textsuperscript{275} Charles Mouton, *Pièces de luth sur différents modes* (Paris, c.1680): *Pour tirer la corde de la main gauche après l'avoir touchée de la main droite une fois.*
This ornament is notated with a ( , ), but is placed on top or below the note it effects. However, its execution is slightly more complicated, as De Machy explains:

The _tremblement sans appuyer_ [sic]. is played by pressing one finger against another, while pressing only very slightly on the string.\(^{276}\)

What De Machy is actually referring to is in fact the two-finger vibrato, where one finger is pressing behind the fret, and the other is repeatedly touching above it to create a kind of vibrato. Obviously, this ornament is not possible with the fourth finger. Below is an example of a _tremblement sans appuyer_ in De Machy’s music (Fig. 24).

**Fig. 24** De Machy, _Pièces de Violle, Sarabande_, first book, page 39, bar 23-24.

---

**Comment on the Tremblements**

The _petit tremblement_ is an ornament that has confused many present-day violists. Although the above explanation of the different _tremblements_ by De Machy seems clear, it may appear confusing in the score as De Machy uses the same symbol ( , ) for all three different _tremblements_. However, if one inspects the music carefully, it becomes clear that these symbols are written differently. The _tremblement_ is written with a much larger ( , ), and it is often larger than the note head itself. Likewise, the _petit tremblement_ is written with a smaller ( , ), usually no larger than the note head. The difference between the _tremblement_ and _petit tremblement_ is clear when they are

\(^{276}\) Sieur de Machy, 9: _Le tremblement sans appuyer, est de serrer un doit contre un autre, sans appuyer que fort peu sur la corde._
written one after another in the score. The *tremblement sans appuyer* is the easiest one to recognise, as it is clearly positioned below or above the note.

**Martellement**

**Fig. 25** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle*, Demonstrations des Agréments, Martellement and Double martellement, page 13.

![Diagram of martellement and double martellement](image)

There are two kinds of *martellement*: the *martellement* and *double martellement*. The *martellement* is notated with a ( x ), and the *double martellement* with a ( ≠ ). De Machy explains:

> The *martellement* is played by raising the finger from the note or the letter, as soon as it has been played, and putting it back down at the same time. The *double martellement* is made the same, except it is doubled.\(^\text{277}\)

The *martellement* refers to a lower mordent, and the *double martellement* refers to a lower mordent done twice. The *double martellement* is demonstrated below (Ex. 3).

\(^{277}\) Sieur de Machy, 9: *Le martellement est de lever le doigt de la notte ou de la lettre, aussi-tôt qu'elle est touchée, & le remettre en même temps. Le double martellement se fait de même, estant redoublé.*
**Port de voix**

**Fig. 27** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle*, Demonstrations des Agréments, Port de voix, page 13.

This ornament commonly refers to an appoggiatura from a note below. De Machy explains:

The *port de voix*, which one calls the *cheutte* [sic] on the lute & other instruments, is done by anticipating one note or letter to another.\(^{278}\)

According to Rousseau, the *port de voix* could begin either before or on the beat of the note it is applied to,\(^{279}\) however, in the context of De Machy’s music, because of the placement of the *port de voix*, it is very clear that he intends for the *port de voix* to

\(^{278}\) Ibid: *Le port de voix, qui est ce qu'on appelle cheutte sur le Luth & autres Instrumens, se fait par anticipation d'une note ou d'une lettre à une autre.*

occur on the beat. Technical considerations simply do not allow the *port de voix* to occur before the beat. Bar 8 demonstrates this (Fig. 28).

**Fig. 28** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Allemande*, first book, page 17, bar 5-9.

![Musical Example](image)

**Battement**

**Fig. 29** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle*, Demonstrations des Agréments, Battements, page 13.

The *battement* must be started having the finger raised, & continued like the *tremblement*.

This ornament is self-explanatory. It is a trill that begins on the main note, without an upper auxiliary note. It should be continued (trilled) like a *tremblement*.

**Aspiration**

**Fig. 30** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle*, Demonstrations des Agréments, Aspiration, page 13.

---

280 Sieur de Machy, 9: *Le battement doit estre commencé ayant le doigt levé, & continué comme le tremblement.*
The aspiration which is also named the plainte, is done by varying the finger on the fret. There are people who want to call it a miaullement by allusion.281

The aspiration is similar to the present-day vibrato achieved with one finger only. Why De Machy has decided to use the term aspiration instead of plainte is something of a mystery. The decision of some historical violists to call the aspiration a miaullement282 gives us an insight into the irregularities of the ideas of ornamentation during the time. It does, however, give present-day violists a clearer indication on how the aspiration may have sounded like.

Tremblement et martellement

Fig. 31 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments, Tremblement et martellement, page 13.

De Machy is the only violist to ever combine ornaments. This makes the interpretation of these ornaments slightly more complicated, as there are no similar ornaments from other viol composers of the period to draw upon as a model for them. De Machy explains:

When a martellement is [played] with the tremblement, the petit tremblement, or the port de voix, one must always play it last.283

---

281 Ibid., 9: L’aspiration qu’on nomme aussi plainte, se fait en variant le doigt sur la touche. Il y a des gens qui veulent que cela s’appelle miaullement par allusion.
282 The “meowing of a cat”.
283 Sieur de Machy, 9: Quand le martellement est avec le tremblement, le petit tremblement, ou le port de voix, on le doit toujours faire le dernier.
Hence, with the tremblement et martellement, one begins with a trill on the upper auxiliary note and finishes with a martellement terminating the note. This would sound like a modern trill with a termination. The tremblement et martellement is demonstrated below (Ex. 4).

**Fig. 32** De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Gigue, first book, page 22, bar 22-32.

![](image1)

**Ex. 4** A suggested performance of Fig. 32, bar 25-27.

![](image2)

**Petit tremblement et martellement**

**Fig. 33** De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments, Petit tremblement et martellement, page 13.

![](image3)

The petit tremblement et martellement is a very common ornament with other composers of the time. As the petit tremblement is an appoggiatura from the note above, and the martellement is a mordent, the resulting ornament can be recognised as a turn. The petit tremblement et martellement is demonstrated below (Ex. 5).
Fig. 34 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Prelude, page 26, 3rd stave.

Ex. 5 A suggested performance of a petit tremblement et martellement in Fig. 34.

Port de voix et martellement

Fig. 35 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments, Port de voix et martellement, page 13.

In essence, the port de voix et martellement is an extension of the port de voix. It is simply terminated with a mordent. This ornament is one of the most often used ornaments in the works of De Machy, the martellement occurring immediately after the port de voix. Other composers also treat this ornament in a similar fashion. Rousseau writes:

The martellement is always inseparable from the port de voix because the port de voix is always concluded by a martellement.²⁸⁴

²⁸⁴ Rousseau, Traité, 87: Le Martellement est toujours inseparable du Port de Voix, car le Port de Voix se doit toujours terminer par un Martellement; trans. R. A. Green.
Even flutist Jacques-Martin Hotteterre (1674-1763), writing at a much later time, has the same opinion as Rousseau:

One often joints the *Battements* with the *Ports-de-voix* [sic]... 285

The *port de voix et martellement* is demonstrated below (Ex. 6).

Fig. 36 De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Sarabande*, first book, page 39, bar 1-7.

Ex. 6 A suggested performance of Fig. 36, bar 1-2.

Although the *port de voix* is almost always followed by the *martellement*, there are certain cases when this does not happen (Fig. 37).

Techniques

The remaining examples in De Machy’s table of ornaments can also be described as techniques for the finger and the bow, as they do not require the swift movements of the fingers to execute. Preceding the table of ornaments, De Machy writes:

"Demonstrations des Agréments, unisons, tenœs, liaisons, Coulés d’archet, et autres."

Simple unison and Unison double

Fig. 38 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments, Simple unison and Unison double, page 13.

---

286 Sieur de Machy, 13.
The `uni-son` [sic] `ordinaire` or `simple`,\(^{287}\) is the same sound as an open string, or another stopped string. When it is doubled, two strings are played together.\(^{288}\)

The *simple unison* refers to the playing of a note on a stopped string, instead of an open or higher string. This is primarily done to keep the sound of a phrase of music within the same tonal colour, i.e. on the same string or stopped string, instead of open string. Other reasons may include ease of fingering, preparing the hand for a particular chord shape and aiding string crossing. Below is an example of a *simple unison* in De Machy’s music (Fig. 39).

![Fig. 39 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Gavotte, first book, page 42, bar 1-5.](image)

The *unison double*, a technique that is commonly used on plucked instruments, is made when one plays the same note on both a stopped and open string simultaneously. This is often accompanied by an ornament, such as a *martellement*, and results in a momentary semitone clash that is reminiscent of French lute technique. Occasionally, the playing of two strings incites the polyphonic character of the music. There are also times where the *unison double* is used to emphasise a particular note. Below is an example of a *unison double* in De Machy’s music (Fig. 40).

\(^{287}\) Machy refers to *uni-son* on page 9 of the *avertissement*, but refers to *unison* on page 13 in the *Demonstrations des Agréments*.

\(^{288}\) Sieur de Machy, 9: *L’uni-son ordinaire ou simple, est le même son d’une corde à vide, ou d’une autre. Quand il est double, ce sont deux cordes ensemble.*
These “holds” refer to the technique of keeping the sound within the phrase by means of sympathetic resonance, which is inherent to all fretted string instruments. This is achieved by holding the fingers down on specific notes that are marked in the score. This technique, which was probably derived from the lute tradition, became an integral part of the left hand technique of the whole French viol school. De Machy explains:

The *tenuë ordinaire* is marked with a line, to show that one must not lift the finger from the note or the letters until all those included in it are finished. The *tenuë de notes* is marked by the notes themselves, as on the harpsichord, by holding the fingers on the longest in value, & not lifting them until all those contained within it, are also finished.  

As to the *tenuë ordinaire*, a line below or above the note indicates that it is to be held for as long as the line lasts, usually as long as the implied harmony of the musical

---

289 Ibid: *La tenuë ordinaire se marque avec une ligne, pour montrer qu'il ne faut pas oster le doigt de dessus les nottes ou les lettres, que toutes celles qu'elle comprend ne soient finies.*
phrase. Below is an example of the *tenuë ordinaire* marked in De Machy’s music (Fig. 42).

**Fig. 42** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Prelude*, second book, page 15, 1st stave.

The *tenuë de nottes* (also spelled *tenuë de notes* in De Machy’s *avertissement*) is usually denoted by notes that are of a long note value, which are impossible to be continued with the bow, as there are other notes that are required to be played above or below this note. The fingers must be held for as long as the note value implies. As to the reasons why these *tenuës* are so important, De Machy states:

> One must be careful to use the required fingerings, when observing the *tenuës*, which are very important for three reasons. The first consists in keeping the sound so as to maintain the harmony. The second is used to avoid cacophony or wrong tones: And the third is to have the hand positioned where it is needs to be, & likewise the fingers. As for the *tenües*, they are extremely meticulously observed on the Lute, & other instruments with a neck, which make harmony, and also on the harpsichord.\(^{290}\)

Below is an example of the *tenuë de nottes* marked in De Machy’s music (Fig. 43).

\(^{290}\) *Ibid.,* 5: *L’on doit prendre garde encore à se servir des doigts qu’il faut, en observant aussi les tenuës, qui sont très importantes pour trois raisons. La première consiste à garder les sons pour entretenir l’harmonie. La seconde sert pour éviter la cacophonie ou le mauvais son : Et la troisième pour avoir la main toute portée où il faut qu’elle soit, & pareillement les doigts. Quant aux tenües, elles sont fort ponctuellement observées sur le Luth, & sur les autres Instrumentes à manche, qui font harmonie, comme aussi sur le Clavessin.*
Fig. 43 De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Allemande*, first book, page 17, bar 5-9.

---

**Liaison**

Fig. 44 De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Demonstrations des Agréments*, Liaison, page 13.

The *liaison de nottes* assumes that two crotchets notes makes one minim in value, & similarly with the others.²⁹¹

Clearly, this ornament refers to a tie. It is used in situations where it is not possible to write a note in its whole value, especially over a bar line. Bar 11 and 12 demonstrate this (Fig. 45).

---

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 9: *La liaison de nottes est de supposer que deux noires font en valeur une blanche, & ainsi des autres.*
Coulé and Coupé

The coulé d’Archet is to play several notes or letters, with only one bow, while pushing or pulling the bow; & that which is called coupé is made while half raising the bow, to carry it over the other strings, avoiding those which are in between the two. Same thing is done on those which are adjacent, when one is obliged to do so, particularly when the notes or letters are dotted, & when it is necessary to animate those which come after the dots, pushing or pulling the bow, without retaking with the arm again.  

---

292 Ibid., 9-10: Le coulé d’Arquet est de faire plusieurs nottes ou lettres, d’un seul coup, tant en poussant qu’en tirant ; & celuy qui est coupé se fait en levant l’Arquet à moitié, pour le porter sur d’autres cordes, en évitant celles qui sont entre deux. La mesmo chose se fait sur celles qui sont proche, quand on est obligé de le faire, particulièrement lors que les nottes ou lettres sont pointées, & qu’il est necessaire d’animer celles qui sont après les points, tant en poussant qu’en tirant, & sans reprendre le bras.
These techniques are specific to bow. The *coulé* refers to a slur, playing two or more notes within the same direction of the bow on the same string or adjacent strings.

Below is an example of *coulés* in De Machy’s music (Fig. 47).

**Fig. 47** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Prelude*, first book, page 15, 1st stave.

The *coupé* is somewhat a modified slur; making a smooth transition between two notes that do not lie on adjacent strings. Although technically impossible, due to the reverberant qualities of the viol, the bow is able to create an illusion of a slur, especially since the bow is moving in the same direction. Bar 2 demonstrates this (Fig. 48).

**Fig. 48** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Chaconne*, first book, page 51, bar 1-7.
Conclusion

Despite the irregularity of ideas on ornamentation amongst violists during the late seventeenth century, De Machy’s effort to codify and clarify ornaments can be viewed as the first attempt to create a standard for viol ornamentation. More importantly, the precision of his descriptions of ornamentation reveals a man extremely knowledgeable in the musical and technical potential of the viol. This is important, as it irrefutably demonstrates that De Machy was a master of his instrument.

De Machy’s knowledge concerning the capabilities and current developments of instruments other than the viol - such as the lute, theorbo and harpsichord - clearly portray De Machy as a man who was a well-rounded musician, with many forward-thinking ideas.

The practices of later violists may have been influenced by this initial effort of De Machy. For example, although Marais changes and reduces the symbols used in his ornament table, and decides to write most of his ornaments out, he makes few additions to De Machy’s original ideas. He only adds the *coulé de doigt*, *enflé* and *harpègement*.

With the knowledge of the practices of the other instrumental traditions, it is clear the beginnings of ornamentation on the viol are deeply rooted in the practices of the seventeenth-century lutenists. The influence of these lutenists has undoubtedly paved the way for violists to include their ideas on ornamentation into their compositions. For example, in De Machy’s *petit tremblement*, he refers to a technique in the lute to demonstrate his ornament. While this may be confusing to present-day violists, it would be instantly understood by historical violist, many of whom were also lutenists.

In the context of all this, it will be demonstrated in the next chapter that the opinions suggested by De Machy through Rousseau are also those of an esteemed viol
player and teacher, which has much of its basis in the already-established traditions of solo instrumental playing.
Chapter 4

Rousseau and his *Traité*

Rousseau published his *Traité de la viole* two years after the publication of De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle*. In this treatise, Rousseau makes references to De Machy, attacking De Machy’s views on viol playing and technique. Shortly afterwards, De Machy replies with another public document, which is now lost. Rousseau made his final reply in 1688 in his *Réponse de Monsieur Rousseau* from which some further insight into De Machy’s reply may be gained.

However, before we examine the nature of the argument, or even discuss its validity, we need to understand the context in which this argument was being made, and hopefully determine the reliability of the information presented by both parties. From this, it is hoped that we will be able to draw certain conclusions concerning the reasons for their vastly different points of view.

Rousseau

Jean Rousseau (1644-1699) was originally from the town of Moulins, the capital of the province of Bourbonnais. Other than his publications mentioned above, he is also known for his vocal treatise *Méthode claire, certaine et facile pour apprendre à chanter la musique* (1680). As a composer, none of his music has survived, and as a violist, there are no descriptions of his playing. He held no positions in court, and may have been better known in his day as a teacher rather than a performer. He moved to

---

293 Rousseau, Réponse, 3: *Il demande si c’est dans mon Village que j’ay appris ce que j’avance; mais il faut lui apprendre que la Capitale du Bourbonnais.*
Paris from Moulins in 1676, and lived with luthier, Michel Colichon at rue de la Harpe. During some point while he was in Paris, he had lessons with Sainte Colombe, but for only one month.

Prior to having lessons with Sainte Colombe, Rousseau had only been “been playing the viol for three years”. If he began having lessons with Sainte Colombe immediately after his arrival in Paris, Rousseau would have started on the viol in 1673 at the earliest. In spite of this, Rousseau claims:

This reproach [about his early shortcomings as a viol player] was to my advantage, since I learned more during that month than what others take years to learn.

Naturally, this may be seen as a gross exaggeration on the part of Rousseau, and his claims about the short time of study as a means of self-promotion. However, with so few years of formal training, this makes Rousseau a relative newcomer to the viol compared to De Machy or Sainte Colombe.

Marais, like Rousseau, was also under the tutelage of Sainte Colombe, but remained with him for six months. The reason, according to Titon du Tillet, was that Sainte Colombe had nothing more to teach Marais, for Marais had surpassed his master. It is curious why Marais, clearly the more accomplished player, required six months of study, while Rousseau, whose abilities we know very little of, decided to

---

294 Ibid., 8: A cela je répons qu’il y a douze ans que je suis demeurant a Paris.
295 Ibid., 3: Je logeais chez le bon homme Colichon Luthier qui demeurait en ce temps-l’a au bas de la rue de la Harpe.
296 Ibid., 3: Il dit que je n’ay appris qu’un mois de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe.
297 Ibid., Réponse, 3: j’ay appris de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe il y avait trois ans que je jouais de la Viole; trans. M. van der Beken.
298 On the other hand, Sainte Colombe and De Machy, who were both students of Hotman, had experience with viol as far back as the early 1660s at the latest as one would have to have studied with Hotman before 1663 as he died in that year.
299 Rousseau, Réponse, 3: que ce reproche était a mon avantage, attendu que j’en ay plus appris pendant ce mois que d’autres ne sont en des années; trans. M. van der Beken.
300 Titon du Tillet, 625: Sainte colombe fut le maître de Marais; mais s’étant aperçu au bout de six mois que son Élève pouvait le surpasser, il lui dit qu’il n’avait plus rien à lui montrer.
study for only one month. This puts Rousseau’s abilities to question, as one month of study could hardly have led to a high level of skill.

Despite the status that some present-day scholars and violists have accorded to Rousseau’s *Traité* and *Réponse*, it should be noted that some of his comments, especially those pertaining to the history of the viol and viol playing in general, present us with certain inaccuracies, inconsistencies and coincidences, suggesting that Rousseau’s writings are a somewhat unreliable and confusing source. This surely raises questions about his knowledge, and to a considerable extent, the reliability of his treatise as a principal historical source on viol playing in this period.

**Rousseau in Modern Writings**

Rousseau’s *Traité de la Viole* has been accorded great importance amongst present-day scholars and violists. Green writes:

> In spite of the polemical aspects of this work [*Traité*], it is one of the most important sources of information concerning French viol music and various aspects of performance practice as well.\(^{301}\)

Rousseau’s representation in modern writings has largely focussed on his ideas on viol ornamentation in the *Traité*. For example, the article “Grammar of Improvised Ornamentation: Jean Rousseau's Viol Treatise of 1687”\(^{302}\) by John Spitzer addresses this issue in detail, applying Rousseau’s ideas to Chomskian Linguistics.

* Celia Pond, in the article “Ornamental Style and the Virtuoso: Solo Bass Viol Music in France c 1680-1740”,\(^{303}\) also discusses Rousseau’s ideas on viol

---

\(^{301}\) Green, “Annotated Translation”, 9.


ornamentation. In doing so, she accords much attention towards Rousseau’s *Traité*. Pond writes:

Jean Rousseau’s *Traité de la viole* of 1687 is probably the most comprehensive treatise for the viol player. The third section, entitled “Des Agrèmens”, offers many illuminating ideas about bow and finger articulation when playing ornaments, and also reveals obliquely certain views on the part of the author on the sound quality required of the instrument. I should like to mention as exemplary his description of the *port de voix*, which suggests a rhythmic regularity and surprising melodic flow.\(^{304}\)

While most of her discussion concerning Rousseau applies to his ideas on ornamentation, Pond cites Rousseau’s description of Maugars and Hotman,\(^{305}\) and does not detect Rousseau’s bias towards Hotman.\(^{306}\)

Donald Beecher, in his article “Aesthetics of the French Solo Viol Repertory, 1650-1680”,\(^{307}\) attempts to answer questions concerning musical taste and style of the viol repertory. However, when discussing the quarrel between De Machy and Rousseau, Beecher does not detect the flaw of Rousseau’s character. Beecher writes:

On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt Rousseau who (though he was only thirteen years old at the time of Hotman’s death and could not have formed his impressions first hand), celebrates the delicate hand of the master and the engaging charm with which he performed simple chasonettes.\(^{308}\)

Although it seems that the reliability of Rousseau’s words concerning Hotman are questionable, like Pond, Beecher does not consider this.

\(^{304}\) Ibid., 513.
\(^{305}\) Ibid.
\(^{306}\) See chapter 4 on “Rousseau Imitates Mersenne”.
\(^{308}\) Ibid., 14.
Green, in his article, “Jean Rousseau and Ornamentation in French Viol Music,” makes an interesting observation about Rousseau:

The letter [Réponse] tells us much about Rousseau’s personality. He appears as a man deeply wronged, who has been cornered and is now fighting for his professional existence. He is a man of little education, who nevertheless likes to quote Latin phrases which he knows most of his enemies will not understand. He has obviously worked very hard to gain his reputation and values his eminence as a teacher. As much as he would like to rise above this sort of sordid squabble, his ferocity belies his pose.  

This provides us with a view of Rousseau that may be suggested from the style of language in the Réponse. The Réponse will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Peter Farrell, in his article, “The Viol in France”, briefly comments on all the historical sources for the viol in France. Concerning Rousseau’s Traité, he writes:

Rousseau’s history of the origin of the viol is naive, and the entire text is wordy and opinionated. The year following publication of his Traité, Rousseau was constrained to defend himself in a libel suit for some of his unkind statements. Yet, it is one of the most important documents in the history of viol playing.

Farrell recognises Rousseau’s shortcomings, and only acknowledges the Traité’s historical importance from a modern perspective. This “history of the origin of the viol” will be discussed in the next section.

Although modern writers particularly feature Rousseau’s contribution towards ornamentation, it must be noted that the ideas on ornamentation during the time were hardly standardised. It is difficult to ascertain if any of the ideas promoted by Rousseau were authoritative. Green writes:

---

310 Ibid., 9-10.  
[The placement of the agréments in melodies, for example, were generally ignored or avoided by his contemporaries.]

Also, it was reported by Rousseau that De Machy and other singing teachers did not agree with his ideas:

\begin{quote}
I could not be more impressed than by the liberty he takes to blame the rules I gave for port de voix and the cadence in my music method, saying that Masters of singing make fun of it….
\end{quote}

**Examining the *Traité***

Rousseau begins his *Traité* with the *Dissertation sur l’Origine de la Viole*. He writes:

\begin{quote}
The viol appears to us as one of the newest instruments, because it has been esteemed in France for only a short time and because the lute, guitar, and other instruments seem to us to be much older.
\end{quote}

Such a claim may be untrue for, as seen in the drawing attributed to Nicolas Houel, viols were active in France far earlier, at least as early as 1538. Furthermore, by the 1540s, the viol was already a mainstream instrument in the court of François I. By the late sixteenth century, violists were actively writing for the viol consort. It seems inconceivable that the viol would still be considered a new instrument by 1687.

---

312 Green, “Annotated Translation”, viii.
313 This music method refers to Rousseau’s vocal treatise: *Méthode claire, certaine et facile pour apprendre à chanter la musique* (Paris, 1683).
314 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 8: *Je ne puis assez admirer icy la liberté qu’il prend de blasmer les Regles que jay donné du Port de Voix & de la Cadence dans ma Methode pour la Musique; disant que les Maistres du Chant en sont des risées*; trans. M. van der Beken.
315 Rousseau, *Traité*, 1: *Quoyque la Viole nous paroisse un Instrument des plus nouveaux, parce qu’il y a peu de temps qu’elle est estimée en France, & que le Luth, la Guitarre, & plusieurs autres Instruments nous semblent beaucoup plus anciens*; trans. R. A. Green.
316 See Fig. 14, 15 & 16.
Rousseau reveals one of his intentions in writing this *Dissertation*:

I will first prove its antiquity by a process of deduction, and I assert that the object of the inquiries and inventions of the first men was to imitate nature as is still done today.\(^{317}\)

It will be revealed that Rousseau’s method of deduction exhibits certain flaws. Rousseau’s underlying intention in the *Dissertation* is to prove the ancient origins of the viol. In doing so, dissociating the development of the viol from plucked instruments. This is the basis of his argument that is debated vehemently in the quarrel between De Machy and Rousseau in the *Réponse*. This opinion is contrary to modern historical evidence, which has shown that viols and plucked instruments share a common ancestry. This opinion is held by Rousseau throughout the *Traité*, which is based upon the information that he has derived from other authors. It also will be shown that the information from these authors is questionable.

One of these authors is Father Athanasius Kircher (1602-1680). Kircher was one of the most influential theorists of his time. Although he was a Jesuit priest, he worked mostly as an academic, notably in the fields of Mathematics, Physics and Eastern Studies. He published thirty books on many different subjects and his *Musurgia Universalis* (Rome, 1650) remained influential well into the eighteenth century.\(^{318}\)

Despite his success in the past, there are some errors in his writings. George J. Buelow writes:

> Like many of his contemporaries, among them Mersenne, Fludd and Kepler, Kircher often erred by failing to evaluate the accuracy of his scientific data.\(^{319}\)

---

\(^{317}\) Rousseau, *Traité*, 1: *Je prouve d’abord son Antiquité par un raisonnement, & je dis que l’objet des recherches & des inventions des premiers hommes a esté d’imiter la nature, comme on le fait encore aujourd’hui*; trans. R. A. Green.


\(^{319}\) Ibid.
It appears that the reputations of these eminent theorists had convinced Rousseau of the reliability of their information and, as such, much of the information has gone unquestioned by Rousseau. This is important because it reflects on present-day scholars’ failure to evaluate the evidence that is presented by Rousseau.

When addressing the creation of the viol, Rousseau draws upon the Bible. He refers to the time of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Concerning the justification for the viol’s creation, Rousseau writes:

If we begin with our first father after his creation, we will find that, having been given the most enlightened soul and the most perfect physical skill, he possessed all science and arts in their perfection and, consequently, music and the way to make the most perfect instruments and to play them perfectly. As the viol is the most perfect of all, because it comes closer to nature than any other, it can be concluded that if Adam had wished to make an instrument, he would have made a viol, and, if he did not, it is easy to provide the reasons why. First, we know that the first man was created in paradise on earth, which was place so charming and full of delights that all the inventions of the science and the arts would sooner have diminished than increases them. Thus there is no point in asking why Adam made no instruments. Secondly, after having been driven from terrestrial paradise, he could have done it in truth, but would he want to in his sadness resulting from the state to which his sin had reduced him. The image of this beautiful place which was always present in his mind did not permit him to search for other pleasures. Further, the intemperateness of the climate, which made him feel the rigor of the seasons, and the sterility of the earth, which yielded nothing but brambles and thistles, gave him too much trouble to think about diversions while he needed strength for the necessities to which his crime had made him a slave. Thus his sighs and sobs caused by his loss were the music and instruments with which he passed and ended his life, and there is no other song to quote than this by one of his descendants. Cythara mean versa est in luctum, et organum meum in vocem flentium. The children of Adam had not enjoyed the charms of paradise on earth and, having been conceived in sin and born and raised in pain, began to search for the means of making life easier with some diversion. But, as they were also born in ignorance, which is caused by the original sin in all men, they discovered instruments over a period of time.

320 Taken from the Bible (New International Version), Job 30:31: My harp is tuned to mourning, and my flute to the sound of wailing.
321 Rousseau, Traité, 2-3: Si nous commençons par nostre premier Pere après sa creation, nous trouverons qu’ayant esté doüé des plus belles lumieres de l’esprit & de j’adresse du corps la plus parfaite, il possedoit toutes les Sciences & tous les Arts dans leur perfection, & consequement la Musique, & la maniere de faire les Instruments les plus parfaits, & d’en jouer parfaitement: Et comme la Viole est le plus parfait de tous, parce qu’elle approche plus près du naturel qu'aucun autre, on peut juger que si ADAM avoit voulu faire un Instrument, il auroit fait une Viole, & s’il n’en a pas fait, il est facile d’en donner les raisons. Premierement nous sçavons, que le premier homme fût crée dans le Paradis terrestre, qui estoit un lieu si charmant & si remply de delices, que toutes les inventions des
Although Rousseau is the only violist to attempt to discuss the origins of the viol, it must be noted that Rousseau’s treatise is not the only one of this period to write in such a fanciful manner. Danoville’s *L’art de toucher le dessus et basse de viole* (1687) offers a comparison of the viol with Orpheus’ lyre in the *Preface*. However, this fanciful discussion is far shorter than Rousseau’s *Dissertation*.

It appears Rousseau is writing in a rhetorical fashion, aligning his views with that of the Bible. He has clearly taken his inspiration from the writings of Kircher, imitating the style in which it was written, as well as including some of Kircher’s anecdotes. Rousseau’s decision to merge his ideas into the biblical story can be seen as a rhetorical device in order to add credibility to his claim. In a time when religious views were universally accepted, an explanation of this sort may have been considered extremely persuasive. According to Green:

> The primary purpose of history in the seventeenth century was instruction and edification for the moral and spiritual improvement of the reader; in other words, it served a purpose closely akin to that of art, and it was closely tied to both rhetoric and poetry.  

However, from a modern perspective, Rousseau’s assessment of the evolution of the viol presents itself as an unreliable source for historical and factual information.

Concerning the first musical instrument invented, Rousseau explains:

> Sciences & des Arts en auraient plustost diminüé les charmes que de les augmenter, ainsi il ne faut pas demander pourquoy Adam n’y a point fait d’Instrument. En second lieu après avoir esté chassé du Paradis terrestre, il en pouvoit faire, à la vérité; mais pouvoit-il le voudoir dans la douleur qu’il conçut du malheur où son peche l’avoit reduit. L’image de ce beau lieu qu’il avoit toujours present à son esprit, ne luy permettoit pas de rechercher d’autres plaisirs: De plus l’intemperie de l’air qui luy faisait sentir la rigeur des Saisons; & la sterilité de la terre qui ne luy presentoit plus que des Ronces & des Chardons, luy donnoient trop de soin pour songer à son divertissement, pendant qu’il avoit besoin de pourvoir aux necessitez dont son crime l’avoit rendu l’esclave. Ainsi les soupirs & les sanglots que luy causa la perte qu’il avoit faite, fût la Musique & les instruments avec lesquels il passa & finit sa vie; & il n’eut point d’autre Chanson à dire que celle d’un de ses descendans. Cythara mea versa est in luctum, & Organum meum in vocem flentium. Les enfants d’Adam qui n’avoient pas joüy des charmes de Paradis terrestre, & qui ayant esté conceus dans le peché, estoient nez & avoient esté elevez dans la peine, commencèrent à chercher les moyens de l’adoucir par quelque divertissement; mais comme ils estoient aussi nez dans l’ignorance que cause le peché originel dans tous les hommes, ils ne découvrirent les Instruments que par succession de temps; trans. R. A. Green.

322 Green, “Annotated Translation”, 122.
According to the most general opinion, the *chalumeau* was the first of the instruments that man invented, and this opinion is founded on reason. As the Jesuit Father Kircher has said very well in his *Musurgia Universalis*, the first men at the beginning of the world lived a rustic life and had no other occupation for most of the time than keeping their flocks, which required them to search for good pastures and marshy places where rushes, reeds, and other types of plants appropriate for making pipes intermingled. As the pastoral and rustic life is an idle one, it is believable that the first men attempted to invent anything that would be capable of diverting them and keeping them from boredom.  

Rousseau does not seem to be critical towards the authenticity of Kircher’s claim, suggesting that this may have not have been one of Rousseau’s concerns. It appears Rousseau is more concerned with aligning his information with that of Kircher’s. Perhaps it is through this association with Kircher’s writings that allows Rousseau’s work to appear more credible and, therefore, more saleable. Should this be the case, this further undermines the reliability of Rousseau’s *Dissertation* as a historical source today.

Rousseau also mentions certain biblical anecdotes:

After the flood, the Egyptians were the first to devote themselves to music and instruments, and Father Kircher affirms that it was Noah’s son Shem and his son Mesraim who gave them knowledge.

The sons of Noah, mentioned in the Bible in Chapter 10 of the book of Genesis, do not describe musical activity. It seems that this is a striking example of fantasy on the part of Kircher. This demonstrates Rousseau’s carelessness in using a source without ensuring its reliability. This is surprising, as Rousseau quotes from the Bible in the

---

323 Rousseau, *Traité*, 4: *Selon la plus commune opinion, le Chalumeau fût le premier des Instruments que les hommes inventèrent, & cette opinion est fondée sur la raison; car, comme dit fort bien le Pere Kircher Jesuite dans sa Musurgie Universelle, les premiers hommes dans le commencement du monde menoient une vie champestre, & n’avoient point d’autre occupation la pluspart du temps qu’à garder leurs troupeaux, ce qui les obligeoit à chercher les bons pasturages, & les lieux marescugeux où croissent les Joncs, les Roseaux, & autres especes de Plantes propres à faire des Chalumeaux, & comme la vie pastorale & champestre est une vie oysive, il est à croire que les premiers hommes pour se dessenuyer tâchoient d’inventer tout ce qui estoit capable de les divertir; the following translations of the *Traité* (footnotes 328-329) are by R. A. Green.

324 Ibid., 6: *Après le Deluge les Egyptiens surent les premiers qui s’adonnerent à la Musique & aux Instruments, & le Pere Kircher assure que ce fût CHAM fils de NOÉ, & son fils MESRAIM, qui leur en donnerent l’intelligence.*
Réponse, suggesting that he should have had at least access to one. This further supports the premise that Rousseau’s Dissertation may not be a factual and reliable source.

Another example is Rousseau’s treatment of the term *neghinoth.*

One of the earliest writers on commentaries on rabbinical works and the Talmud is Schilte Haggiborim, a Hebrew author who is very accurate in his writings, cited by Father Kircher. He says that instruments in the sanctuary were made in different ways, that they number thirty-six and that David found the correct way to play all these instruments. Among them, the same author says, were *pulsatiles* instruments, which were called *neghinoth.* They were made of wood, their shape was long and round, and they had holes on the lower part. They had three gut strings, and when they were played, the sound was drawn from these strings with a bow with strongly tightened hair from a horse tail.\(^\text{325}\)

The word *neghinoth* is a plural form of a feminine Hebrew noun derived from the verb *nagan* meaning to play a stringed instrument. It occurs in a number of places in the Bible, including the initial line of 7 psalms where it traditionally is understood to mean “stringed instrument” or “instruments” if plural. However, this term does not always have the same meaning, and can also mean “song”, for example in Psalm 77:7.\(^\text{326}\) What is even more surprising about Kircher’s assertion is that he claims to know the exact constructional details of this instrument, even though there is no evidence to support it. This is not apparent to Rousseau.

According to Green, Abraham da Portaleone’s *Schilte ha-Gibborim* (Mantua, 1612), which is the source of this information, describes instruments that are essentially

---

\(^{325}\) Ibid., 6-7: *Un des plus anciens Ecrivains des Commentaires des Rabins & des Talmuds est SCHILTE HAGGIBORIM Autheur Hebreu, & tres-exact dans ses écrits, rapporté par le Pere Kircher. Il dit que les Instruments du Sanctuaire estoient faits de diverses manières, & qu’ils estoient au nombre de trente-six, & que ce fût David qui trouva les Jeux propres de tous ces Instruments, entre lesquels le mesme Autheur dit qu’il y avoit des Instruments Pulsatiles, que l’on appelloit Neghinoth; ils estoient faits de bois, leur figure estoit longue & ronde, & il y avoit plusieurs trous par-dessous. Ils estoient tendus de trois chordes faites de boyaux d’animaux, & quand ils en vouloient joüer, ils tiroient le Son des chordes avec un Archet lié de crin de queue de Cheval fort bandé.*

\(^{326}\) I am indebted to Dr. Suzanne Wijsman for this information.
early seventeenth-century Italian instruments; however, transposed into ancient times.\textsuperscript{327} An example of this is can be seen in this description:

\begin{quote}
Among these pulsatiles instruments the same author names two, specifically machul and minim, which were made of somewhat similarly to viols, according to the opinion of Father Kircher, and the shape which he gives us. But, he shows a peculiarity which he calls haghningab, which Father Kircher affirms to have been identical to the instrument commonly referred to as viola da gamba, or viol, and this instrument had six strings.\textsuperscript{328}
\end{quote}

While it is clear to us that the instrument being referred to could not possibly be a viol, Kircher’s opinion remains unquestioned by Rousseau. Rousseau is simply attempting to align his opinion with that of Kircher’s while allowing the viol to appear more ancient than it really is; hence, inflicting its historical significance.

Another perplexing paragraph in Rousseau’s \textit{Traité} concerns an ancient instrument called the \textit{Magadin}. Rousseau explains:

\begin{quote}
This is proved by Athene’e who says that Euphorion, in his book \textit{On the Isthmian Games (de Istimiis)}, writes that there was an ancient instrument, \textit{Magadin}, and that this instrument was encircled with strings placed on a pivot on which it turned as it was played with a bow.\textsuperscript{329}
\end{quote}

According to the classical Greek author, Athenaeus, “Now Euphorian, in his work \textit{On the Isthmian Games}, says that the instrument known as the \textit{magadis} was very old, but in more recent times its construction was altered and its name changed to \textit{sambuca}”.\textsuperscript{330}

\textsuperscript{327} Green, “Annotated Translation”, 289-290.
\textsuperscript{328} Rousseau, \textit{Traité}, 7-8: \textit{Entre ces Instruments Pulsatiles le mesme Autheur en nomme deux, sçavoir Machul & Minnim, qui estoient faits à peu près comme des Violes, suivant le sentiment du Pere Kircher & la figure qu’il nous en donne; mais il nous en démontre un particulierement qu’il nomme Hagningab, que le Pere Kircher asseure avoir esté tout semblable à l’Instrument que l’on appelle ordinairement Viola Gamba, Viole de Jambe, & cet Instrument avoit six chordes}; trans. R. A. Green.
\textsuperscript{329} Rousseau, \textit{Traité}, 8-9: \textit{La preuve de cecy est dans ATHENE’E, qui rapporte qu’EUPHORION dans son Livre de Istmis écrit qu’il y avoit un ancien Instrument que l’on nommoit Magadin, que cet Instrument estoit tout entouré de chordes, qu’on le mettoit sur un pivot pour le tourner à mesure qu’on le touchoit avec l’Archet}; trans. R. A. Green.
There is no mention of its circular or pivoted construction, or its usage with a bow as purported by Rousseau.

Rousseau Imitates Mersenne

Rousseau’s description of an early viol closely resembles the figure of such an instrument published in the *Harmonie Universelle*.\(^{331}\) Rousseau writes:

> The first viols in France had five very big strings and were used for accompanying. The bridge was very low and placed above the sound holes, and the lowest part of the fingerboard touched the soundboard. The strings were very thick and tuned by fourths: specifically, the chanterelle [or top string] was in C, the second in G, the third in D, the fourth in A, and the fifth, or bourdon, was on E.

Mersenne gives us with same tuning for the instrument:

> And one sees the tuning by the letters with the clef of G re sol on the second string, with E, A, D, G and C, which signify that the tuning of these five strings….\(^{332}\)

While Mersenne does not provide us with the information that Rousseau does in his description, it is clear that Rousseau has embellished his *Traité* with details from Mersenne’s figure.

Rousseau also quotes widely from Mersenne without attributing its source.

Rousseau writes:

> Besides, the instrument [the first viols played in France] was very large so that young pages of the musical establishment could be enclosed in it for singing the soprano while the bass was played. He says that it was practiced by a certain Granier in front of Queen

---

\(^{331}\) See chapter 2 on “Beginnings in France”, Fig. 6.

Marguerite where he played the bass and sang the tenor while a little page, closed up inside, sang the soprano. Mersenne:

Now they are made of all sorts of sizes, in which one can enclose some young page-boy to sing the treble of many delightful airs while the bass player sings the alto, so as to perform a concert in three parts, as Granier does before Queen Marguerite.

Rousseau:

The first men in France to excel in playing the viol were Messieurs Maugars and Hotman. They were equally admirable, although their characters were different.

Mersenne:

[There be none in France to compare either to Maugars or to Hotman…who excel in so many divisions, & such delicate, & and sweet bowing, [and] there is nothing in harmony which they do not express perfectly, especially when someone else is simultaneously playing the Clavichord with them.}
Rousseau:

The first [Maugars] possessed so much knowledge and technique that he could provide variations in an infinity of different ways on a subject of five or six notes given to him on the spot until all that could be done with chords as well as diminutions had been exhausted.«337

Mersenne:

By himself he [Maugars] performs two, three, and more parts simultaneously on his bass viol, and so much ornamented, & with such stupendous celerity of hand in all kinds of music, I dare say unheard-of-before.»338

On the other hand, when Mersenne chooses to belittle the efforts of Hotman, Rousseau gives a different account. In Mersenne’s version, Maugars is described as the better player. Perhaps because of a personal bias or the indirect links with Hotman, it would not have made much sense for Rousseau to exalt the status of Maugars beyond what was necessary. However, according to Rousseau, it seems that the beauty of Hotman’s playing is prized far more than the technical dexterity of Maugars. Mersenne writes:

What the other sounded on the bass viol, or any other instrument whatsoever, he [Maugars] emulated at once, so that he also often surpassed the latter [Hotman], & with more than sagacious ingenuity even seemed to intuit the imagination itself of him who was playing.»340

337 Rousseau, Traité, 23: car le premier avoit tant de science & d’execution, que sur un Sujet de cinq ou six notes qu’on luy donnoit sur le champ, il le diversersoit en une infinite de manières différentes, jusqu’a épouser tout ce que l’on y pouvoit faire, tant par accords que par diminutions; trans. R. A. Green.


339 Sainte Colombe and De Machy were students of Hotman. Perhaps many other French violists were as well.

340 Mersenne, Harmonicorum Libri XII, De Instrumentis Harmonicis, Liber Primus, prop. xxx, 47: Quas alius Barbito, vel alius quòquis instrumento cecinerit, congrēstīm emulatur, vt illis etiam sepemenumero præ& ingenio plusquam sagaci ipsam canentium imaginationem atque mentem intueri videatur; trans. A. Otterstedt.
Rousseau:

The second [Hotman] is the one in France who began composition of *pieces d’harmonie* suited to the viol and to write beautiful melodies and imitate the voice so that the tender performance of a little *Chansonette* was often more admired than the most complicated and learned pieces. The tenderness of his playing came from his beautiful bow strokes, which he enlivened, or sweetened with so much skill and appropriateness that he charmed all who heard him. It is this, which began to give perfection to the viol, and to make it valued above all other instruments.\(^{341}\)

Nevertheless, Rousseau’s comments concerning Maugars and Hotman should be taken with caution. Maugars probably died around 1645; hence, it is impossible for Rousseau, who was born in 1644, to have actually met Maugars. Likewise, Rousseau’s account of Hotman seems far too similar to Mersenne’s for it to have actually been a first-hand account. For these reasons, it is almost certain that Rousseau neither met Maugars nor Hotman. Moreover, most of the material in Rousseau’s *Dissertation* is derived from someone else’s writings.

It is interesting to note that Rousseau does not acknowledge Mersenne’s work in the same methodical way that he treats Kircher’s. In fact, it appears that Rousseau is presenting Mersenne’s writing as his own.

Rousseau mentions a Benedictine priest, whom according to Rousseau was a great improviser:

> At the same time there was a Benedictine, a man named Father André, with an astonishing ability for varying a subject on the spot in a thousand surprising ways. The memory of the charming things he did on the viol makes him admired today among the most famous of our time who heard him. They admit that had he been able to make a

---

\(^{341}\) *Rousseau, Traité, 23: & le second est celuy qui a commence en France à composer des Pieces d’Harmonie reglées sur La Viole, à faire de beaux Chants, & à imiter la Voix, en sorte qu’on l’admiroit souvent advantage dans l’execution tendre d’une petite Chansonette, que dans les Pieces les plus remplies & les plus scâvantes. La tendresse de son Jeu venoit de ces beaux coups d’Archet qu’il animoit, & qu’il a doucissoit avec tant d’adresse & si à propos, qu’il charmoit tous ceux qui l’entendoient, & c’est ce qui a commence à donner la perfection à la Viole, & à la faire estimer preferablement à tous les autres Instrument; trans. R. A. Green.*
profession of this instrument, he would have obscured all his contemporaries.342

Rousseau also describes both Father André and Maugars as being acclaimed for the uncommon skill of improvisation.

The style of improvising on a subject is very little used because it is very difficult, and there are only a few men who practice it, such as Monsieur Maugard and Father André, the Benedictine, of whom we have spoken, as do yet at present some extraordinary masters.343

Rousseau is probably unaware that Maugars’ first name is André, as he makes no reference to his first name throughout the *Traité*. However, according to Green:

It has been generally concluded (by Van den Straeten and Natalie Dolmetsch) that the Benedictine Father André and André Maugars were one and the same. There are no other references to a Father André in the literature of the period, but it seems like a strange mistake, given the closeness of Rousseau to these events.344

As Rousseau gives us very little information about Father André, like Maugars, it is very likely that Rousseau never actually met him. Despite of being unaware of this, modern scholars have already made this conclusion. It is far too great a coincidence that André Maugars and Father André share the same first name and musical skill. It seems as though hearsay from two different sources has been taken as fact in Rousseau’s document. Although there is a possibility of the existence of a Father André, Rousseau’s carelessness in verifying his information, as shown previously, makes this error a likely one.

342 Rousseau, *Traité*, 24: *Dans les mesme temps il y avoit encore un Benedictin, homme admirable pour diversister un Sujet sur le champ en mille manieres surprenantes, que l’on nommoit le PERE ANDRÉ: Le souvenir des choses charmantes qu’il faisoit sur la Viole, le fair encore admirer aujourd’hui des plus Illustres de nostre temps qui l’ont entendu, & qui avouent que si’il avoit esté d’un estat à faire profession de cet Instrument, il auroit obscurcy tous ceux de son temps;* trans. R. A. Green.

343 Ibid., 70: *Ce Jeu de travailler sur un Sujet est tres-peu en usage, à cause qu’il est tres-difficile, & qu’il n’y a que les hommes rares qui le pratiquent, comme ont fait Monsieur MAUGARD, & le Pere ANDRÉ Benedictin, dont nous avons parlé, & comme sont encore à present les Maistres extraordinaires;* trans. R. A. Green.

344 Green, “Annotated Translation”, 306.
Conclusion

Most of the Dissertation is written with references to biblical characters and mythological figures, seriously undermining Rousseau’s credibility as a theorist in relation to the viol for the present-day scholar and performer.\textsuperscript{345} To further look for evidence to validate his claims would be pointless, since most of the Dissertation is written in the same fanciful manner. This is in contrast to the straightforward and didactic approach of De Machy, containing none of the polemic or biblical associations designed to win over customers. Rousseau’s disregard for factual information is demonstrated in his views of sacred and secular writings:

Sacred and secular books teach us that it is something permissible, and even necessary, to ignore ordinary rules, because rules are made for man, not man for the rules.\textsuperscript{346}

While Rousseau’s style of writing, in aligning his opinion with that of other sources, may be seen as an attempt at making him more credible, some at this time may not have been so easily convinced.\textsuperscript{347} In fact, Rousseau had been accused of stealing the works of others.\textsuperscript{348} This may point towards the fact that Rousseau’s manner of writing would not have been acceptable in the past in the same way as it would not be in present times. The purported reaction by De Machy of name-calling, encapsulates the disdain he may have had for Rousseau’s writing:

\textsuperscript{345} For a complete list of authors cited in the Dissertation, see Green, “Annotated Translation”, 135-136.
\textsuperscript{346} Rousseau. Traité, 62: \textit{car les Livres sacrez & prophanes nous apprennent qu’il est quelquefois permis, & mesme necessaire de passer par-dessus les Regles ordinaires, parce que les Regles sont faites pour l’homme, & non pas l’homme pour les Regles}; trans. R. A. Green.
\textsuperscript{347} Rousseau, Réponse, 2: \textit{Il me reproche d’avoir parlé de l’Origine de la Viole & d’avoir cite les passages des Autheurs en latin comme je les ay trouvé, remontrant que de tous les Illustres qui ont esté pour chaque Instrument, pas un ne s’est mis en peine de sçavoir d’où provenoit le sien, voila une consequence extremement forte, il faudra consulter l’Université pour y réprondre}.
\textsuperscript{348} Ibid., 8: \textit{Il dit que je suis le singe de la Musique mais il ne me fait pas une grande injure car j’avoue que je tache d’imiter les habiles gens dans leurs Ouvrages, mais non pas de les piller comme il dit.}
The pamphlet's author [De Machy] can be assured that all the insults he throws at me, that of usurper, false-devout, envious, malign, ambitious, ignorant, man of ill will, malicious, arrogant, Doctor Fariole, blinded, uneducated, ridicule, a man that could scare the devils, foolhardy, devoid of good sense, extravagant, and generally all the invectives with which he charges me, do not trouble my rest.\textsuperscript{349}

As most of Rousseau’s information has been derived from other authors, such as Kircher and Mersenne, the accuracy of Rousseau’s accounts that do not correspond with these sources is questionable. This is especially noticeable in the works that have been traced to Mersenne, where he has allowed the information to appear as his own, while altering certain details in his version. This brings into question Rousseau’s truthfulness and honesty in his presentation of the \textit{Traité}.

When viewed against the bulk of evidence that has resulted from modern research, we realise that much of the information presented by Rousseau is not reliable or well supported. The only person mentioned in the \textit{Dissertation}, with whom we can be somewhat certain that Rousseau had contact is Sainte Colombe. But as one would expect, because of Rousseau’s obvious bias, he has nothing but praise for his teacher, and we are again unsure about what is true and what is not.

\textsuperscript{349} Ibid., 12: l’Auteur du Libelle peut s’assurer que toutes les injures qu’il me dit, d’Usurpateur, Faux-devot, Enieux, Malin, Ambitieux, Ignorant, Homme de mauvaise foy, Malicieux, Orgueilleux, Docteur Fariole, Aveuglé, mal instruit, Ridicule, Homme a faire peur aux Diables, Temeraire, Dépourveu de bon sens, Extravagant, & généralement toutes les invectives dont il me charge, ne troublent point mon repos; trans. M. van der Beken.
Chapter 5

Quarrel Over Viol Playing: Rousseau vs. De Machy

The argument between Rousseau and De Machy begins with Rousseau’s comments towards De Machy in his newly published Traité. Although De Machy’s avertissement makes no explicit reference to any specific violist, Rousseau felt it necessary to create a response. The following are quotations from De Machy’s book that elicited Rousseau’s resentment:

I now consider the rules, which are necessary for playing this instrument well, because there are few who know them. To speak about them in general would require a whole volume. It is sufficient to be familiar only with those rules it is absolutely essential to know…. It is certain that by carefully following all these rules one cannot but play well. But one of my astonishments is having noticed that, except for some people skilled in viol playing, there are few, even among those who make a profession of it who have heard anything about these rules, which are so essential to the instrument. On the contrary, they will scorn them, as is usual with the majority of ignorant people. What has always contributed to the perfection of this instrument is seen by them as a defect – even though the most illustrious players have always so strongly recommended [such rules] that they have never composed pieces which did not respect these rules. 350

These “rules” refer to the techniques of the left hand, namely the two ports de main and the tenuë. They are specified in De Machy’s book and are an integral part of viol playing. It is De Machy’s belief that without the knowledge of these techniques, playing the viol well would not be possible. His words may have been offensive to

350 Sieur de Machy, 4-6: Je passe aux regles qui sont necessaires pour bien jouër de cet Instrument, parce qu’il y en a peu qui les sachent. Pour en parler en general il faudroit un Volume entier, il suffit seulement de connaitre celles qu'on est indispensablement obligé de ne pas ignorer... Il est certain qu'en pratiquant exactement toutes ces regles, on ne peut manquer de bien joier. Mais un de mes étonnemens est d'avoir remarqué qu'excepté quelques personnes qui sont habiles pour la Violle, il y en a peu de ceux même qui en font profession, qui aient entendu parler d'aucune de ces regles, qui sont si essentielles à l'Instrument. Au contraire ils les mépriseront, comme sont ordinairement la plus grande partie de ceux qui sont ignorans. Ce qui a contribué de tout temps à la perfection de cet Instrument, est un défaut pour eux, quoiqué les plus illustres les ayent toujours tellement récommandées, qu'ils n'ont jamais fait de Pieces qui ne fussent selon ces regles.
professionals, especially those who did not know of his techniques or rejected them. In a broader sense, this may also be seen as an effort to persuade his followers and students the validity of his technique, as the sales of his books, and perhaps his livelihood as a teacher, depended on it.

One should not judge by the first pieces, because one is not usually successful when one begins; but should judge by recent ones, written in their hand…. Others scarcely reason logically, saying “each to his own way”. It is true any author can differ from another in his compositions, & can even have a different style of touch, just as everyone differs in writing, & in almost everything; but as for the rules they must be general & based on the same principles. Anyone who upheld the opposite view would form principles which worked only by chance & by caprice. This would become apparent when they fell into the hands of skilled people.351

De Machy acknowledges that there may be different manners of viol playing, but is nevertheless adamant about his rules. He does, however, appear more sympathetic towards violists who have little experience. He may have been referring to Rousseau, and may be alluding to his inadequacies.352

Concerning those who are still adamant about the advantages of playing melodic pieces on the viol, De Machy states:

Finally, to respond to those who wish to persuade [people] that pieces of a single melodic line are preferable to those which are harmonized, I say that they are more wrong than they think, as they reveal in this way that they know nothing of the latter. And when they quote pieces with a single melody by some skilful man, to justify themselves using his example, they do not notice that they are written for several viols: which is easy to recognise. A person can have an excellent hand & play beautiful songs pleasantly, even though they have a single melody: but it is necessary to compare this to a man who plays perfectly on the harpsichord, or organ, with only

351 Ibid., 6: *Il ne faut pas juger des premières, parce que l'on ne réussit pas ordinairement quand on commence; mais bien de celles des derniers temps, & écrites de leur main…. D'autres ne raisonnent guères juste, qui disent que chacun a sa manière. Il est vrai que chaque Auteur peut differer d'un autre en ses productions, & peut même avoir un caractere different pour le toucher, comme tout le monde differe dans l'écriture, & presque en toutes choses : mais pour les regles, elles doivent estre generales, & fondées sur les mêmes principes. Quiconque soutiendroit le contraire, se formeroit des principes qui ne rouleroient que sur le hasard & sur le caprice. Ce qui paroistroit au moment qu'il tomberoit entre les mains d'habiles gens.*

352 See chapter 4 on “Rousseau”.
one hand: the simple performance might be pleasant; nevertheless one would not call that playing the harpsichord, nor the organ.\footnote{Ibid., 7: Enfin, pour répondre à quelques-uns qui veulent persuader que des Pieces d'un chant simple sont préférables à celles qui sont harmonieuses, je dis qu'ils se font plus de tort qu'ils ne pensent, puisqu'ils montrent par là qu'ils sont ignorans dans celles-cy. Et lors qu'ils citent les pieces d'un chant simple de quelque habile homme, pour s'autoriser de son exemple, ils ne remarquent pas qu'elles sont faites pour plusieurs Violles: ce qui est facile à connoistre. Une personne peut avoir la main excellente & jouer agréablement de beaux chants, quoique simples: mais il faut comparer cecy à un homme qui joueroit parfaitement du Clavessin, ou de l'Orgue, d'une seule main : ce jeu simple pourroit estre agréable ; neanmoins on n'appelleroit pas cela jouer du Clavessin, ny de l'Orgue.}

In this situation, De Machy is showing preference for harmonic pieces. This suggests that there have been some at the time who had been treating the viol as melodic instrument. He also points out that some have made the error in treating individual parts of viol consort music as solo music. It is in De Machy’s opinion that treating the instrument as such falls short of the true method of playing the viol. It is unclear to whom De Machy may be referring when making these comments. It appears to be directed to the general public, as there is no reason to believe that any of the well-known violists of the time would have made this error.

In promoting the playing of melodic pieces, De Machy refers to those who lack the proper knowledge of viol playing:

> When a man knows his profession well, chords should not prevent him from composing beautiful songs with all the ornaments necessary for tender playing: And it is only those who use only one port de main, & who very often do not use one at all, who feel this way.\footnote{Ibid., 7: Quand un homme sçait bien sa profession, les accords ne doivent pas l'embarrasser en composant de beaux chants avec tous les agréments necessaires pour jouer tendrement : Et il n'y a que ceux qui ne se servent que d'un port de main, & qui bien souvent n'en ont point du tout, qui soient de ce sentiment.}

While this comment could be referring to violists like Sainte Colombe, it is revealed in the Réponse that Sainte Colombe did in fact agree with the use of the two ports de main, but, according to Rousseau, disagreed in calling it a second port de main.\footnote{This point is further discussed in this chapter in “Rousseau and the Ports de main”.

Therefore, these words by De Machy could not have been directed to Sainte Colombe.
It could only have been directed to those who only have one *port de main* or simply have no knowledge on the matter.

The rest of the *avertissement* does not refer to other parties, but simply describe in detail his method of viol playing and his thoughts on the techniques advocated. It is through this means that De Machy describes the techniques of viol playing that is best adapted to his pieces.

While De Machy makes no direct reference to any specific violist, it will be shown that Rousseau implicates himself in making his reply to De Machy, which as we shall see, reveals a man deficient in the arts of viol playing and discourse.

**Rousseau’s Initial Retort**

The first signs of retaliation against De Machy’s work is seen in the second chapter of “The Position of the Left Hand” in Rousseau’s *Traité de Viole*, where he takes issue with De Machy’s two *ports de main*:

Following what we have just said, there is only one hand position for playing the viol, and this position is natural. An *Avertissement au public* was published some time ago advocating two hand positions necessary for perfection in playing the viol, and that all the masters by a common error sinned against this rule, except the author of the *Avertissement*. I say all the masters, because they all know and practice one hand position. Monsieur de Sainte Colombe has never taught or practiced what I have just spoken of. Thus, it is out of place for the author of the *Avertissement* to wish to confuse the public with two pretended hand positions. It is without foundation to present to us what is practiced on the lute, theorbo, and guitar, because there is great difference between the way of holding the lute, theorbo, and guitar and the way of holding the viol, and, as a result, there must be some difference in hand position.356

356 Rousseau, *Traité*, 30-31: *Suivant ce que nous venons de dire, on peut remarquer qu’il n’y a qu’une manière de porter la main pour jouer de la Viole, & que cette manière est naturelle; cependant on a donné un Avertissement au Public depuis quelque temps, par lequel on veut faire croire qu’il y a deux Ports de main nécessaires pour la perfection du Jeu de la Viole, & que tous les Maîtres, par un abus general, pechent contre cette Regle, excepté l’Auteur de l’Avertissement. Je dis tous les Maîtres, parce que tous ne connaissent & ne pratiquent qu’une manière de porter la main; & que Monsieur de SAINTE COLOMBE n’a jamais enseigné, ny pratiqué que celle dont j’ay parlé cy-devant. Ainsi c’est mal à propos que l’Auteur de l’Avertissement veut embrasser le Public de deux pretendus Ports de main;*
Rousseau’s complaint is mainly with the *port de main*. Rousseau claims that there is only one *port de main*, and second *port de main* is specific to De Machy alone. De Machy, on the other hand, claims that there are few that know of his technique of the two *ports de main*, in spite of the fact that “the most illustrious players have always so strongly recommended [such rules] that they have never composed pieces which did not respect these rules”. 357

There seems to be two schools of thought when it comes to the left hand. Rousseau cites Sainte Colombe as an authority on his technique, but there is no way to know for certain if either Rousseau or Sainte Colombe is truly reliable on this matter. As seen in the *Dissertation*, Rousseau’s approach in its justification relies more on fiction than fact, proving him to be unreliable. Likewise, Sainte Colombe never wrote any theoretical work nor made any comment on viol technique. De Machy’s knowledge of two *ports de mains* shows that he is clearly aware of the single *port de main* as suggested by Rousseau.

**Melody or Harmony?**

Throughout Rousseau’s writings, one will observe that he intentionally makes an effort to dissociate the development of the viol from plucked instruments. This is contrary to modern thinking based on historical evidence, which has shown that viols and plucked instruments share a common ancestry. This is also expressed in his *Dissertation*, where he has constantly tried to show that bowed and plucked instruments have no relation. Certainly, this dissociation is an integral part of his argument, as any

---

357 Sieur de Machy, 6: quoyque les plus illustres les ayent toujours tellement recommandées, qu’ils n’ont jamais fait de Pieces qui ne fussent selon ces regles.
historical connection between the viol and plucked instruments would suggest that their
techniques of execution for the left hand should be related, if not the same. This
includes the treatment of the viol as a harmony instrument, instead of a melodic one.
Concerning the playing of melodic pieces, Rousseau writes:

The playing of melodic pieces is very pleasing and even very
touching when done well. I do not understand why the author of the
Avertissement inveighs so strongly against those who compose them.
All the masters beginning with Monsieur Hotman acquired much
more admiration with the most simple and touching airs with all the
delicacy of the art than with the most correct and complicated
harmonic pieces. Further, if one wished to place the perfection of the
viol only in the harmony, the plucked instrument would prevail over
it, but particularly the organ and the harpsichord, which surpass all
others in harmony.  

In this instance, Rousseau explains his preference for the viol as a melodic instrument,
describing how Hotman, whom he very likely never actually met, excelled in this style
of playing. He assumes that all the violists that follow Hotman belong to this school of
thought, and the success of this style conveys more beauty. He also assumes that
harmonic pieces are reserved for keyboard instruments, and any effort to replicate that
would prove inadequate. On the other hand, De Machy compares the playing of the
melody alone “to a man who plays perfectly on the harpsichord, or organ, with only
one hand”.  To this, Rousseau retorts:

There is no one who does not agree that a melody played with
tenderness is much more pleasant than harmony without taste.
Further, the viol is an instrument where the melody must preferably
dominate the harmony, because the delicacy of song is its spirit, and

358 Rousseau, Traité, 57: Le Jeu des Pieces de Melodie est fort agreable, & mesme fort touchant quand
on s’en acquite bien, & je ne comprend pas pourquoi l’Auheur de l’Avertissement s’emporte si fort
contre ceux qui joüent des Pieces de Melodie, & encore plus contre ceux qui les composent; car tous les
Maistres, à commencer par Monsieur HOTMAN, se sont beaucoup plus fait admirer sur des Airs simples
touchez avec toute la delicatesse de l’Art, que sur les Pieces d’Harmonie les plus reguliers & les plus
remplies. De plus il faut remarquer que si on veut faire consister la perfection de la Viole dans la seule
Harmonie, il est certain que les Instruments à pincer l’emporteront par-dessus elle; mais
particulierement l’Orgue & le Clavecin, qui surpassent tous les autres en fair d’Harmonie; trans. R. A.
Green.

359 Sieur de Machy, 7: à un homme qui joueroit parfaitement du Clavessin, ou de l’Orgue, d’une seule
main.
it is for this quality alone that it is respected as approaching the voice closer than all other instrument which much imitate it. If someone derives great pleasure from hearing a beautiful solo voice when it uses all the vocal agréments, why would he not wish to permit the melodic style for the viol which imitates it perfectly? It is indeed unjust to condemn the melodic style and its composers. Likewise it is against good sense for the author of the Avertissement to compare melodic pieces for the viol to someone who would play the organ or harpsichord with only one hand, adding that one would be as pleasing as the other.  

Rousseau reveals certain misconceptions. A performance of any kind lacking in taste, whether melodic or harmonic in nature, will undoubtedly be unpleasant. Rousseau’s comments belie his assumption that the viol’s ability to imitate the human voice can only be achieved when one is playing a solo line, like a solo voice does with vocal agréments. This has no justification, since De Machy’s works, composed in the harmonic style, include many solo lines - with occasional double stops - and they are thoroughly filled with ornaments (agréments) (Fig. 49).

![Fig. 49 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Sarabande, first book, page 30, bar 1-9.](image)

Implicit in Rousseau’s comments is the question of whether the melodic style has more expressive value than the harmonic style. In principle, there is no reason why it should not be possible to achieve the highest level of expression, as Rousseau

---

360 Rousseau, Traité, 58-59: *car il n’y a personne qui ne demeure d’accord qu’une Melodie executée avec tendresse est beaucoup plus agréable qu’une Harmonie sans goût, outre que la Viole est un Instrument où la Melodie doit dominer préférentiellement à l’Harmonie; parce que la delicatesse du Chant est son esprit, & que c’est par ce seul endroit qu’elle est estimée, comme aprochant plus prés de la Voix, que tous les Instruments doivent imiter. Et si on se fait un grand plaisir d’entendre une belle Voix seule, lors qu’elle chante avec tous les agréments du Chant, pourquoi ne voudra-t-on point souffrir le Jeu de Melodie de la Viole qui l’imite parfaitement: C’est donc contre la Justice que l’on veut blâmer le Jeu de Melodie & ceux qui en composent les Pieces; comme aussi c’est contre le bon sens que l’Author de l’Avertissement compare les Pieces de Melodie de la Viole à un homme qui joueroit de l’Orgue ou du Clavecin d’une main seulement, ajoignant que l’un seroit aussi agréable que l’autre: J’en laisse le Jugement au Lecteur;* trans. R. A. Green.
intends, in both compositional styles, but it is in Rousseau’s opinion that this can only be achieved by his method.

Rousseau’s comments concerning this issue reveal a man unaware of the nature of the harmonic style. This also indicates that Rousseau was unaware of the many harmonic pieces that had been composed in the past. The harmonic style of viol playing existed before Hotman, especially in the works of the English *lyra* violists. De Machy is clearly better informed on this issue.

The underlying question that both men are attempting to address is whether or not the viol can function successfully as a harmony instrument. As this is partially a question of musical taste and conventions, it cannot be answered definitively in the context of this thesis. However, there is nothing to suggest that De Machy’s pieces, most of which belong to the harmonic style, are lacking in quality.

In the chapter discussing the harmonic style, Rousseau comments on composing for the viol, and the skills required to do so successfully:

> It is easy to learn the rules for composition. The neck\(^{361}\) is easy to learn from studying the illustrations we have seen, and the character of the viol can be learned. Genius and good taste, however, are natural gifts which cannot be learned from rules, and it is through them that the rules are practiced. License can be taken *if à propos* it always pleases, as to please requires genius and good taste. The author of the *Avertissement* cries strongly against those who limit themselves to pleasing. “People have always, he says, “preferred the bad to the good.” It seems to me, however, that this moral observation is inappropriately applied and that truly one must have no other goal that to please.\(^{362}\)

---

\(^{361}\) The neck of the viol, where upon lies the frets.

\(^{362}\) Rousseau, *Traité*, 60-61: *Pour la Composition il est facile d’en apprendre les Regles. Au regard du Manche il est facile à connoistre, suivant les Figures que nous avons vues, & l’on peut comprendre quel est le caractere de la Viole; mais le genie & le bon goït sont des dons naturels que l’on ne peut apprendre par Regles, & c’est par leur moyen que l’on pratique les Regles, & que l’on prend des licences si à propos que l’on plaist toûjours; car plaist c’est avoir du genie & du bon goït: Cependant l’Autheur de l’Avertissement crie fortement contre ceux qui se bornent au seul but de plaist; parce que, dit-il, on a de tout temps plus aimé le mal que le bien: mais il me semble que cette raison morale est for mal appliquée, & qu’il est vray de dire qu’on ne doit avoir d’autre but que de plaist; car quand on ne plaist pas, c’est une marque évidence que l’on n’a point de genie, ny de bon goït;* trans. R. A. Green.
It would seem that Rousseau is in favour of more compositional liberties as compared to De Machy when composing pieces for the viol. In this instance, Rousseau misunderstands De Machy. De Machy’s concern is toward those who compose for the viol without knowing the technical abilities of their instrument, as he explains:

I speak to those who do not care to put on paper everything that comes into their heads, without asking whether what they do is appropriate for the hand, the bow & the rest; & who believe they are protecting themselves from all the reproaches that one might make, by saying only, that provided people like what they write, that is enough for them. This is a response without any foundation, since one can say that people have always preferred the bad to the good.\(^{363}\)

In writing in the harmonic style, there must be some thought put into writing music. This is because there are a limited amount of chords that can be achieved with the viol’s configuration of strings and the shape of the hand; hence De Machy’s admonition is directed towards violists that do not consider these issues.

Rousseau misunderstands this point. He takes the issue out of context and allows De Machy to appear as if he does not value pleasant and tasteful music. It is not in relation to good taste or pleasure that De Machy directs his point, but towards the lack of foresight on the part of those who do not write idiomatically for the viol, especially when there are so many possibilities for this instrument.

The underlying question raised by this argument is whether or not one should compose so that the performer can play comfortably, effectively using the viol for its intended purpose while exploiting all its abilities. Should a violist simply create melodies from his imagination without concern for how it falls under the hand, player comfort would be compromised, as would be the possibility of writing in a harmonic style.

\(^{363}\) Sieur de Machy, 8: Je parle à ceux qui ne se soucients pas de mettre sur le papier tout ce qui leur vient dans l'idée, sans examiner si ce qu'ils font convient pour la main, l'Archet & le reste; & qui croyent se mettre à couvert de tous les reproches qu'on leur feroit, en disant seulement, que pourvû que ce qu'ils font plaise, cela leur suffit. Qui est une Réponse sans aucun fondement, puisqu'on peut dire que l'on a de tout temps plus aimé le mal que le bien.
style. Rousseau appears not to take these issues into account, as his sole stated purpose in writing for the viol is to create pleasing melodies.

Surely, all of the above reasons should be taken into consideration when composing. However, Rousseau, being an advocate of the melodic style, seems to allow us to forego this; in principle, it is possible to play any melody on the viol if one chooses. Hence, the fundamental issue is still the same: the viol’s relative success as a harmonic or melodic instrument.

Tenuës

On the topic of the harmonic *tenuës*, Rousseau explains:

Harmonic pieces require the regular observance of *tenuës de bienseance* [sic] and particularly the harmonic *tenuës* which are essential for reasons we have discussed. If their practice is not required with too much severity, they may be discarded in favour of some more important consideration. Nevertheless, the author of the *Avertissement* says that no license is permitted with regard to the *tenuës*, and all places must be eliminated where the requirement to observe them exists without being able to do so.364

Rousseau refers to *tenuës de bien-séance* as:

The *tenuës de bien-séance* [sic] refer to never raising the fingers placed on the frets without having to when they can remain in place without forcing the hand. The reason for this is that having all the fingers occupied presents the most agreeable appearance and because often the fingers are in place for the next note anyway.365

364 Rousseau, *Traité*, 61: *Les Pieces d’Harmonie demandent que l’on observe regulierement les Tenuës de bien-séance, mais particulierement les Tenuës d’Harmonie, qui sont tres-necessaires, pour les raisons que nous avons dit; cependant on n’est pas obligé de les pratiquer avec tant de severite, qu’on ne puisse quelquefois s’en dispenser, en faveur de quelque chose qui soit plus considerable. Neantmoins l’Auteur de l’Avertissement dit, qu’il n’est jamais permis de se licentier à l’égard des Tenuës, & que l’on doit éviter tous les endroits qui demandent qu’on les observe, lorsqu’on ne peut le faire; trans. R. A. Green.

365 Ibid., 56: *Les Tenuës de bien-séance consistent à ne lever jamais les doigts qui sont placez, sans necessite, & lors qu’on peut les tenir occupez sans forcer la main, parce que la figure la phys agreeable sur la Viole, est d’avoir les doigts occupez; & aussi parce que souvent les doigts sont placez pour les Notes suivantes*; trans. R. A. Green.
Concerning the harmonic *tenuës*:

The harmonic *tenuës* refer to holding the pitches which make the harmony with another part and which would cause dissonances if the fingers were raised.\(^{366}\)

De Machy’s entire explanation concerning *tenuës*:

One must be careful to use the required fingerings, while observing the *tenuës*, which are very important for three reasons. The first consists in holding the sounds to maintain the harmony. The second is used to avoid cacophony or wrong tones. And the third is to have the hand positioned where it is needs to be, & likewise the fingers. As for the *tenuës*, they are extremely meticulously observed on the Lute, & other instruments with a neck, which make harmony, and also on the harpsichord… In regard to *tenuës*, if one examines the pieces of foreign authors, which are famous, one will see that they [the rules] are indeed observed there; and therefore it should not pass for a novelty.\(^{367}\)

De Machy justifies the use of the *tenuës* by citing the very same reasons Rousseau gives. As seen above, De Machy’s first and second explanation is equivalent to that of Rousseau’s description of the harmonic *tenuës*, while his third reason refers to what Rousseau calls *tenuës de bien-séance*. De Machy even gives further justification, linking the practices of plucked and keyboard instruments to those of the viol and claiming that famous foreign authors marked out their *tenuës*.

One could argue that Rousseau’s creation of the term *tenuës de bien-séance* is superfluous, since the term *tenuës* already refer to the holding down of fingers. It is only their supposed purpose, which differs. *Tenuës de bien-séance* are done to keep the

\(^{366}\) Ibid., 56: *Les Tenuës d’Harmonie consistent à tenir les Sons qui font Harmonie contre une autre Partie, & qui causeroient des Dissonances si on levoit les doigts, outre que souvent les doigts sont portez pour les Notes suivantes*; trans. R. A. Green.

\(^{367}\) Sieur de Machy, 5-6: *L'on doit prendre garde encore à se servir des doigts qu'il faut, en observant aussi les tenuës, qui sont très importantes pour trois raisons. La premiere consiste à garder les sons pour entretenir l'harmonie. La seconde sert pour éviter la cacophonie ou le mauvais son : Et la troisiéme pour avoir la main toute portée ou il faut qu'elle soit, & pareillement les doigts. Quant aux tenuës, elles sont fort ponctuellement observées sur le Luth, & sur les autres Instrumentes à manche, qui font harmonie, comme aussi sur le Clavecin…. Pour ce qui est des tenuës, si l'on examine les Pieces de Autheurs étrangers qui ont esté fameux, l'on verra qu'elles y sont bien marquées, & que par consequent cela ne doit pas passer pour une nouveauté.*
hand in a suitable shape so that it may be prepared for the following notes, while *tenuës* are specifically used to lengthen or shorten the sound of sympathetic vibrations created by the harmony of certain held notes or chords. This difference in opinion suggests that Rousseau felt the need to distinguish between these two techniques, while De Machy did not. De Machy probably felt that since the action was the same it would not require a different name.

Rousseau’s reply to De Machy’s strong stance on *tenuës*:

I answer that truly all things exist through order and that if it is eliminated, confusion takes its place. Thus all people who are orderly in their actions and in their works are very praiseworthy and cannot be imitated too much, particularly when it concerns something of the least importance. Sacred and secular books teach us that it is something permissible, and even necessary, to ignore ordinary rules, because rules are made for man, not man for the rules. Following this principle, I admit, and all masters generally agree, that to play an instrument which produces harmony, the *tenuës* should be observed, and those who fail to do not know their profession well; or neglect it. But to say that conformity must be so exact and strict that it can never be ignored in favour of a beautiful melody or some other beautiful thing cannot be supported and is against standard procedure in all the arts, where sometimes freedoms are permitted provided that it not be without necessity and without replacing them with something beautiful which demonstrates that their omission is by design.

Rousseau’s emphatic rhetoric gives one the impression that De Machy was absolutely adamant about the use *tenuës*. It is true that De Machy strongly advocated the use of *tenuës*, and commented about those who were ignorant of them, but he makes no mention about the situations where they are not practical or required. Rousseau

---

368 Rousseau, *Traité*, 61-63: Je réponds à cela qu’il est vray que toutes choses ne subsistent que par l’ordre, & que si-tost qu’il cesse, la confusion prend sa place, & qu’auz ainsi toutes les personnes qui sont regulieres dans leurs actions & dans leurs ouvrages sont fort loyables, que l’on ne sçauroit trop les imiter; mais aussi il est certain qu’une regularité trop severe est insuportable, particulierement quand il s’agit d’une chose qui n’est pas de la derniere importance: car les Livres sacrez & prophanes nous apprennent qu’il est quelquefois permis, & mesme necessaire de passer par-dessus les Regles ordinaires, parce que les Regles sont faites pour l’homme, & non pas l’homme pour les Regles. Suivant ce principe j’avoué, & tous les Maistres generalement en demeurent d’accord, que pour jouer d’un Instrument qui fait Harmonie il est necessaire d’observer les Tenuës, & que ceux qui ne les observent pas ne sçavent pas parfaitement leur profession ou la negligent; mais de dire que cette regularité doive destre si exacte & si severe qu’on ne puisse jamais passer pas-dessus en faveur du beau Chant, ou de quelque beau Trait, c’est ce qui ne se peut soutenis, & que est contre l’usage de tous les Arts, où il est quelquefois permis de prendre des licences, pourveu que ce ne soit oas sans necessité, & sans la payer pau quelque chose de beau, qui fasse connoistre que la chose est faite avec dessein; trans. R. A. Green.
assumes that De Machy means for the rules governing *tenuës* to be absolute. This is unjustified, considering De Machy’s brief comment concerning *tenuës*. Again, Rousseau misinterprets the intentions of De Machy in the effort to prove his point, and to portray De Machy in negative light. This further underscores Rousseau’s unreliability as a factual source.

Although De Machy insists that *tenuës* should always be used, Rousseau exaggerates the matter and claims that De Machy suggested, “all places must be eliminated where the requirement to observe them [*tenuës*] exists without being able to do so”.

369 Perhaps Rousseau is confused by this statement:

I return to the chords. One can leave them out, but let it be done with prudence. They are extremely pleasant in some situations, when one knows to play them well: And one must avoid [playing the chords/removing the chords in] all the places which require *tenuës* & ornaments, if they cannot be played there.

This statement by De Machy is ambiguous as it is unclear what must be avoided in situations that require *tenuës* & ornaments. As the technique of the *tenuë* applies quite frequently to chords, it appears more likely that he may be referring to the removing of chords that should be avoided. However, it is equally valid to avoid playing “extra” chords in musical passages that already have *tenuës* & ornaments prescribed to them. Whatever the case may be, it is clear that this statement is made in reference to idiomatic treatment of chords on the viol, especially when composing new pieces.

It appears Rousseau is misunderstanding De Machy’s words. Rousseau believes that De Machy means to avoid playing musical passages with *tenuës* & ornaments if

369 Rousseau, *Traité*, 61: que l’on doit éviter tous les endroits qui demandent qu’on les observe, lorsqu’on ne peut le faire; trans. R. A. Green.

370 Sieur de Machy, 8: Je reviens aux accords. On peut les détacher, mais que ce soit avec prudence. Ils sont fort agréables en plusieurs rencontres, quand on les sçait bien prendre: Et l’on doit éviter tous les endroits qui demandent des tenuës & des agrémens, s’ils n’y peuvent estre.
they cannot be executed there. This is clearly not the case as De Machy’s statement is referring to the treatment of chords in favour of making *tenuës* & ornaments.

This statement reveals De Machy as a man who was flexible concerning the use of chords, while placing a greater importance in the use of *tenuës* & ornamentation. This also suggests that De Machy was keen in proper left hand technique while preserving a resonant tone while executing ornaments.

Once more, Rousseau dissociates the viol from plucked instruments, despite the many similarities the viol has with plucked instruments:

I will add to this that, inappropriately, the author of the *Avertissement* wishes to give us the lute, theorbo, and guitar as a model for having us practice the *tenuës* preferable to all that can be done of more importance.  

Rousseau assumes that *tenuës* would interfere with *agréments*. This issue has more to do with the ability of the composer, rather than the viol’s abilities, because, in principle, there is no reason why music for the viol cannot be written in a singing style with both adequate *tenuës* and *agréments*. This point, the ability of the composer to write idiomatically for the viol, has already been addressed by De Machy. This comment by Rousseau highlights the fact that Rousseau was unaware of this issue and misunderstood De Machy’s intentions when De Machy discussed it in his *avertissement*.

Rousseau culminates his discussion on *tenuës*, reiterating the long-held view of the viol’s goal in imitating the human voice:

---

371 Rousseau, Traité, 64: *J’ajoûte encore à cecy, que mal à propos l’Autheur de l’Avertissement nous veut donner le Lute, le Thuorbe, & la Guitarre pour modelle, afin de nous obliger à la particule des Tenuës, preferablement à tout ce que l’on peut faire de plus considerable, puis que la Viole ne connoist que la Voix au dessus d’elle, & que son but doit estre d’imiter son unique modelle dans la beauté du Chant, & de ses agrémens, qui sont preferable à toutes les Tenuës qui voudroient s’y opposer;* trans. R. A. Green.

372 See chapter 5 on “Melody or Harmony?”
Since the viol knows only the voice above it, its aim must be to imitate its only model in the beauty of song and its agréments in preference to all the tenuèses which might interfere. 373

While this seems noble and well informed on the part of Rousseau, this is an opinion that he also shares with De Machy:

[T]he voice is the model for all instruments, & this instrument is one of the best [at imitating it]. 374

It is peculiar why Rousseau chooses to conclude this chapter with this comment. While it may appear to be made in opposition to De Machy’s views, it is in fact in agreement with them.

Rousseau, in attempting to uphold the validity of his ideas, shows little actual justification for most of his argument. Mostly, there is a sense of Rousseau misquoting De Machy while misunderstanding his intentions. This also begs the question if this was an intentional act to misrepresent and defame De Machy or simply an honest mistake in misreading his avertissement. While it appears clear that this argument for De Machy is mainly a substantive argument about viol playing, there are so many incongruities in their argument that one has the impression that Rousseau appears to be intentionally misrepresenting De Machy in an effort to discredit him, thereby winning over customers.

Rousseau’s two main points in undermining De Machy’s credibility are: 1) Rousseau’s method of playing seems more aesthetically appealing than De Machy’s, and 2) all the masters abide by Rousseau’s rules. In the absence of other evidence, it is certain that these reasons alone are not sufficient to support Rousseau’s credibility.

373 Ibid., 64: puis que la Viole ne connoist que la Voix au dessus d’elle, & que son but doit estre d’imiter son unique modelle dans la beauté du Chant, & de ses agréments, qui sont preferable à toutes les Tenuèses qui voudroient s’y opposer; trans. R. A. Green.
374 Sieur de Machy, 11: la voix est le modele de tous les instrumens, & que celuy-cy l’imiter des mieux.
De Machy’s Reply

Sometime between the publication of Rousseau’s *Traité* and *Réponse*, it appears that De Machy distributed a public document in reply to the *Traité*. This document, which shall be referred to for the purposes of this thesis as “De Machy’s reply”, is unfortunately lost. We cannot be absolutely certain in what manner De Machy chose to reply; however, we can recreate the document based on Rousseau’s *Réponse*. There are, however, issues of reliability to take into consideration when using the *Réponse* as an authoritative source. This will be discussed in greater details in the next section.

Assuming what Rousseau said in the *Réponse* concerning De Machy is true, we can attempt to recreate De Machy’s reply. Here are the comments that De Machy may have made:

- **De Machy questions Rousseau’s credentials:**

  The pamphlet's author, after having said that he was forced to waste his time responding to my treatise of the viol, calls me a usurper of the quality of the viol Master as if I had not received it from the Masters.  

- **De Machy comments on the *port de main***:

  He then talks about the *port de main*, and it is a dispute only about the name rather than the thing.

- **De Machy discusses the interview he had with Sainte Colombe:**

---

375 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 2: L’Author du Libelle, apres avoir dit qu’il s’est vu force de perdre son temps a repondre a mon Traite de Viole, me traite d’usurpateur de la qualite de Maistre de Viole comme ne l’ayant pas receu des Maistres; the following translations of the *Réponse* are by M. van der Beken (footnotes 380-416).

376 Ibid.: Il parle ensuite du Port de main, et c’est une dispute qui n’est que du Nom & non pas de la chose.
The author of the pamphlet tries here to surprise the public by the account he makes of an interview he says he had with Monsieur de Sainte Colombe on the manner of laying the hand.  

- De Machy talks of an incident with his son:

  In regard to his son, of whom he then speaks, it is true that one day Monsieur de Sainte Colombe told me that the pamphlet's author had brought him his son and that he had played the viol in front of him.  

- De Machy questions Rousseau’s provenance, possibly attempting to belittle him:

  He is asking if it is in my village that I learned what I am putting forward.  

- De Machy questions Rousseau’s lack of experience and short length of study with Sainte Colombe:

  He says I learned only for a month under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe.  

- De Machy mentions having given Rousseau some lessons:

  The pamphlet's author is boasting of having given me a few lessons.  

- De Machy criticises Sainte Colombe’s skill:

---

377 Ibid., 2-3: L’Auteur de Libelle tache icy de surprendre le Public par le recit qu’il fait d’un conference qu’il dit avoir eue avec Monsieur de Sainte Colombe sur la maniere de porter de main.
378 Ibid., 3: Au regard de son fils dont il parle ensuite, il est vray qu’on jour Monsieur de Sainte Colombe me dit que l’Auteur du Libelle lui avoit mené son fils & qu’il avoit joue de la Viole devant lui.
379 Ibid.: Il demande si c’est dans mon Vilage que j’ay appris ce que j’avance.
380 Ibid.: Il dit que je n’ay appris qu’un mois de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe.
381 Ibid.: L’Auteur du Libelle se vante de m’ay avoir donne quelques leçons.
He told me I had chosen a Master who did not know how to play the viol, that he did not hold his hand properly, that the seventh string he was using on the viol was a folly….382

• De Machy discusses the rules pertaining to viol playing:

He wants for viol playing to follow the rules pertaining to plucked instruments.383

• De Machy takes issue with Rousseau’s left hand technique:

The pamphlet's author reproaches me for not holding my hand properly.384

• De Machy criticises Rousseau’s *Traité*:

The pamphlet's author then makes an outline of the parts of my viol treatise and he rejects almost all of them.385

• De Machy discusses the playing of melody:

He then considers the playing of the melody and in order to answer what he is saying about it, I shall be pleased with him if he composes a piece of simple melody that should be tender, and that he executes it in a manner that is pleasant.386

• De Machy discusses the playing of harmony and comments on Sainte Colombe:

Regarding the pieces of harmony, where it is not always followed, he can continue to blame Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, as he started to

---

382 Ibid., 4: *il me dit que j’avoir choisi un Maistre qui ne sçavoit pas ce que c’estoit que de joüer de la Viole, qu’il ne portoit pas bien la main, que a septième Chord dont il se servoit à la Viole estoit une folie.*

383 Ibid.: *Il veut que l’on se règle pour jouer de la viole sur les Instruments a pinser.*

384 Ibid., 5: *L’Auteur du Libelle me reproche que je ne portie pas bien la main.*

385 Ibid.: *L’Auteur de Libelle fait en suite le dénombrement des parties de mon Traité de la Viole & il les rejette presque toutes.*

386 Ibid., 6: *Il passe en suite au jeu de Mélodie & pour répondre a ce qu’il en dit, je seray content de luy sur ce sujet s’il compose une Pièce de simple Melodie qui soit tendre, & qu’il l’execute d’une maniere qui plaise.*
do it at the time I was learning, all he also has to do is put on the same rank the late Monsieur Meliton of whom one can show pieces in the same way and in general of all the skilled Masters.\footnote{Ibid.: Au regard des Pièces d’Harmonie, ou elle n’est pas toujours suivie, il n’a qu’a continuer a faire le procès à Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, comme il le commença dans le temps que j’aprenois, il n’a aussi qu’a mettre dans le même rang feu Monsieur Meliton dont on peut faire voir des Pièces de la même manière & généralement de tous les habiles Maistres.}

- De Machy requests to see Rousseau’s compositions:

The pamphlet’s author wishes to see some of my pieces.\footnote{Ibid.: L’Auteur du Libelle souhaite voir de mes Pièces.}

- De Machy comments on performing tastefully:

He says that in order to please, it is necessary to please people who have genius and good taste.\footnote{Ibid.: Il dit que pour plaire, il faut plaire aux personnes qui ont du genie & du bon goust.}

- De Machy comments on the tenuë:

We have presently arrived at the tenuës, which he calls the famous question.\footnote{Ibid.: Nous voicy presentement aux Tenuës qu’il appelle la fameuse question.}

- De Machy discusses composition in relation to harmony:

But what one must admire still more, is the emphasis with which he talks about false relations and composition liberties.\footnote{Ibid., 7: Mais ce qu’il faut admirer davantage, c’est l’enphaze avec laquelle il parle des fausses relations & des licences de la Composition.}

- De Machy declares that Rousseau asked him what tenuës were:

He says that I asked him what tenuës were.\footnote{Ibid., 7: Il dit que je luy ay demandé ce que c’estoit que les Tenuës.}

- De Machy reveals Rousseau inability to play pieces of harmony:
He says I confessed to him that I did not know how to play pieces of harmony, but the duel challenge I sent him a year ago shows the contrary.  

- De Machy questions Rousseau’s skill, reputation and length of experience:

He says that I came out all of a sudden in one night like a mushroom, that two days ago I made up my mind to compose vocal and instrumental music.

- De Machy accuses Rousseau of stealing from the works of others:

He says that I am the monkey of music but he does not make me a great insult because I admit I am trying to imitate skilled people in their works, but not to steal from them as he says I do.

- De Machy criticises Rousseau’s ideas on ornamentation:

I could not be more impressed than by the liberty he takes to blame the rules I gave for *port de voix* and the *cadence* in my music method.

- De Machy discusses the use of tablature:

Here we are now, at the tablature where he reproaches me for absurdities.

- De Machy ridicules Rousseau’s method of the representing the viol’s neck:

He enters here in mockery against the four kinds of necks, which I have advised.

---

393 Ibid.: Il dit que je luy ay avoüé que je ne scavoir pas joüer des Pièces d’Harmonie, mais le Cartel de deffy que je luy envoyé il y a un an fait voir le contraire.
394 Ibid.: Il dit que je suis venu tout en une nuit comme les Champignons, que je me suis mis en teste depuis deux jours de composer de la Musique Vocale & Instrumentale.
395 Ibid., 8: Il dit que je suis le singe de la Musique mais il ne me fait pas une grande injure car j’avoüe que je tâche d’imiter les habiles gens dans leurs Ouvrages, mais non pas de les piller comme il dit.
396 Ibid.: Je ne puis assez admirer icy la liberté qu’il prend de blaser les Regles que jay donné du Port de Voix & de la Cadence dans ma Methode pour la Musique.
397 Ibid.: Nous voicy présentement à la Tablature où il me reproche des absurditez.
• De Machy criticises Rousseau’s rules on the practice of ornamentation:

He then talks about the rules I gave for the practice of ornamentation but what he says is so poor that I should not answer it. 399

• De Machy notes that Rousseau has not given attention to the plucking of the viol:

He says that I have not talked of plucking the viol. 400

• De Machy criticises the practice of playing of accompaniment:

He makes all these efforts to destroy the playing of accompaniment. 401

• De Machy expresses dismay concerning transposition:

The pamphlet's author makes it clear that what I said about Transposition frightened him, when I said one should be able to play high pieces as low ones, and low ones as higher ones. 402

• De Machy claims that Sainte Colombe did not find favour in Rousseau’s Traité and his musical duel challenge:

I only stop at what he says that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe has not read my book, and that consequently he did not approve of it, and on the duel challenge about which I have already talked. 403

398 Ibid., 9: Il entre icy en raillerie contre les quatre sortes de Manches que j’ay donné.
399 Ibid.: Il parle ensuite des Regles que j’ay donné pour la pratique des Agréemens mais ce qu’il dit est si pauvre que je ne dois pas y répondre.
400 Ibid.: Il dit que je n’ay point parlé de pincer la Viole.
401 Ibid.: Il fait tous ces efforts pour détruire le jeu de l’Accompagnement.
402 Ibid., 10: L’Auteur du Libelle fait bien voir que ce que j’ay dit de la Transposition luy a fair peur, lors que j’ay dit qu’il faut scavezoir joier les Parties Supérieures en Basses, & les Basses en Supérieures.
403 Ibid.: je n’arreste seulement sur ce qu’il dit que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe n’a pas lu mon Livre & par consequent qu’il ne l’a pas approuvé, & sur le cartel de defy dont j’ay deja parlé.
• De Machy says Sainte Colombe disapproved with Rousseau’s reaction towards De Machy in the form the “duel challenge”:

He says that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe disapproved of me in that. He does not say the truth, Monsieur de Sainte Colombe found what I did was appropriate, to make the noisy tongue of the pamphlet's author keep quiet.\(^{404}\)

• De Machy makes a reference to De Visé\(^{405}\) and gives Rousseau a riddle:

He quotes Monsieur de Visé and at the same time gives a riddle.\(^{406}\)

• De Machy insults Rousseau through malicious name-calling:

The pamphlet's author can be assured that all the insults he throws at me, that of usurper, false-devout, envious, malign, ambitious, ignorant, man of ill will, malicious, arrogant, Doctor Fariole, blinded, uneducated, ridicule, a man that could scare the devils, foolhardy, devoid of good sense, extravagant, and generally all the invectives with which he charges me, do not trouble my rest.\(^{407}\)

It must be emphasised that we can never be certain if any of this information truly appeared in “De Machy’s reply”. Even if De Machy did bring up any of these issues, it is impossible to know to how genuinely they have been transmitted. Any biases that Rousseau may have had would have undoubtedly been voiced in the Réponse. Because of this, we can only speculate to the reliability of the information contained in it.

\(^{404}\) Ibid., 11: *Il dit que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe m’a desaprouvé en cela. Il ne dit pas vray. Monsieur de Sainte colombe a trouvé a propos ce que j’ay fait, pour faire taire l’Auteur du Libelle qui faisoit trop de bruit de la langue.*

\(^{405}\) This refers to the lutenist, violist, theorist and guitarist: Robert de Visée. For the sake of continuity, the spelling used in the Réponse is retained when he is discussed in this context.

\(^{406}\) Ibid.: *Il cite Monsieur de Visè & donne en mesme temps une histoire a deviner.*

\(^{407}\) Ibid., 12: *l’Auteur du Libelle peut s’assurer que toutes les injures qu’il me dit, d’Usurpateur, Faus-devot, Envieux, Malin, Ambitieux, Ignorant, Homme de mauvaise foy, Malicieux, Orgueilleux, Docteur Fariole, Aveuglé, mal instruit, Ridicule, Homme a faire peur aux Diables, Temeraire, Dépourveu de bon sens, Extravagant, & généralement toutes les invectives dont il me charge, ne troublent point mon repos.*
Rousseau’s Réponse

In this section, Rousseau’s comments in his Réponse will be analysed. In addition to better understanding this document, we will attempt to determine the reliability of Rousseau Réponse as a credible source of information.

Rousseau’s Réponse appears to be based on accounts made from a secondary source. From the style of writing, Rousseau appears not to have read “De Machy’s reply”. Rousseau’s Réponse reads:

Monsieur Rousseau's reply to the letter of one of his friends who had warned him of a defamatory pamphlet that had been written against him.408

We are not told who Rousseau’s “friend” was, but it appears that he had the intention of making known what was said by De Machy to Rousseau to the entire viol-playing community. Rousseau reveals that it is from this friend that he derived this information:

I am very indebted to you for the obliging letter you wrote to me, I don't know how I could show enough gratitude for all your kindness, particularly that of having applied yourself to retain the content of the defamatory pamphlet the author of the preface has written against me, which has been read to you. You must have such a good memory as to have remembered all that you are telling me, and you also must have great patience to have taken the trouble to write it down with such accuracy.409

Rousseau assumes that this information is accurate. However, as demonstrated in his Traité, he often does not clarify the reliability of his sources. Furthermore, the

408 Ibid., 1: RÉPONSE DE MONSIEUR ROUSSEAU A LA LETTRE d’un de ses Amis qui l’avertit d’un Libelle diffamatoire que l’on a écrit contre luy.
409 Ibid.: Je vous suis tres-redevable de la Lettre Obligeante que vous m’avez écrite, je ne sçay par quel moyen je pouray reconnoistre toutes vos bontez, mais particulierement celle que vous avez eu de vous appliquer à retenir le contenu du libelle diffamatoire que l’Auteur de l’Avertissement a écrit contre moy, & dont on vous a fait la lecture. Il faut avoir la mémoire aussi heureuse que vous l’avez pour avoir retenu tout ce que vous me mandez, & il faut avoir aussi une grande patience pour vous estre donné la peine de l’écrire avec tant d’exactitude.
information from “De Machy’s reply” appears to have been transmitted orally to Rousseau’s friend, seriously reducing the reliability of the information.

In reality, we cannot be even completely sure if Rousseau’s “friend” really did exist. It is possible to speculate that Rousseau may have read “De Machy’s reply”, but chose to reply through a fictionalised friend in an effort to distance himself from De Machy, giving himself the excuse of the neutrality of a third party.

Rousseau gives us even further reasons to doubt the reliability of all the information:

Firstly it is not his style and the work is made up of added pieces, because I can tell that different people have been working on it, each one bringing his own bits and pieces to it and that is what makes me believe that it is a conspiracy from people who had no other purpose but to bring discord between he and I.\textsuperscript{410}

From this account, there is a reason to believe that the rift between both men could have resulted in a reaction by the public towards the different points of view brought about by De Machy’s and Rousseau’s publications. This may be seen as an indication of the importance viol playing had during the time. This also raises the possibility that “De Machy’s reply” may not been the work of De Machy himself, but that of his supporters, keen on bringing down Rousseau.

It also seems unbelievable to Rousseau that De Machy would reply in such a fashion over a disagreement on technique:

Secondly, how could it possibly be the work which he boasted of having produced against my treatise of the viol, and that for more than a year that he has been working on it he would have produced only insults, abuse and calumnies as arguments, he who reproached me my lack of charity when I so much as called one port de main only something he used to call two ports de main; for is it out of

\textsuperscript{410} Ibid.: \textit{Premierement ce n’est point son stile, & l’Ouvrage est de Pièces raportées, car je reconnais que differentes presonnes y ont travaillé & que chacune y a mis sa Pièce & son morceau, & c’est ce qui me fait croire que c’est une Cabale de gens qui n’ont point eu d’autre dessein que de mettre le feu entre lay & moy.}
This suggests that “De Machy’s reply” may have been worded in an abusive manner. As seen previously, Rousseau claims alleged name-calling. Rousseau does, however, maintain much of De Machy’s reaction was unprovoked.

Rousseau is unconvinced of the information because it refers to De Machy wanting to dedicate his reply to Sainte Colombe:

The third reason that makes me believe again that this pamphlet does not come from him, is a conclusion I draw from what you say that his first aim was to have it printed and to dedicate it to Monsieur de Sainte Colombe (nice dedication) but that having changed his mind for reasons you do not know, he took the decision to have a few copies made and to sneakily disseminate them everywhere in Paris in order to destroy me without my knowing. That is not credible, he is not capable of such cowardice, and he has too much heart and honour for that….

It is hard to understand why De Machy would dedicate his reply to Sainte Colombe, as Sainte Colombe represents the school of thought that is contrary to that of De Machy’s, which is upheld by Rousseau. After all, Sainte Colombe was Rousseau’s teacher, and the *Traité* was dedicated to him. According to Rousseau:

I can bring forth several witnesses who know what contempt he [De Machy] had for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe’s playing style, depreciating him everywhere.

---

411 Ibid.: *En secôd lieu commét seroit-il possible que ce fût la l’Ouvrage qu’il s’est vanté de donner cótre mon Traité de Viole, & que, depuis plus d’un an qu’il y travaille, il n’eut donné pour raisons que des injures, des inventives & des impostures, luy qui m’a reproché d’avoir blesse la Charité parce que j’ay donné le nom d’un seul port de main à une chose à laquelle il avoit donné le nom de deu Ports de main ; Car seroit ce par charité qu’il me traiteroit si mal & qu’il me chargeroit de calomnies.*

412 Ibid.: *La troisième raison qui me fait encore croire que ce Libelle ne vient pas de luy, est une consequence que je tire de ce que vous dites que son premier dessein avait esté de la faire imprimer & de le dedier à Monsieur de Sainte Colombe (belle dedicace) mais qu’ayant changé ce dessein pour des raisons que vous ne connaissez pas, il a pris la resolution d’en faire faire quelque coppies & de les glisser sourdement dans tout Paris pour me détruire sans que j’en aye connoissance. Cela n’est pas croyable, il n’est pas capable d’une si grande lacheté, & il à trop de cœur & d’honneur pour cela.*

413 Ibid., 4: *Je puis produire plusieurs témoins qui ont connoissance du mepris qu’il faisait du jeu de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, le décrivant par tout.*
If De Machy did initially decide to dedicate his reply to Sainte Colombe, it would have revealed a relationship between the two men, giving us a different view of Sainte Colombe altogether. It may also suggest that De Machy was indebted to Sainte Colombe in some way. As mentioned earlier, De Machy did in fact have an interview with Sainte Colombe and according to De Machy, they were in agreement concerning the *ports de main*.

These reasons point to another striking indication that we are faced with extremely contradictory information in the *Réponse*, seriously undermining the authority of this document. It is also Rousseau’s opinion that De Machy is not capable of the deeds in which he has been accused of.

Nevertheless, these words can also be interpreted as an attempt by Rousseau to insult De Machy. If De Machy was indeed responsible for the actions suggested, then this could be seen as an attempt to defame him. However, as seen in the style of writing, its ambivalence makes it difficult to ascertain the actual intent of Rousseau. Rousseau goes as far as to offer a disclaimer. Instead of referring to De Machy as the “author of the *avertissement*”, Rousseau refers to him as the “author of the pamphlet”.

In spite of this, as will be shown later parts of this thesis, Rousseau, in reality, assumes that the author of the *avertissement*, De Machy, is the author of the pamphlet. In the

---

414 *L’Auteur de l’Avertissement.*
415 *L’Auteur du Libelle.*
416 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 1-2: *voicy donc me pensé en abregé; & je suppose pour cela que ce Libelle a esté fait, par l’Author de l’Avertissement, ce que je ne croy pas, c’est pourquoi je diray toûjours l’Auteur de Libelle;* trans. M. van der Beken.
process, one in faced with information that is both conflicting and derogatory towards De Machy.

**In Rousseau’s Defense**

Rousseau defends his reputation as a teacher, explaining that one does not need qualifications to be proven a quality teacher of the viol, as this was never done with other professions of the time. In his reasoning, financial success is the measure of a craftsman’s worth:

> And regarding the quality of a Master, I never thought a viol master had to be admitted by other Masters as one admits the Master cobblers, and that if it happened that they put a Master's degree on it, the one that is making so much noise might well be refused; a sensible person answered him once cautiously on the subject, what qualification do you want him to take since his playing is appreciated by everybody and is earning him good Louis d’or, do you want him to proclaim himself Master blacksmith?418

It would be unsurprising if De Machy disapproved of Rousseau’s Dissertation. As discussed earlier, most of it is based on very unsound evidence:

> He [De Machy] reproaches me for having talked of the origin of the viol and to have quoted passages from authors in Latin, as I found them, arguing that of all the famous that were for each instrument, not one has taken the trouble to find out from where his [instrument] was coming from, this is an extremely strong conclusion, we will have to consult the university in order to reply to it.419

---

417 *Louis d’or* refers to the currency of gold coins that were first introduced in 1640 by Louis XIII.

418 Rousseau, Réponse, 2: *Et au regard de la qualité de Maistre, je n’ay jamais cru qu’un Maistre de Viole deu estre receu par les autres Maistres comme on reçoit les Maistres Savetiers, & que s’il arrivoit que l’on y mit une Maistrise, celuy qui fait tant de bruit seroit estre bien empesché; une personne de bon sens luy répondit un jour fort prudemment sur ce sujet, quelle qualité voulez vous donc qu’il prenne puis que son jeu plaist à tout le monde & qu’il engagne de bons Louis d’or, voulez vous qu’il se dise Maistre Corroyeur?*; trans. M. van der Beken.

419 Ibid.: *Il me reproche d’avoir parlé de l’Origine de la Viole & d’avoir cité les passages des Autheurs en latin comme je les ay trouvé, remontrant que de tous les Illustres qui ont esté pour chaque Instrument, pas un ne s’est mis en peine de sçavoir d’où provenoit le sien, voila une conséquence extremement forte, il faudra consulter l’Université pour y répondre;* trans. M. van der Beken.
Most of the Latin quotes used by Rousseau in his *Traité* were derived from the Bible, Kircher, Mersenne and classical philosophers and writers. As previously discussed, they do not have any direct implications to the development of the viol, as claimed by Rousseau, but refer instead to far more ancient musical instruments. De Machy’s disapproval with Rousseau’s *Dissertation* may indicate that such fanciful writing may not have been acceptable during the time. It also seems that De Machy is attacking Rousseau’s attempt to appear learned.

**Rousseau and the *Ports de main***

Rousseau refers again to the *port de main*, which in his view is justified through its use by his teacher, Sainte Colombe, and those who studied with him:

He then talks about the *port de main*, and it is a dispute only about the name rather than the thing; for if we examine what I said in my treatise, we will know that we agree on the same thing and that the only difference is that the author of the pamphlet names two *ports de main* in his *avertissement* something I name one *port de main* only, according to the precept of all the Masters, for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe never distinguished two *ports de main*, Monsieur Marais who learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe recognises one port de main only, the late Monsieur Meliton who had also learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe and who perfectly knew the characteristics of the viol, never said nor taught that there was such a thing as two *ports de main*, finally I call here on Monsieur des Fontaines and all those who learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, if they ever heard him mention two *ports de main*, this is why I was right to say that the author of the *avertissement* calls ignoramuses all the Masters in general who are unaware that there are two *ports de main*, when he says that it is essential that one should not be unaware of it, and when all the Masters except him never said anything about it or even heard about it; was I not right to rank myself along those ignoramuses, since I only mention one *port de main*, just like them?  

---

420 Ibid.: *Il parle ensuite du Port de main, & c’est une dispute qui n’est que du Nom & non pas de la chose*: Car si l’on examine ce que je dis dans mon *Traité*, on connoistra que nous convenons de la mesme chose & que la seule difference est que l’Auther du *Libelle* donne le nom de deux *Ports de main* dans son *Avertissement* à une chose que je nomme un *feu*! Port de main, suivant la maxime de tous les *Maitres*, Car Monsieur de Sainte Colombe n’a jamais distingué deux *Ports de main* Monsieur Marais qui a apris Monsieur de Sainte Colombe ne reconoist qu’un *Port de main*, feu Monsieur Meliton qui avoit encore apris de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe & qui conoissoit parfaitement le caractere de la *Viole*, n’a jamais dit ny enseigné qu’il y eut deux *Ports de mains*, enfin j’appelle icy Monsieur des *Fontaines* & tous ceux qui ont apris de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, si jamais ils luy ont oüi nommer deux *Ports de main*,
One can surmise that, according to Rousseau, Sainte Colombe is the true authority on viol technique. The acceptance of his technique amongst his students is seen as support for Sainte Colombe’s ideas on the port de main. This is in fact the basis of Rousseau’s entire rationale, not musical reasons.

The author of the pamphlet tries here to surprise the public by the account he makes of an interview he says he had with Monsieur de Sainte Colombe on the manner of laying the hand, saying that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe agreed that you had to put the thumb under the middle finger, and sometimes under the first finger, I will grant him that, but I refute that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe ever considered that one should call it two ports de main, on the contrary Monsieur de Sainte Colombe said that if he had asked his opinion on that subject before having his avertissement printed, he would have advised him not to suggest that there was two ports de main in the viol playing.421

Even though there is no explanation of why one should not name the two ports de main, Rousseau acknowledges the requirement to occasionally use it. De Machy is said to have convinced Sainte Colombe on his ideas of the two ports de main. This is a fact that is not refuted by Rousseau. However, according to Rousseau, Sainte Colombe felt that they did not require a different name. This assertion is a strange one, as it begs the question why Sainte Colombe would have agreed to the two ports de main in the first place. With Rousseau’s limited period of formal study with Sainte Colombe, the accuracy of his assertion is questionable.

c’est pourquoi j’ay eu raison de dire que l’Author de l’Avertissement traite d’ignorans tous les Maistres généralement qui ignorent qu’il y a deux Ports de main, quand il dit qu’on est indispensablement obligé de ne le pas ignorer, & que cependant tous les Maistres hors luy n’en ont jamais parle ny ouï parler; n’ay je pas eu aussi raison de me mettre aux nombres de ces ignorans, puisque je ne nomme qu’un Port de main aussi bien qu’eux; trans. M. van der Beken.

421 Ibid., 2-3: L’Autheur de Libelle tâche icy de surprendre le Public par le recit qu’il fait d’un conference qu’il dit avoir eué avec Monsieur de Sainte Colombe sur la maniere de porter de main, disant que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe a aprouvé qu’il falloit mettre le pouce sous le doit du milieu, & quelquesfois sous le premier doigt, je luy accorde cela, mais je nie que jamais Monsieur de Sainte Colombe soit tombé d’accord qu’il fallot nommer cela deux Ports de main, au contraire Monsieur de Sainte Colombe a dit que s’il luy auyoit demandé son avis sur ce sujet avant que de faire imprimer son Avertissement, il luy auroit conseillé de ne pas avancer qu’il y eut deux Ports de main dans le jeu de la Viole; trans. M. van der Beken.
Rousseau, like De Machy, is also responsible for creating a name for an existing viol technique. As discussed earlier, the technique of *tenuës de bien-séance* and *tenuës* are the same physical action; however, it is in their intended purpose which differs. Compared to De Machy, advocating two *ports de main*, it seems more illogical to give *tenuës* a different name when its physical action is the same; the purpose of doing a *tenuë* is the same regardless of context.

**Sainte Colombe and De Machy’s Son**

In this instance, Rousseau attempts to make a connection with De Machy by referring to an event with De Machy’s son:

> In regard to his son, of whom he then speaks, it is true that one day Monsieur de Sainte Colombe told me that the pamphlet's author had brought him his son and that he had played the viol in front of him, that he found him a good looking boy and that he had some talent, and that it was a pity he was not in his hands and that he believed he would do something good of him.⁴²³

It seems that now Rousseau is admitting that the “author of the *avertissement*” and the “author of the pamphlet” are both the same person, namely De Machy. The consequence of this is that the information that was derived from Rousseau’s secondary source, his “friend”, is now being directly ascribed to De Machy, making this now a personal attack.

---

⁴²² See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.
⁴²³ Ibid., 3: *Au regard de son fils dont il parle ensuite, il est vray qu’un jour Monsieur de Sainte Colombe me dit que l’Auteur du Libelle luy avoit mené son fils & qu’il auroit jouë de la Viole devant luy, qu’il le trouvoit joly garçon, qu’il avoit assez de disposition, & que c’estoit dommage qu’il n’estoit pas entre ses mains & qu’il croyoit qu’il en seroit quelque chose de bon*; trans. M. van der Beken.
**Rousseau’s Quality as a Violist**

De Machy comments on Rousseau’s lack of formal lessons on the viol, as Rousseau explains:

He says I learned only for a month under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, but Monsieur de Sainte Colombe himself answered on this, that this reproach was to my advantage, since I learned more during that month than what others take years to learn. As a matter of fact this time was enough for me because when I learned under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe I had been playing the viol for three years and I was teaching it, I only put myself under his discipline in order to learn how to hold my hand better than I did. ⁴²⁴

Rousseau affirms that one month of study was sufficient since he had learnt so much in that one month; though his main priority during this study was to improve the way he held his left hand. Rousseau insists that his prior three years of playing and teaching the viol had brought him significant skill as a violist.

De Machy reveals the town that Rousseau had come from, perhaps with the intent of proving that he had not sufficient proper formal education on the viol prior to Sainte Colombe:

He is asking if it is in my village that I learned what I am putting forward; but he needs to learn that the capital of the Bourbonnais, from where I come, is well worth that of the Pontieu. That the town of Moulins is worth that of Abbeville, and that a territory managed by a General Treasurer is worth a territory without Provincial Assembly and I also want to bring to his knowledge that the place of birth does not guarantee people’s merit… ⁴²⁵

---

⁴²⁴ Ibid.: *Il dit que je n’ay appris qu’un mois de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, mais Monsieur de Sainte Colombe a répondu luy mesme a cela, que ce reproche estoit à mon avantage, attendu que j’en ay plus appris pendant ce mois que d’autres ne sont en des années. En effet ce temps la me suffit parce que quand j’ay appris de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe il y avoit trois ans que je joüois de la Viole & que j’enseignois, je ne me mis sous sa discipline que pour apprendre à porter la main mieux que je ne faisois;* trans. M. van der Beken.

⁴²⁵ Ibid.: *Il demande si c’est dans mon Vilage que j’ay appris ce que j’avance ; mais il faut lui apprendre que la Capitale du Bourbonnois, d’où je suis, vaut bien celle du Pontieu. Que la Ville de Moulins vaut bien celle d’Abbeville, & qu’une Generalité vaut bien une Election, & je lui veux encore apprendre que le lieu de la naissance ne fait pas le merite des gens;* trans. M. van der Beken.
Rousseau maintains that provenance does not determine one’s ability. However, in an effort ridicule De Machy, Rousseau attempts to imply that De Machy is dishonest in making his reply, distributing it throughout Paris without his knowing. This is an unjust accusation, since Rousseau’s *Traité*, which makes direct references to De Machy, was similarly circulated.

At some point of time, it appears Rousseau consulted De Machy for some lessons on the viol. This eventually led to some unpleasantness when Rousseau decided to leave De Machy and study with Sainte Colombe:

The pamphlet's author is boasting of having given me a few lessons, if I now believed he could do that, I would go and pray him to give me these lessons; but for the salvation of his honour he should not brag about it. You will know that at the time I was learning under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, I was staying with the good man Colichon, the Luther, who lived at that time at the end of the *rue de la Harpe* where the pamphlet's author quite often called, and when he saw that I was learning how to play the viol from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, he told me I had chosen a Master who did not know how to play the viol, that he did not hold his hand properly, that the seventh string he was using on the viol was a folly, for you will notice as a parenthesis, that the pamphlet's author at that time was very poorly positioning his hand, as we shall see hereafter, and was using only six strings, he did more because having looked at the pieces Monsieur de Sainte Colombe was giving me, and that I could show written in his own hand, he said this was a man who did not know how to write *pièces* that there was only melody and no harmony, and that all the pieces he saw from him were not authentic *pièces de viole* that if I wanted he would show me. Finally, to make it short, he made himself such a nuisance about it that I went to his place to see his technique, but when I tasted of it once I did not have enough bad taste to leave Monsieur de Sainte Colombe. Judge for yourself if the pamphlet's author should boast of having given me a few lessons, and if he should press me to recall it; because I can bring forth several witnesses who know what contempt he had for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe's playing style, depreciating him everywhere, and preferring against him the playing style of the late old du Buisson who was carrying his hand very poorly.426

426 Ibid., 3-4: *L’Auteur du Libelle se vante de m’avoir donné quelques leçons, si je le croyois à présent capable de cela, j’irais le prier de me les donner; Mais, pour le salut de son honneur il ne devoit pas s’en vanter. Vous saurez que dans le temps que j’apprenois de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, je logeais chez le bon homme Colichon Luther qui demeuroit en ce temps-l’a au bas de la rue de la Harpe où l’Auteur du Libelle venoit tres-souvent, & comme il sçeut que j’apprenois à jouer de la Viole de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, il me dit que j’avois choisi un Maistre qui ne sçavoit pas ce que c’estoit que de jouer de la Viole, qu’il ne portoit pas bien la main, que a septième Chorde dont il se servoit à la Viole estoit une folie, car vous remarqueriez par Paranthèze, que l’Auteur du Libelle en ce temps – la portoit tres mal la main, comme nous verrons cy-après, & ne se servoit que de six Chordes, il fit plus car ayant regardé les Pièces que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe me donnitoit, & que je puis faire voir écrites de sa main, il dit que c’estoit un homme qui ne sçavoit pas faire des Pièces, qu’il n’y avoit que de la
Rousseau claims that De Machy said that Sainte Colombe “did not know how to play the viol” and “did not hold his hand properly”. Rousseau also claims that De Machy prefers the playing of “the late old du Buisson who was carrying his hand very poorly”. Little seems conclusive concerning who was the better or more knowledgeable player. However, De Machy’s comments concerning Sainte Colombe’s inability to write pièces are demonstrated in Sainte Colombe’s surviving compositions, some of which exhibit many strange and displeasing qualities.\(^{427}\)

There is also an inconsistency with what was said of De Machy’s supposed contempt for the seventh string. De Machy’s *Pièces de Violle* freely utilise the seventh string. Although he may have initially preferred a six-string viol, he must have quickly accepted the new seven-string instrument. To quote De Machy calling the seventh string “folly” makes little sense, as De Machy was the first to publish pieces for the seven-string viol. Perhaps De Machy’s comment comes from an earlier period when he was unconvinced of its usefulness.

**De Machy and the Honest Lute Master**

Concerning the origins of the viol, Rousseau maintains that viols did not derive from plucked instruments, and as such, their techniques would have no similarities. Rousseau writes:

\[\text{He [De Machy] wants for viol playing to follow the rules pertaining to plucked instruments. I refuted this in my treatise and I refute it}\]

\(^{427}\) See chapter 2 on “Sainte Colombe”.

\(\text{Melodie & point d’Harmonie, & que toutes les Pièces qu’il voyoit de luy n’estoient point de veritables Pièces de Viole, que si je voulois il me montretoit. Enfin, pour your faire court, il m’importuna tant que j’allay chez luy pour voir quelle estoit sa maniere, mais quand j’en eus gouté une fois, je n’eus pas le goust assez mauvais pour quitter Monsieur de Sainte Colombe. Juge si l’Autheur du Libelle devoit se vanter de m’avoir donné quelques Leçons, & si l devoit me presser de m’en ressovenir ; car je peu produire plusieurs témoins qui ont connoissance du mepris qu’il faisoit du jeu de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, le décrivant par tout & luy preferant le jeu de feu le vieux du Buisson qui portoit tres-mal la main; trans. M. van der Beken.}\)
again for the reasons I have given, one only needs to thoroughly examine the issue to see the truth, I shall only say that I asked, some time ago, a highly skilled and honest lute master, who is not one of the conspiracy clique, if he knew two ports de mains to play the lute, he laughed saying that he knew two of them, one for the right hand, and one for the left hand, and he added that to say there are two ports de main was pure quibble from some individual who wished to singularise himself. 428

From this reference, we uncover a group of people, referred to as the “clique”, which one would expect to be the followers of De Machy. Therefore, it is a contradiction to say that this is an effort of an “an individual who wished to singularise himself”, since it is a collective effort of a group of people.

It is curious that Rousseau does not mention the name of the “honest lute master”, as he mentions many other musicians in the Réponse. As we shall see later, he freely mentions d’Anglebert, Couperin, Chambonnières, etc., but not those with “questionable” reputations.

De Machy Executes the two Ports de main

Rousseau addresses an issue concerning the ports de main; but instead of discussing its musical consequence, Rousseau only makes a physical observation:

The comparison he draws between his two ports de main from the difference of a person who is sitting and one who is standing is exaggerated, I must admit that in the way he plays he makes this difference appear dramatically, in that he constantly raises high his elbow and then he glues it against his hip and one should think seeing this continual movement that he is playing some musette with bellows; you can see if Monsieur de Sainte Colombe plays like that

428 Ibid., 4: Il veut que l’on se regle pour joüer de la Viole sur les Instruments à Pinser. Je l’ay nié dans mon Traité & je le nie encore pour les raisons que j’en ay donné, il ne faut qu’examiner la chose à fond pour connoiostre la verité, je diray seulement que je demanday il y a quelque temps à un tres-habile Maistre de Luth & tres-honneste homme, qui n’est pas de la Cabale, s’il connoissoit deux Ports de main pour joüer du Luth, il me répondit en riant qu’il en connoissoit deux, sçavoir un de la main droite, & un de la main gauche, & il ajouta que de dire qu’il y a deux Ports de main c’est une pure chicane de quelque particulier que veut se faire distinguer par la; trans. M. van der Beken.
and if he holds his elbow stuck against his hip, which gives the arm and the hand a crippled aspect.\textsuperscript{429}

What Rousseau’s account truly describes is the physical action required to execute the technique as advocated by De Machy. Describing it as “playing some musette with bellows” is unnecessary, and is a malicious attempt to portray De Machy in a bad light.

**In Reference to Hotman**

Rousseau questions Hotman’s ability in an effort to discredit De Machy’s views on the two \textit{ports de main}. Rousseau writes:

I ask in turn the author of the pamphlet [De Machy], of whom he learned how to play the viol: it is, he will say, from the illustrious Monsieur Hotteman [sic], he is right to call him illustrious and he could not honour him enough, I am asking again, did he know how to play the viol well?\textsuperscript{430}

Rousseau attempts to disprove the validity of De Machy’s techniques based on the information that Rousseau acquired through study with Sainte Colombe:

This is, he [De Machy] will say, a ridiculous question for a man who calls himself a master of viol; but I know as well as he does, how much obliged we are towards him and how skilled he was. I am asking for a third time, did he [Hotman] hold his hand correctly? Did he observe and did he acknowledge two \textit{ports de main} to be absolutely necessary for the viol playing, following the rules of the \textit{avertissement} that calls ignoramuses all those who do not observe these things he calls essential? The pamphlet's author would not dare to say yes, for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe and all those who learned from Monsieur Hotteman [sic] would give him a denial.\textsuperscript{431}

\textsuperscript{429} Ibid.: \textit{La comparaison qu’il fait de ses deux Ports de main par la difference d’une personne qui est assisse & une personne qui est debout est outrée, j’avoué que dans son jeu il les fait beaucoup paroistre, en ce que à tous momens il lève le coude fort haut & ensuite il le cole contre sa hanche & l’on diroit en voyant ce mouvement continuil qu’il jouë de la Musette Organisée; On peut voir si Monsieur de Sainte Colombe joué ainsi & s’il tient son coude colé sur sa hanche, ce qui donne une figure estropiée au bras & à la main; trans. M. van der Beken.

\textsuperscript{430} Ibid.: \textit{Je demande à mon tour à l’Auteur du Libelle, de qui il a apris à joüer de la Viole : c’est dira t’il de l’illustre Monsieur Hotteman, il a raison de l’appeller Illustr & il ne scauroit lay faire trop d’honneur, je demande encore, scavoit il bien joüer de la Viole?; trans. M. van der Beken.

\textsuperscript{431} Ibid.: \textit{c’est la, dira t’il, une demande ridicule pour un homme qui se dit Maistre d Viole ; Mais je scaÿ aussi bien qui luy les obligations que nous luy devons & qu’il estoit tres-habile. Je demande une
Although it seems that De Machy is being forced into a tight corner, to either affirm or deny his loyalty to Hotman, it is questionable if Rousseau really has the authority to speak on behalf of Hotman and Sainte Colombe. As discussed previously, Rousseau had very likely never met Hotman, and we are uncertain how much contact Rousseau actually had with Sainte Colombe after his one month of study with him. Because of this, it is highly improbable that Rousseau actually knows the answers to the questions he has raised. After all, one would expect De Machy to have more authority on this matter, since he was a student of Hotman.

As there is no mention concerning Hotman’s opinion on the ports de main, we cannot be certain if he ever did use them. However, it must be noted that De Machy may not have shared the same level of esteem for Hotman as Rousseau, since De Machy’s few references to Hotman in his avertissement simply describe him as the “illustrious Hautemant [sic]” with a brief mention of his use of tablature. De Machy’s brief mention hardly constitutes paying homage to his teacher. This is in contrast to the efforts of Sainte Colombe’s students, Rousseau and Danoville, who endeavoured to praise their teacher wholeheartedly in their treatises. Also, it is possible that De Machy received instruction from other violists, as his ideas on viol playing reflect ideas and influences from outside France.

Because of this, it is reasonable to assume that De Machy did not treat Hotman as an authority on viol technique, quite unlike Rousseau, who seems to have an

\[\text{troisième fois, portoit-il bien la main? observoit-il & reconnoissoit-il deux Ports de main absolument nécessaires pour le jeu de la Viole, suivant les Regles de l'Avertissement qui traite d'ignorans tous ceux qui n'observe pas ces choses qu'il appelle essentielles? L'Author du Libelle n'oseroit dire oüy, car Monsieur de Sainte Colombe & tous ceux qui appris de Monsieur Hotteman luy donneroient le dementy; trans. M. van der Beken.}\]

\[\text{Sieur de Machy, Pièces de Violle, 3: l'illustre Monsieur Hautemant.}\]

\[\text{Ibid., 2-3: Cette Methode met une personne en etat de s'exercer dès la premiere leçon, puisqu'on peut apprendre la Tablature dans un moment: mais il n'en est pas de même de la Musique. Le chemin le plus court est toujours le meilleur. Les Italiens, les Allemans, les Polonois, les Suedois, les Danois & les Anglois ont toujours suivy cette maxime; & l'illustre Monsieur Hautemant s'en servoit aussi pour enseigner, comme on le peut justifier par plusieurs pieces écrites de sa main, qui se trouvent à Paris & ailleurs.}\]

\[\text{See chapter 2 on “Sainte Colombe”.}\]

\[\text{See chapter 2 on “De Machy”.}\]
unquestioning respect for both Hotman and Sainte Colombe. Also, it seems Rousseau’s justification for the use of the *ports de main* is dependent on whether or not either Hotman or Sainte Colombe were exponents of the technique.

Rousseau attempts to prove that one can also be successful without the knowledge of the *ports de main*:

If he [De Machy] admits that he was not observing these things [two *ports de main*], he confesses at the same time that Monsieur Hotteman [sic] was an ignorant, and myself I am drawing another conclusion that, since Monsieur Hotteman was highly skilled and was charming all his auditors without observing nor acknowledging two *ports de main*, that those two *ports de main* are not absolutely necessary, whether they are in effect or in name, in order to be a skilled viol master, and that it is only a formality which has its uses. It has been about fifteen or sixteen years since the pamphlet's author was thinking highly of the late old Dubuisson, however everybody knows that he was holding his hand very poorly and it did not prevent him from being skilled in his own way.

As it is impossible to know for sure if either Hotman or Dubuisson were practitioners of the two *ports de main*, we cannot be certain if their success as violists were dependent on this. However, many of the English violists prior to the time of De Machy’s publication were aware of De Machy’s first *port de main*, yet their abilities as violists seem not to have been affected.

We are faced with further contradictions concerning Rousseau’s understanding of the differing viol techniques:

At that same time, the pamphlet's author, who calls himself a student of Monsieur Hotteman [sic], was carrying his hand very badly like his Master, and he was condemning Monsieur de Sainte Colombe for his *port de main* that is the same that is presently in usage, he must

---

436 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 4-5: *S’il avouë qu’il n’observoit pas ces choses, il confesse donc en mesme temps que Monsieur Hotteman estoit un ignorant, & moy j’en tire une autre conséquence que, puis que Monsieur Hotteman estoit tres-habile & charmoy tous ses auditeurs sans observer & reconnoistre deux Ports de main, que ces deux Ports de main e sont point absolument necessaires ny d’affet ny de nom pout estre un habile Maistre de Viole, & que c’est seulement une formalité qui a ses utilitez. Il y a environ quinze ou seize ans que l’Auheur du Libelle faisoit grand cas de feu le vieux Dubuisson, cependant chacun sçait qu’il portoit tres-mal la main, & cela n’empeschoit pas qu’il ne fut habile homme dans sa maniere*; trans. M. van der Beken.

437 See chapter 6 on “Left Hand Positions on the Viol”.

therefore conclude in spite of himself that at that time he was an ignorant, since he was not observing the things he calls essential today.\textsuperscript{438}

Rousseau admits that De Machy and Hotman held their hands similarly; however, he strangely assumes that neither of them used the two \textit{ports de main}:

I ask him now from whom he learned how to hold his hand differently from what he used to do, he will say it is by watching Monsieur de Sainte Colombe play, and he boasted about it, if it is true, why not have thus given him all the honour in his \textit{avertissement}, instead of awarding it to himself through his term of two \textit{ports de main} of which Monsieur de Sainte Colombe never talked... for he [De Machy] has created for himself a way of playing that is not that of Monsieur Hotteman [sic], nor that of Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, he mixes to it some lute, some guitar and anything that pleases him and that is why he wants the Masters of lute, theorbo and guitar to be the true judges of playing the viol, which is absurd.\textsuperscript{439}

As seen previously, Sainte Colombe agreed to the use of the two \textit{ports de main}.\textsuperscript{440} It is concerning calling it two different \textit{ports de main} that Sainte Colombe apparently disagrees with. It seems impossible for Rousseau to conceive that perhaps the two \textit{ports de main} had always been in use, which may have very well been the case. Rousseau displays his intention to ridicule De Machy, making him appear undecided, describing his technique neither “that of Monsieur Hotteman [sic], nor that of Monsieur de Sainte Colombe”. In addition, we are faced again with Rousseau’s obvious scorn for plucked instruments.

\textsuperscript{438} Rousseau, \textit{Réponse}, 5: \textit{Dans ce mesme temps l’Auteur du Libelle, qui se dit écolier de Monsieur Hotteman, portoit tres-mal la main comme son Maistre, & il condamnoit Monsieur de Sainte Colombe dans son Port de main qui est le mesme qui est à present en usage, il doit donc conclure contre luy mesme qu’en ce temps - l’a il estoit un ignorant, puis qu’il n’observoit pas les choses qu’il appelle aujourd’huy essentielles}; trans. M van der Beken.

\textsuperscript{439} Ibid., 5: \textit{Jeluy demande maintenant de qui il a apris à porter la main autrement qu’il ne faisoit, il dira que c’est en voyant joier Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, & il s’en est vanté, si cela est vray, que ne luy en donnoit-il donc tout l’honneur dans son Avertissement, au lieu de se l’attribuer par son terme de deux Ports de main dont Monsieur de Sainte Colombe n’a jamais parle... car il s’est fait une maniere de joier de la Viole qui n’est ny celle de Monsieur Hotteman ny celle de Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, il y mesle du Luth, de la Guitarrre & de tout ce qui luy plaist & c’est pour cela qu’il veut que les Maistres de Luth, de Theorbe & de Guitarrre soient les veritables juges du jeu de la Viole ce qui est absurde}; trans. M. van der Beken.

\textsuperscript{440} See chapter 5 on “Rousseau and the \textit{Ports de main}”.
Rousseau Denounces the *Ports de main*

In another attempt in portraying De Machy in a bad light, Rousseau describes De Machy as being inflexible:

However I do not blame him for having created for himself a fashionable way to play, for everyone in that matter must align themselves with the strength and size of their hand, and that as regards students one should not do as some practitioners who prescribe a same remedy for all ailments, I mean one must treat them according to how they are naturally disposed, driving them as much as possible towards perfection without impeding them with too much formality, because if one should listen to the pamphlet's author, it seems that the strict observance of the formalities of playing the viol are as necessary as salvation.441

The topic at hand, the two *ports de main*, should be seen as an addition to the technique of viol playing. It is Rousseau that seems to be rigid in accepting the possibility of an extra *port de main*, since in principle, the knowledge of two *ports de main* are better than one. Concerning De Machy's purported comment on Rousseau’s left hand technique:

The pamphlet's author reproaches me for not holding my hand properly, I admit I do not hold it as he does, and (according to him) this is enough to be reproved in viol playing, but is he right to reproach me for not holding my hand like him, for since he believed he could create for himself a manner of holding the hand on the viol according to his whim, why does he not want me to have the same privilege? He will say his is the best one, but I refute it and I uphold that my students hold their hand better than his and more naturally.442

---

441 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 5: *Cependant je ne le blasme point de s’estre fait un jeu à la mode, car chacun en cela doit se regler sur la force & la grandeur de sa main, & qu’au regard des écoliers il ne faut point faire comme certains Medicins qui ordonnent le mesme remede à tous les maux, je veux dire qu’il les faut traiter suivant leur disposition naturelle, les conduisant autant qu’on le peut à la perfection sans le trop gêner dans les formalitez, car à entendre parler l’Autheur du Libelle, il semble que l’exacte observation des formalitez du jeu de la Viole soient de nécessité de salut;* trans. M. van der Beken.

442 Ibid.: *L’Autheur du Libelle me reproche que je ne porte pas bien la main, j’avoue que je ne la porte point comme lui, & (selon lui) c’est assez pour estre reprouvé dans le jeu de la Viole, Mais a-t’il raison de me reprocher que je ne porte pas la main comme lui, car puisqu’il a cru qu’il luy estoit permis de se faire une maniere de porter la main sur la Viole à sa fantaisie, pourquoi ne veut-il pas que j’aye le mesme privilege : Il dira que la sienne est la meilleure, mais je le nie & je soutiens que mes écoliers portent mieux la main que les siens & plus naturellement;* trans. M. van der Beken.
Rousseau assumes that the two *ports de main* were created by De Machy without foundation, and explains that his basis for its rejection is its unnaturalness. This conclusion is made under the assumption that the two *ports de main* never existed prior to De Machy, which, as explained previously, is possibly untrue. At this point, it is strikingly clear that the chasm in opinion between Rousseau and De Machy is a mutual.

**Rousseau and the Skilled Men**

Concerning De Machy’s scrutiny of Rousseau’s treatise, Rousseau makes a swift condemnation of De Machy’s knowledge with little justification:

>The pamphlet’s author then makes an outline of the parts of my viol treatise and he rejects almost all of them, but it is easy to see by the manner in which he talks about it that he knew nothing or that envy prevents him to make me justice, therefore I shall not waste my time refuting what he says about it, the benefits several persons are reaping from it are enough proof to me of its usefulness. Furthermore I can say that the most skilled men we know examined it and judged it quite useful and that only the *avertissement*’s author and his clique talk badly of it.\(^443\)

Once more, Rousseau does not mention the names of the “skilled men” he refers to. However, from this it is revealed that there are a group of people, possibly led by De Machy, that oppose Rousseau’s ideas.

**Composing Pieces of Melody and Harmony**

In defence of the preference of the playing of melody, Rousseau replies with a challenge:

\(^443\) Ibid.: *L’Auteur de Libelle fait en suite le dénombrement des parties de mon Traité de la Viole & il les rejette presque toutes, mais il est aisé de connoistre par sa manière d’en parler qu’il n’y connoist rien où que l’envie l’empesche de me rendre justice, ainsi je ne perdray point mon temps à refuter ce qu’il en dit, le profit que plusieurs personnes en tirent me prouve assez son utilité. De plus je puis dire que les plus habiles hommes que nous avons l’ont examiné, approuvé & jugé très utile & qu’il n’y a que l’Auteur du Libelle & sa Cabale qui en parlent mal;* trans. M. van der Beken.
He [De Machy] then considers the playing of the melody and in order to answer what he is saying about it, I shall be pleased with him if he composes a piece of simple melody that should be tender, and that he executes it in a manner that is pleasant.\footnote{Ibid., 6: Il passe en suite au jeu de Mélodie & pour répondre à ce qu’il en dit, je seray content de luy sur ce sujet s’il compose une Pièce de simple Melodie qui soit tendre, & qu’il l’execute d’une maniere qui plaie; trans. M. van der Beken.}

It seems that it is Rousseau’s opinion that De Machy is unable to compose and perform successfully in the melodic style. Although we can never conclusively determine this fact, it must be noted that De Machy made a conscious effort to include different kinds of pieces in his *Pièces de Violle*. De Machy writes:

\begin{quote}
I have chosen for music those pieces that can easily be put into this notation without causing any difficulty: There are some that are filled out in both ways, some which are less so, but nonetheless make harmony from the beginning to the end.\footnote{Sieur de Machy, 3-4: J’ay choisi pour la Musique celles qui s’y peuvent mettre sans faire aucune peine: Il y en a de remplies des deux façons, & d’autres qui le sont moins, & qui ne laissent pas de faire harmonie depuis le commencement jusqu’à la fin.}
\end{quote}

There are many instances in De Machy’s music that display melodic writing. De Machy’s preference for the harmonic style did not restrict him completely to harmonic writing (Fig. 50).
It appears that De Machy, being a strong advocate of the harmonic style, took issue with those who did not compose pieces of harmony:

Regarding the pieces of harmony, where it is not always followed, he can continue to blame Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, as he started to do it at the time I was learning, all he also has to do is put on the same rank the late Monsieur Meliton of whom one can show pieces in the same way and in general of all the skilled Masters. Notice that he says one cannot make as much harmony on the plucked instruments as on the organ or the harpsichord, and that one cannot do as much with the viol as with the pluck instruments, and from there I draw the conclusion that since the viol chords are more sterile to create harmony than are other instruments, it must be allowed to discontinue it when one judges it appropriate, and it is the custom.\footnote{Rousseau, Réponse, 6: Au regard des Pièces d’Harmonie, où elle n’est pas toujours suivie, il n’a qu’à continuer à faire le procès à Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, comme il le commença dans le temps que j’aprenois, il n’a aussi qu’à mettre dans le mème rang feu Monsieur Meliton dont on peut faire voir des Pièces de la mème maniere & généralement de tous les habiles Maistres. Remarquez qu’il dit que l’on ne peut faire autant d’Harmonie sur les Instrumens à pincer que sur l’Orgue & sur le Clavecin, & que l’on n’en peut pas tant faire sur la Viole que sur les Instrumens à pincer, & de la conclus que l’accord de la Viole estant plus sterile pour faire de l’Harmonie que les autres Instrumens il doit estre permis de la discontinuer quand on le juge à propos, & c’est l’usage; trans. M. van der Beken.}

In this era, it must be noted that writing melodic pieces for the viol would have been relatively new, since most of the pieces before De Machy’s time, especially English lyra-viol music, would be considered harmonic works. Hotman’s, Dubuisson’s and
Sainte Colombe’s solo viol pieces can be considered pieces written in both melodic and harmonic styles, without the need for a *basso continuo* accompaniment. However, it is in Rousseau’s opinion that Sainte Colombe’s preference to compose in the melodic style is endorsed by the works of Meliton and other “skilled Masters” of the day. Unfortunately, no music by Meliton survives and it is hard to ascertain to which “skilled Masters” Rousseau is referring.

Rousseau’s advice to “to discontinue it [chords] when one judges it appropriate” somewhat corresponds with De Machy’s advice concerning chords.\(^{447}\) However, it is clear from Rousseau’s preference for the melodic style that he much prefers to do away with them.

In Rousseau’s opinion, the viol’s inability to create as complete harmony as is possible on plucked and keyboard instruments is grounds for abandoning chords when required. This is not so much of a question of the instrument’s ability to create harmony, but the ability of the composer to write idiomatically for the instrument in the harmonic style. This issue is already discussed by De Machy;\(^{448}\) however, Rousseau misunderstands him yet again:

> The pamphlet's author wishes to see some of my pieces. In that I shall satisfy him, but he should not be surprised that, since he is so passionate I shall not fully use his own judgement as my authority; he said about those of Monsieur Marais that they were not made for the hand, he does not, however, execute them with his foot, and everybody is playing them, if he says the same about mine he will honour me greatly, for his own there is only him to play them, and his students on who he uses strappado to bring them to it.\(^{449}\)

---

\(^{447}\) See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.  
\(^{448}\) See chapter 5 on “Melody or Harmony?”  
\(^{449}\) Rousseau, *Réponse*, 6: *L’Auteur du Libelle souhaite voir de mes Pièces. Je le satisferay en cela, mais il trouvera bon qu’estant passioné comme il l’est je ne m’en raporte pas tout à fait à son jugement; il a dit de celles de Monsieur Marais qu’elles n’estoient pas faites pour la main, il ne les execute pourtant pas avec le pied, & tout le monde les joué, s’il dit la mesme chose des miennes il me fera bien de l’honneur, pour les siennes il n’y a que luy qui les joué & ses écoliers a qui il donne l’estrapade pour les y faire venir;* trans. M. van der Beken.
When De Machy requests to scrutinise Rousseau’s pieces, Rousseau directs the discussion towards the popularity of Marais’ pieces to prove the validity of his own style of composition. It must be noted that works of Marais from his *Pièces à une et à deux violes* (1686) are mostly works in the melodic style that may have been initially composed with a *basso continuo* accompaniment in mind. Their prior existence without a *basse continue* part from 1686 to 1688 may have confused De Machy, who was used to playing solo music in the harmonic style. The lack of this feature may have prompted him to suggest, “They were not made for the hand”. However, the underlying question concerns the ability to compose idiomatically. The popularity of Marais’ pieces obviously has to do with many factors including idiomatic writing.450

We are again confronted with two conflicting schools of thought during De Machy’s time, otherwise referred to as the “clique” by Rousseau:

He says that in order to please, it is necessary to please people who have genius and good taste. I grant him that, and I add that one should make one’s best to try and please everybody, but let him produce persons of genius and good taste whom his playing pleases, apart from the people of his clique who have been his coadjutors in the works of the pamphlet.451

This can be seen as an attempt to challenge De Machy’s ability on the viol.

However, in this statement, there is no actual evidence of De Machy’s shortcomings. It is only in Rousseau’s opinion that he is unable to perform pleasingly, which, at this point, has no foundation. This statement merely demonstrates the existence of a group of people that do find favour in De Machy’s playing, but they are negatively referred to as his “clique”.

450 See chapter 2 on “The Beginnings of Basso Continuo in France”.
451 Rousseau, 6: Il dit que pour plaire, il faut plaire aux personnes qui ont du genie & du bon goust. Je lay accorde cela & j’ajoute qu’il faut faire tout ce que l’on peut pour plaire à tout le monde, mais qu’il produise des personnes de genie & de bon goust à qui son jeu plaise, excepté les gens de sa Cabale qui ont esté ses coadjuteurs dan l’ouvrage de ce Libelle; trans. M. van der Beken.
An Argument Over Tenuës

Concerning Rousseau’s misunderstanding of the use of the *tenuës*:

When I talked of the *tenuës de bien-séance* I said they were necessary for all viol playing, and I called them like that because it is an inappropriate figure for the hand to have the fingers raised for no reason. But you will notice that I did not say one had to give them that name, and that those who did not name them are ignorant. Regarding *tenuës* of harmony he accuses me of a contradiction because I said they had to be observed on a regular basis and that, however, that regularity did not have to be so exact that one could not from time to time do without in favour of something more considerable….\(^{452}\)

Rousseau appears to be taking his words back concerning the *tenuës de bien-séance*, a term coined by him. As discussed previously, *tenuës de bien-séance* refers to the same physical action as those of the harmonic *tenuës*; however, their supposed purpose is different. This probably indicates that Rousseau’s *tenuës de bien-séance* were met with severe criticism by De Machy.

Rousseau explains that he “did not say one had to give them that name, and that those who did not name them are ignorant”. It is perplexing why Rousseau should choose to name the technique *tenuës de bien-séance*, but place so little importance to adhering to it. This statement was clearly made in direct reaction towards De Machy’s words:

> It is certain that by carefully following all these rules one cannot but play well. But one of my astonishments is having noticed that, except for some people skilled in viol playing, there are few, even among those who make a profession of it who have heard anything about these rules, which are so essential to the instrument. On the contrary,

\(^{452}\) Ibid.: *Quand j’ay parlé des Tenuës de bien seance j’ay dit qu’elles estoient necessaires pour tous les jeux de la Viole, & je les ay nommé ainsi parce que c’est une figure mal seance pour la main d’avoir les doigts levez sans necessité. Mais vous remarquerez que je n’ay pas dit que l’on fut obligé de les nommer ainsi, & que ceux qui ne les nomme pas sont des ignorans. Au regard des Tenuës d’Harmonie il me reproche une contradiction parce que j’ay dit qu’il les falloit observer regulièrement & que cependant cette regularité ne devoit pas estre si exacte que l’on ne put quelquefois s’en dispenser en faveur de quelque chose de plus considerable;* trans. M. van der Beken.
they will scorn them, as is usual with the majority of ignorant people.\footnote{Sieur de Machy, 6: Il est certain qu’en pratiquant exactement toutes ces regles, on ne peut manquer de bien joier. Mais un de mes étonnemens est d’avoir remarqué qu’excepté quelques personnes qui sont habiles pour la Violle, il y en a peu de ceux même qui en font profession, qui aient entendu parler d’aucune de ces regles, qui sont si essentielles à l’Instrument. Au contraire ils les mépriseront, comme font ordinairement la plus grande partie de ceux qui sont ignorans.}

Rousseau appears to be submitting a disclaimer, implying that those who do not know of his technique are not ignorant. This simply appears to be a more diplomatic way of expressing his point of view. However, it now appears that Rousseau has little conviction in what he formerly proposed.

The contradiction of which De Machy accuses Rousseau concerns the way Rousseau treats the harmonic \textit{tenuès}. Although Rousseau believes they should be used regularly, he also believes that they can occasionally be done away with should there be good reason. However, owing to the lack of a deeper explanation, there is no way to prove how credible this optional use of the harmonic \textit{tenuë} is. This matter of \textit{tenuës}, and Rousseau’s initial misunderstanding of De Machy’s words, has already been discussed earlier.\footnote{Rousseau, Réponse, 6-7: Je dis donc & je soutiens que l’on peut se dispenser quelquefois des Tenuës sur la Viole. Que tous les Maistres ont cru cette licence necessaire & l’ont pratiquê. Que, par l’aveu propre de l’Autheur du Libelle dans son Avertissement, Monsieur Hotteman ne pratiquoit par regulièrement les Tenuës (cependant il estoit habile homme & jouoit tres-bien du Theorbe) Que les Pièces de tout les habiles Maistres en sont une preuve convaincante; trans. M. van der Beken.}

While asserting his point, Rousseau quotes De Machy’s supposed reference on Hotman:

\begin{quote}
Therefore I say and I maintain that one can sometimes do without \textit{tenuës} on the viol. That all masters have believed this liberty to be necessary and have practiced it. That from the proper admission by the pamphlet’s author in his \textit{avertissement}, Monsieur Hotteman [sic] did not practice \textit{tenuës} on a regular basis (even though he was a skilled man and was playing theorbo very well) that the pieces of all skilled Masters are a convincing proof of it.\footnote{See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.

See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.

See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.

See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.

See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.

See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.

See chapter 5 on “Tenuës”.} \end{quote}
We are again confronted with the claim that all “masters” of the viol share Rousseau’s opinion. De Machy, on the other hand, asserts a similar opinion concerning his treatment of *tenuës*:

In regard to *tenuës*, if one examines the pieces of foreign authors, which are famous, one will see that they are indeed observed there; and therefore it should not pass for a novelty.\(^{456}\)

However, Rousseau erroneously cites De Machy as having acknowledged Hotman’s irregular use of the *tenuës* in his *avertissement*. This is another example that undermines Rousseau’s credibility. Since no such admission exists by De Machy, it is questionable if Rousseau’s claim on the Hotman’s treatment on *tenuës* is indeed true at all.

In an effort to demonstrate that *tenuës* could be done away with when required, Rousseau attempts to show instances in De Machy’s music where this was done. Rousseau writes:

Please examine from the 3rd to the 4th bar on page 19. From the 10th to the 11th bar on page 20. From the 11th to the 12th and from the 13th to the 14th bar on page 23. The 5th, the 6th and the 7th bars on page 28.\(^{457}\)

Although it appears that Rousseau is attempting to discredit De Machy’s use of the *tenuë*, the extracts that Rousseau singles out are situations where a violist would very likely do a *tenuë* without indication. This may suggest that the *tenuës* that are marked in De Machy’s music are the ones that may not be so apparent to a violist; hence, a reminder for those less obvious places.

---

\(^{456}\) *Sieur de Machy, 6: Pour ce qui est des tenuës, si l’on examine les Pieces de Autheurs étrangers qui ont esté fameux, l’on verra qu’elles y sont bien marquées, & que par consequent cela ne doit pas passer pour une nouveauté.*

Rousseau’s assertions concerning De Machy’s pieces will be examined and refuted in the examples below. It must be emphasised that De Machy made no comment concerning situations where *tenuê*ś are not practical.

**Fig. 51** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Courante*, first book, page 19, bar 1-6.

Figure 51 is an extract of the *courante* from the first suite in d minor. Rousseau refers to bar 3 to 4. The crotchet on the third beat (F) of bar 3 has no *tenuê* marked. However, when one inspects the music closely, it becomes clear that making a *tenuê* would be a very natural thing for a violist to do. The second finger used to play the minim (c#) on bar 3 would be in the perfect position to execute the *martellement* on first beat of bar 4. This musical passage has clearly been very well thought out by De Machy. The missing *tenuê* is almost certainly the engraver’s error.

**Fig. 52** De Machy, *Pièces de Violle, Courante*, first book, page 20, bar 33-37.

Figure 52 is another extract from the same *courante* as above. Rousseau refers to bar 36 to 37. Because there is no indication of a *tenuê* on the A, unlike the Bb from the preceding bar, perhaps Rousseau feels that this is a situation where De Machy may have forgone the use of a *tenuê* in favour of something more practical. However, when one examines the music further, one realises that the musical phrase ends on the second beat of the next bar (A). This suggests that the low A should be held to extend the
harmony. Because this is physically practicable and musically plausible, it is again possible to attribute this missing \textit{tenuë} to the error of the engraver.

**Fig. 53** De Machy, \textit{Pièces de Violle, Gigue}, first book, page 23, bar 51-60.

![Figure 53](image)

Figure 53 is an extract of the \textit{gigue}, also from the first suite in d minor. Rousseau refers to bars 52 to 53. It is confusing why Rousseau chooses to highlight this section because it does not demonstrate his point. It is obvious that the engraver has accidentally left out a \textit{tenuë} on the A, as there is no reason why one should not hold one’s fingers down. It is physically more efficient to do a \textit{tenuë}. Musically, the harmony does not change, making a \textit{tenuë} a very natural thing to do. Perhaps, in this situation, De Machy thought that a \textit{tenuë} would be superfluous, since a violist would instinctively do one. This may be the very reason why the \textit{tenuës} were left out in the previous examples.

**Fig. 54** De Machy, \textit{Pièces de Violle, Gigue}, first book, page 23, bar 51-60.

![Figure 54](image)

Figure 54 is an extract derived from the same \textit{gigue} as above. Rousseau refers to bars 54-55. What Rousseau is attempting to prove is hard to ascertain. Perhaps Rousseau is referring to the G#, which does not have a \textit{tenuë} indication. Again, this may just have been another error by the engraver.
Figure 55 is an extract of the *allemande* from the suite in D major. Rousseau refers to bars 17-19. Again, it is difficult to understand what Rousseau is trying to prove. The first *tenuë*, which actually occurs one beat before the bars Rousseau states, occurs on an F#. It is marked and can be physically executed. The fourth beat of bar 17 and the third beat of bar 18 are few of the instances where a *tenuë* should be marked, but is not. However, these again are situations where a violist would unconsciously do one. The remaining bars are properly written with correctly marked *tenuës*, sustaining the bass according to the change in harmony.

It seems from these examples that there is little error in De Machy’s compositional style. In fact, they exhibit a strong adherence to the principle of using *tenuës* wherever musically possible. These examples also show that *tenuës* that are not marked are not instances that would benefit from them being done away with, as argued by Rousseau. They are more likely the faults of the engraver rather than those of De Machy’s. This is not considered by Rousseau, who chooses to criticise De Machy’s compositional style and discredit his ideas on the use of the *tenuë*.

There are a number of obvious engraver’s errors in De Machy’s music. As a basis for comparison, such an error is shown in the example below (Fig. 56):
In figure 56, the F natural (notated with $\hat{b}$ sign) on the fourth beat of bar 15, which is tied over until the first beat of bar 16, is missing. However, in this case, the *tenuë* indication remains.

In referring to De Machy’s musical examples, Rousseau comments on De Machy’s inconsistent use of the *tenuës*:

> Furthermore, since the pamphlet's author says one should observe *tenuës* so as to hold harmony sounds and avoid dissonant ones, why is he not as regular in practicing them for the high notes as well as for the low, since same effects result from it.\(^{458}\)

It is clear that the effect of low notes on the viol is far different from the high notes. The lower silver wound strings, which would have been in common use by the time,\(^ {459}\) would resonate far longer than the thinner gut strings. Indicating *tenuës* on all the upper notes, though useful, would have far less noticeable effect. This is obviously not apparent to Rousseau, who seems uninformed concerning the issues of the viol’s tessitura. This remark by Rousseau is further supported by Rousseau’s comment on transposition:

\(^{458}\) Ibid.: *De plus puisque l’Auteur du Libelle dit qu’il faut observer les Tenuës pour conserver les Sons qui sont Harmonie & pour éviter ceux qui seroient des dissonances, pourquoi n’est-il pas aussi regulier à les pratiquer dans le Dessus que dans la Basse puisque les mesmes effets en arrivent*; trans. M. van der Beken.

\(^{459}\) Rousseau attributed the creation of the silver-wound seventh string on the viol to Sainte Colombe in his *Traité* in 1687; however, De Machy was already writing for the seventh string in 1685.
While it may appear that De Machy feared the practice of transposition, this is dubious considering the talents of a master like De Machy. It is far more probable that De Machy was shocked at Rousseau’s disregard – and perhaps ignorance – of the viol’s effect on high and low sounds.

Rousseau Critiques De Machy’s Compositions

On the occasion that De Machy makes a possible error in his compositions, Rousseau takes the opportunity to insult him:

But what one must admire still more, is the emphasis with which he talks about false relations and composition liberties as if one did not know that they are birds he just discovered in a shrub as a novelty, for proof of that please take the trouble to examine his pieces, you will find in it pretty rough liberties, and if you do not accuse him of having made two octaves one after the other in the 9th bar on p. 21 and from the 17th to the 18th bar on p. 22. You will at least admit that this is not worth much, and that a nice melody would be much more bearable than such a nasty harmony, but I challenge you to dispense with two perfect octaves whilst rising up stepwise at the end of the first part of his first allemande. This is what I have noticed in his first suite for I only examined that, and still hastily, I shall consider it more exactly when I get the time, with the rest of it. I pray you for your part to see the nice harmony with which he pretends to enchant the skilled ones.  

---

460 Rousseau, Réponse, 10: L’Auteur du Libelle fait bien voir que ce que j’ay dit de la Transposition luy a fair peur, lors que j’ay dit qu’il faut scavor joier les Parties Supérieures en Basses, & les Basses en Supérieures; trans. M. van der Beken.

461 Ibid., 7: Mais ce qu’il faut admirer davantage, c’est l’enphaze avec laquelle il parle des fausses relations & des licences de la Composition, comme si on ne connoissoit pas que ce sont des oyseaux qu’il vient de dênicher tout nouvellement dans un Buisson, pour preuve de cela donnez-vous la peine d’examiner ses Pièces, vous y trouverez des licences bien grossieres, & si vous ne l’accusez pas d’avoir fait deux Octaves de suite dans la 9. mesure de la page 21. & de la 17. à la 18. mesure de la page 22. Vous direz au moins que cela ne vaut pas grande chose, & qu’une belle Melodie seroit beaucoup plus supportable qu’ue si mechâte Harmonie, mais je vous defie d’exécuser de deux Octaves pleines, en motat par degrez cöjoints, la fin de la première partie de sa première Allemâte. Voila ce que j’ay remarqué dans sa première suite car je n’ay examine que cela encore estoit-ce à la haste, je le consideraray plus exactement à mon loisir avec le reste. Je vous prie de vostre costé de voir cette belle Harmonie avec laquelle il pretend enchanter les habiles; trans. M. van der Beken.
Figure 57 is an extract of the *sarabande* from suite in d minor. Rousseau is in fact referring to bar 10, instead of bar 9. What we observe are consecutive octaves.

Figure 58 is an extract of the *gigue* from the same suite. Rousseau refers to bars 17 and 18. Again, there are consecutive octaves.

Figure 59 is an extract of the *allemande* from the same suite. Rousseau refers to bar 11. It appears Rousseau is referring to the consecutive octaves moving stepwise: the two Gs, the minim on the third beat and the last semiquaver before the final chord, move respectively to the lowest and highest note of the final chord.

Rousseau argues that these are situations where chords might have been better done away with. Rousseau’s words also imply De Machy should not have been so quick to remark on the liberties of others, when he is guilty of these errors in harmony. Although eliminating chords in this situation would solve the problems with harmony
and voice leading, it would result in a different style of composition, one more akin to
the melodic style. To leave out chords where one would otherwise usually expect them,
would reduce the overall level of volume and resonance that the viol would be capable
of.

It is likely that these are situations where De Machy has taken intentional
compositional liberties for the sake of these considerations. After all, De Machy is only
guilty of writing consecutive octaves. This is hardly a crime considering the
compositional limitations when writing idiomatically for the viol. Furthermore, these
situations are isolated, and ultimately do not detract from the quality of the
compositions.

Rousseau Refutes the Knowledge of the Lute Masters

According to Rousseau, because of De Machy’s supposed inability to compose
well, Rousseau is justified in discrediting the knowledge of the masters of plucked
instruments:

After that I don’t think it is necessary to answer about his sending me
back to the plucking Masters, he means to talk about those of the
clique, but even if they were all of that opinion, I argue that it is not
for them to judge about an instrument the features of which they do
not know and that this judgement belongs to the viol Masters, and
even if the pamphlet’s author who has such a loathing for Latin is
going to swear at me I shall quote this passage from Quintilian:

felices artes si de iis soli artifices judicarent.

After Rousseau’s insistence that origins of the viol are not shared with those of plucked
instruments, we now see his obvious resentment of players of plucked instruments

462 Ibid., 7: Après cela je ne croy pas qu’il soit necessaire de répondre sur ce qu’il me renvoye aux
Maistres à pincer, il entend parler de ceux de sa Cabale, mais quand ils seroient tous de ce sentiment, je
soutiens que ce n’est pas à eux à juger d’un Instrument dont ils ne connoissent point le caractare & que
ce jugement appartient aux habiles Maistres de viole, & quand l’Auteur du Libelle qui à tant d’aversion
pour le latin devroit jurer & pester contre moy, je citeray ce passage de Quintilien, felices artes si de iis
soli artifices judicarent; trans. M. van der Beken. I am unable to locate the source of the quote by
Quintilian. The Latins quote is translated “Happy are those who are judged only by artists”.

directed towards De Machy’s “clique”. The above quote implies that most of the members of De Machy’s “clique” are exponents of the viol as well as plucked instruments. Perhaps, it did not occur to Rousseau that perhaps Hotman, whom he whom he speaks so highly of, would belong to such a group, since he was a renowned player on both the viol and theorbo.\textsuperscript{463} The same could be said of Sainte Colombe, who was also a player of plucked instruments.\textsuperscript{464}

It appears that Rousseau questioned De Machy about the use of \textit{tenuës}, albeit rather superficially.

He [De Machy] says that I asked him what \textit{tenuës} were. Apparently he does not remember it. I asked him if it was never allowed to dispense with it, and I asked the same question to Monsieur de Sainte Colombe who was of a contrary opinion to his.\textsuperscript{465}

The problem with this statement is a lack of information. We simply do know in what context this question was asked. Therefore, we cannot make any conclusions based on De Machy’s or Sainte Colombe’s answers.

\textbf{Rousseau and his Compositions}

Concerning Rousseau’s ability in composing harmonic pieces, he writes:

\begin{quote}
He [De Machy] says I confessed to him that I did not know how to play \textit{pièces d’Harmonie}, but the duel challenge I sent him a year ago shows the contrary.\textsuperscript{466}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{463} See chapter 2 on “Hotman”.
\textsuperscript{464} See chapter 2 on “Sainte Colombe”.
\textsuperscript{465} Rousseau, \textit{Réponse}, 7: \textit{Il dit que je luy ay demandé ce que c’estoit que les Tenuës. Apparemment il ne s’en souvient pas. Je luy ay demandé s’il n’estoit jamais permis de s’en dispenser, & j’ay fait la mesme demande à Monsieur de Sainte Colombe qui fut d’un sentiment contraire au sien}; trans. M. van der Beken.
\textsuperscript{466} Ibid: \textit{Il dit que je luy ay avoëté que je ne scavais pas jouër des Pièces d’Harmonie, mais le Cartel de deffy que je luy envoyé il y a un an fait voir le contraire}; trans. M. van der Beken.
Rousseau admits his shortcomings to De Machy and does not refute this fact. This is a strong indication that, at some point, Rousseau acknowledged his lack of ability. However, it seems that Rousseau assumes that the “duel challenge” that was sent to De Machy was an indication of his new-found ability. Perhaps this is why De Machy claims:

He [De Machy] says that I came out all of a sudden in one night like a mushroom, that two days ago I made up my mind to compose vocal and instrumental music.  

Here we have another possible indication of Rousseau’s lack of experience with the viol, as he was unfamiliar with the harmonic style, which had been the most established style prior to the time of De Machy. To this, Rousseau attempts to defend himself:

To that I answer that I have lived in Paris for twelve years and that not finding myself endowed by a spirit or inclination to advance myself through manipulation or through women's intrigues, nor by wine that is the usual way of getting acquainted with people, I thought myself obliged to make all possible efforts to acquire some credit through my work, and having convinced myself of that necessity, I applied myself ceaselessly and with so much regularity that for ten years now I did not give myself one day of respite. I now ask if so assiduous a work, joint with some natural disposition cannot have given me enough exposure to perform in public.

Unfortunately, it is still difficult to ascertain the quality of Rousseau’s ability from this statement, as we know nothing about these ten years of work he assigned himself. It is only in Rousseau’s opinion, however, that it is sufficient to prove his ability to perform.

---

467 Ibid.: Il dit que je suis venu tout en une nuit comme les Champignons, que je me suis mis en teste depuis deux jours de composer de la Musique Vocale & Instrumentale; trans. M. van der Beken.

468 Ibid., 8: A cela je répons qu’il y a douze ans que je suis demeurant à Paris, & que ne me trouvant pas un esprit ny une inclination propre à m’avancer par brigues, par l’intrigue des femmes, ny par le Vin qui est le moyen ordinaire pour faire connoissance avec le monde, je cru estre obligé de faire tous mes efforts pour m’acquerir quelque merite par le travail, & m’estant convaincu moy-mesme de cette necessité, je m’y suis appliqué incesamment & avec tant d’assiduité que depuis dix ans je ne me suis pas donne un jour de relache; Je demande maintenant si un travail assidu comme cely l’a, joint à quelque disposition naturelle n’est pas capable de m’avoir donne assez de lumiere pour paroistre en public; trans. M. van der Beken.
As to Rousseau’s compositional ability, it appears De Machy criticises him on his lack of originality:

He says that I am the monkey of music but he does not make me a great insult because I admit I am trying to imitate skilled people in their works, but not to steal from them as he says I do, and so that everyone can know about it and what I can do, I offer to put the score of my works into the hands of capable and non-suspect persons and I shall submit to any corrections they judge necessary if what he says happens to be true, and at the same time I challenge the pamphlet's author to give likewise the score of his pieces for examination.\textsuperscript{469}

While Rousseau admits he imitates the work of “skilled people”, he is attempting to challenge De Machy’s accusation of him stealing these ideas. This is an unsurprising allegation; as we have seen previously, there have been very many instances where Rousseau has replicated the ideas of others, especially in his Dissertation. Rousseau’s challenge seems illogical: De Machy has already published an entire volume of viol music for all in viol community to inspect.

Rousseau Cites Couperin

Rousseau describes an incident concerning the rejection of his ideas of ornamentation in his Méthode, and makes comments directed to another renowned musician of the time:

I could not be more impressed than by the liberty he takes to blame the rules I gave for port de voix and the cadence\textsuperscript{470} in my music method\textsuperscript{471} saying that Masters of singing make fun of it, because he knows himself what singing is, he who asks what that is a beau trait,\textsuperscript{469}

\textsuperscript{469}Ibid: Il dit que je suis le singe de la Musique mais il ne me fait pas une grande injure car j’avoüe que je tâche d’imiter les habiles gens dans leurs Ouvrages, mais non pas de les piller comme il dit, & afin que l’on connoisse ce que en est & ce que je şçay faire, je m’offre de mettre la partition de mes Ouvrages entre les mains de personnes capables & non suspectes & je me soumets a telle correction qu’elles jugeront si ce qu’il dit se trouve vray, & je defie en mesme temps l’Autheur du Libelle, de donner pareillement la Partition de ses Pièces a examiner; trans. M. van der Beken.

\textsuperscript{470}Rousseau refers to the cadential trill as the cadence.

\textsuperscript{471}This music method refers to Rousseau’s vocal treatise: Méthode claire, certaine et facile pour apprendre à chanter la musique (1683).
who argues in his pamphlet that one has never used this term in the playing of instruments, let him ask Monsieur Couperin, and it will be known to him through *beaux traits* which he embellishes his pieces with, what they call a *beau trait*, and he will learn as well that Monsieur Couperin does not make himself the slave of a *tenuë* so much that he cannot leave it when he finds something more pleasing to put in its place, although *tenuës* are more definitely obligatory on harpsichord than on viol.  

In this case, we see Rousseau using the authority of the Couperin to justify his ideas on ornamentation. It is unclear which Couperin Rousseau is referring to, but we can easily rule out Louis Couperin, as he died in 1661. As for the famous François Couperin “Le Grand” (1668-1733), he would have been a mere 20-year-old at the time of the publication of Rousseau’s *Réponse*. This begs the questions of why Rousseau, who was in his 40s, would choose such a young man as his model. This could, however, be an indication of the enormous talent of the young Couperin. More likely, Rousseau may have been referring to his uncle, François Couperin (c.1631-1708/12). As none of this Couperin’s music or writings is extant, it remains difficult to determine his authority on this matter. However, according to Titon du Tillet, François Couperin the elder seems to have a greater reputation for his fondness for wine:

> The second of the trio of brothers COUPERIN was called François; he did not have same the talent as the two brothers who played the Organ; but he had shown in the *Pièces de Clavecin* of the two brothers that he possessed clearness and great ease. He was a small man that liked good wine very much, and who would readily lengthen his lessons, if one had the attention to bring close to the harpsichord a carafe of wine with a crust of bread, and a lesson ordinarily lasted as long as one wanted to refill the wine carafe.

---

472 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 8: *Je ne puis assez admirer icy la liberté qu’il prend de blasmer les Regles que jay donné du Port de Voix & de la Cadence dans ma Methode pour la Musique; disant que les Maistres du Chant en sont des risées, car sçait-il lui mesme ce que c’est que Chant, lui qui demande ce que c’est qu’un beau trait, & qui soutient dans son Libelle qu’on ne s’est jamais servy de ce terme dans le jeu des Instrumens, qu’il le demande à Monsieur Couperin, & il lui sera connoistre par les beaux traits dont il embellit les Pièces, ce que c’est qu’on appelle un beau trait, & il connoistra aussi que Monsieur Couperin ne se rend pas si esclave d’une Tenuë qu’il ne la quitte quand il trouve quelque chose de plus agreable à mettre a la place, quoy que les Tenuës soient d’une obligation plus exacte sur le Clavecin que sur la Viole*; trans. M. van der Beken.

473 References to deceased musicians in the *Réponse* have always been clear, as seen in the earlier references to Couperin, Chambonnières, Dubuisson and Dominique.

474 Titon du Tillet, 403: *Le second des trios freres COUPERINS s’appelloit François ; il n’avoit pas les mêmes talens que ces deux freres de jouer de l’Orgue & du Clavecin ; mais il avoit celui de montrer les*
Also, according to David Fuller, a note on one of Couperin’s nephew’s music describes him as “a great musician and a great drunk”. 475

**Rousseau and Tablature**

Concerning the use of tablature, Rousseau explains:

Tablature has its advantages and its faults, and the pamphlet's author does not understand that my Viol Treatise is being made only to teach learners, I was right to say that one could not distinguish from the tablature the natural keys of transpositions and I challenge him to teach them to learners as I teach mine through music, and that he could give them definite rules for the appuyer and trembler of the cadence, sometimes on the whole tone, sometimes on the semitone as I advised in my treatise, and this makes me think that he does not understand them. To say the truth, one should say that the tablature for the viol is the ABC, and that if Monsieur Hotteman [sic] and the other Masters used it and are still using it, as I am presently using it myself, it is for the sake of those who either do not want, or cannot learn music; but we know enough why the pamphlet's author wants to ruin music in order to make the tablature reign. 476

While Rousseau and De Machy seem to be at the opposite ends of the argument, it is certain that both men use tablature in their teaching. 477 It is their method for teaching beginners on the viol that differs. Rousseau attempts to portray De Machy as a

---


476 Rousseau, Réponse, 8-9: La Tablature à ses avantages & ses défauts, & l’Auteur du Libelle ne comprend pas que mon Traité de Viole n’estant fait que pour instruire des écoliers, j’ai eu raison de dire que l’on ne sçauroit distinguer par la Tablature les Tons Naturels des Transposez, & je le defie de les faire connoitire à ses écoliers comme je les fais connoitire aux miens par Musique, & qu’il leur puisse donner des Regles certaines pour appuyer & trembler la Cadence tantost sur le Ton entier & tantost sur le Semiton, comme j’en ay donné dans mon Traité, & cela me fait croire qu’il ne les comprend pas. Pour parler juste, il faut dire que la Tablature pour la Viole est le pont aux Asnes, & que si Monsieur Hotteman & les autres Maistres s’en sont servi & s’en servent, comme je m’en serv actuallement moit mesme, c’est par condescendance pour ceux ou qui ne veulent, ou qui ne peuvent apprendre la Musique: Mais en sçait assez pourquoy l’Auteur du Libelle veut aneantir la Musique pour faire regner la Tablature; trans. M. van der Beken.

477 Rousseau, Traité, 53. There is a description of a neck of viol with frets and their corresponding alphabets in tablature.
complete advocate of tablature. This is obviously not true, as De Machy wrote music in both staff notation and tablature, displaying his openness to both methods; however, he expressed a preference for teaching beginners in tablature because of its apparent ease. Rousseau does not seem to agree with this. Instead, he simply disregards De Machy’s efforts and accuses him of wanting to “ruin music in order to make the tablature reign”.

On the subject of the diagrams of four different viol necks in Rousseau’s *Traité*, De Machy offers his criticism:

He [De Machy] enters here in mockery against the four kinds of necks which I have advised, and the manner in which he is talking about it makes me almost believe he is coveting the post of the late Dominique…

Rousseau’s four diagrams describe the different position on the neck of the viol that corresponds to different scales and modes:

The first figure is a diatonic diagram of the neck which contains only the natural scales degrees and double unisons. The second figure is a “harmonic” diagram of the neck, in other words, composed of the diatonic and chromatic scale degrees. It contains the natural scale degrees with their accidentals and the simple and double unisons found within the seven frets. The third figure is the diagram of a “chromatic” neck which contains the natural scale degrees with their accidentals and the most distant transpositions with simple and double unisons with the octave for each string. The fourth figure contains a diagram of the neck for the tablature within the octave for each string.

---

478 Sieur de Machy, 2-3: *Cette Methode met une personne en etat de s’exercer des la premiere leçon, puisqu’on peut apprendre la Tablature dans un moment: mais il n’en est pas de meme de la Musique.... I’ay toujours donné indifferemment l’une ou l’autre, suivant l’inclination des personnes que j’ay eu l’honneur d’enseigner.*

479 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 9: *Il entre icy en raillerie contre les quatre sortes de Manches que j’ay donné, & la maniere dont il en parle me seroit presque croire qu’il brigue le poste de feu Dominique;* trans. M. van der Beken. I am unable to locate any information on the late Dominique.

480 Rousseau, *Traité*, 40-41: *La premiere Figure est un Manche Diatonique, qui contient seulement l’odre des degrez naturels, & les Unissons doubles. La seconde Figure est un Manche Harmonique, c’est à dire composé de Diatonique & de Chromatique, qui contient l’odre des degrez naturels avec leurs feintes, & les Unissons doubles & simples qui sont dans l’estendué des sept Touches. La Troisième Figure est un Manche Chromatique, c’est à dire qui contient l’odre des degrez naturels avec leurs feintes, & les Tons transposez les plus recherchez avec les Unissons doubles & simples dans toute l’estendué du Diapazon de...*
These diagrams may be described as a “fingering chart”, so that a learner can see where all the notes on the viol lie. In order to prove the usefulness of this system, Rousseau’s challenges De Machy:

In any event I challenge him [De Machy] to perform a very simple piece of music which I shall present to him and which will not be of my making, without having recourse to these necks that he calls trifle; a great number of people who are using them with pleasure and effectiveness are not of his opinion.  

This challenge is unconvincing, as it is quite inconceivable that a master like De Machy would require such charts. After all, these charts were devised for beginners of the viol. Despite this, Rousseau asserts that “a great number of people who are using them with pleasure and effectiveness”.

Rousseau’s Aversion to Plucked Instruments

De Machy advocated the plucking the of he viol in his *Pièces de Violle*. Rousseau, on the other hand, shows great aversion to this, as well as any suggestion of the practices of plucked instruments. With regard to De Machy’s criticism of Rousseau’s omission of this style of playing, Rousseau writes:

He [De Machy] says that I have not talked of plucking the viol, I did not think I had to do so, because it is not in playing that it is used and it should not be, I admit that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe is admired

---

481 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 9: quoy qu’il en soit je le defie d’executer une Pièce de Musique toute simple que je lay presenteray & qui ne sera pas de ma façon, sans avoir recours à ces Manches qu’il traite de bagatelle; Un grande nombre de personne qui s’en servent avec plaisir & utilité n’en parlent pas de mesme; trans. M. van der Beken.

482 Sieur de Machy, *Pièces de Violle*, 1: Pour satisfaire aussi à la curiosité de quelques-uns qui sont en doute si l’on doit preferer la Tablature à la Musique, pour apprendre à jouër de cet Instrument, je dis que l’on peut jouër de la Violle de trois manieres, aussi bien que du Tuorbe & du Clavessin. On peut pareillement la pincer; ce qui pourrait passer pour une quatrième.
The ability to play both viols and plucked instruments was a skill universal amongst violists. It is unsurprising that such a practice, the plucking of the viol, would naturally develop. Even Sainte Colombe was well known for it.

However, the reason why Rousseau denounces this method of playing is clear: it reveals the viol to be similar to a plucked instrument. Because much of his ideas on technique on the viol are based on the theory that viols and plucked instruments developed separately, to advocate this style of playing would be an admission of their potential technical similarities, thus, weakening his arguments for his *port de main*, the practice of reading from tablature and the use of the viol as a harmony instrument, and thereby giving credit to the “plucking masters”.

**Rousseau Defends the Playing of Accompaniment**

Rousseau’s explanation of the “playing of accompaniment” on the viol seems to have been condemned by De Machy:

He [De Machy] makes all these efforts to destroy the playing of accompaniment, calling it a rough play, without spirit, graceless, and that one can practice with one finger only as he told several people; but if his friends who gang with him were willing to talk in good faith, they would well and truly say the reason why the pamphlet's author has to talk like that of the playing of accompaniment.  

---

483 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 9: *Il dit que je n’ay point parlé de pincer la Viole, je n’ay pas cru le devoir faire, parce que ce n’est pas un jeu de la Viole qui soit en usage & qui n’y doit pas estre, j’avoué que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe s’y fait admirer, mais c’est un divertissement particulier qu’il se donne par l’usage qu’il a des Instrumens à pincer*; trans. M. van der Beken.

484 Ibid., 9: *Il fait tous ces efforts pour détruire le jeu de l’Accompagnement, le traitant d’un jeu grossier, sans esprit, ingrât, & que l’on peut pratiquer avec un doigt seulement comme il l’a dit à plusieurs personnes; Mais si ses amis qui sont Cabale avec luy vouloient parler de bonne foi, ils diroient bien la raison qui oblige l’Auteur du Libelle de parler ainsi du jeu de l’Accompagnement*; trans. M. van der Beken.
It is revealed that De Machy’s “clique” is also in the same opinion as he is. However, the information that we need to decide Rousseau’s credibility is missing, as he makes no defence for his purported style of playing. Instead, he accuses De Machy’s “clique” of dishonesty in this matter.

It seems De Machy made an example of the harpsichordist Jacques Champion (1601/2-1672), also known as the Sieur de Chambonnières. De Machy explains how Chambonnières disliked accompaniment and even expressed an aversion to it. Rousseau gives his interpretation and reasoning:

In order to achieve his goal, he [De Machy] says that the late Monsieur de Chambonnières never wanted to accompany on the harpsichord and that he loathed accompaniment, I answer that the pamphlet's author does the same in the same spirit, for who does not know that Monsieur de Chambonnières did not know how to accompany, and that it was for that reason that he had to give up his responsibility at the King's and to make do with Monsieur d'Anglebert; and as regarding what he says of the late Monsieur Couperin it is not, and never has a knowledgeable man despised accompaniment, for everybody knows that one needs more science and spirit to accompany well than in playing of pièces, because the routine in pieces added to some natural disposition makes sometimes learners excel over their Masters.\(^{485}\)

Despite Rousseau’s detailed explanation, it appears incredible that Chambonnières, a court musician, would not have the knowledge or ability to accompany. While it seems De Machy’s explanation for Chambonnières’ reason for leaving the court would have been more plausible, scholars have generally accepted Rousseau’s statement, instead of De Machy’s, as truth. Fuller writes:

\(^{485}\) Ibid., 9: *Pour venir à bout de son dessein, il dit que feu Monsieur de Chambonnières ne voulait jamais accompagner sur le Clavecin & qu’il meprisait l’accompagnement, je répons que l’Auteur du Libelle en fait de mesme dans le mesme esprit, car qui est-ce qui ne sçait pas que Monsieur de Chambonnières ne sçavoit pas accompagner, & que ce fut pour ce sujet qu’il fut obligé de se deffaire de la charge qu’il avoit chez le Roy, & de s’en accomoder avec Monsieur d’Anglebert, & au regard de ce qu’il dit de feu Monsieur Couperin cela n’est pas, & jamais un homme sçavant n’a meprisé l’accompagnement, car tout le monde sçait qu’il faut plus de science & d’esprit pour bien accompagner que pour jouer de Pièces , parce que la routine dans les Pièces jointe à quelque disposition naturelle, fait quelque fois exceller les écoliers par dessus les Maistres;* trans. M. van der Beken.
The reason for Chambonnières’ retirement, often speculated upon, was uncovered by Lesure (1960) in a remark by the violist Jean Rousseau: ‘Who does not know that Monsieur de Chambonnières could not accompany [from a bass] and that it was because of this that he was obliged to resign his court position and come to an agreement with Monsieur d’Anglebert? … This was not the case with Monsieur [Louis] Couperin’. One can, however, readily sympathize with the refusal of the aging virtuoso to learn a new skill that, once laboriously acquired, would have stripped away the last shred of seigniorial illusion masking his status as a hired professional by reducing him to a cog in Lully’s orchestral machine.486

While it is conceivable that the practice of *basso continuo* in France during that time would have been relatively new,487 to claim that an established harpsichordist like Chambonnières would not have been able to learn a new skill is unconvincing.

However, recent research by Rebecca Cypess has better explained the situation. Cypess writes:

In any case, that accompaniment from a bass that would have been required of a musician in Chambonnières’s position is confirmed by the debate between Rousseau and de Machy. The apparently small difference between their opinion – the first, that Chambonnières did not know how to accompany from a bass in ensemble settings, and the second, that he disliked and therefore refused to do so – is in fact quite significant. Rousseau’s rhetorical insistence that his opinion was widely held – “car qui est-ce qui ne sçait pas” – belies the tenuous nature of his argument; after all, if everyone agreed with him, there would be little need to state his view so explicitly and emphatically. Indeed, it is de Machy’s theory – that Chambonnières disliked accompanying from a bass – that seems more likely. Rousseau’s claim that Chambonnières did no know how to accompany from a bass is dubious, not only because the skill would have been easy for a of Chambonnières’s talent to acquire, and not only because he is known to have founded and played in a small ensemble early in his career. If the reason for Chambonnières’s departure from court did indeed relate to the role of accompanist that was expect of one in his post, then the nature of his publications may serve as circumstantial evidence in support of the opinion of de Machy. … If de Machy is to be believed, then Chambonnières’s assertion of individuality of the harpsichordist was a modest act of rebellion…Chambonnières, perhaps in the manner of the temperamental artist, did not wish to be reduced to the role of accompanist.488

487 Chambonnières left the court on 23 October 1662.  
With this information in mind, coupled with other misleading aspects of Rousseau in writings, it seems more likely that Rousseau may have misrepresented Chambonnières in an attempt to support his views on the playing of accompaniment.

Even if Chambonnières did not possess the knowledge to accompany, which is highly unlikely, there is little gained from Rousseau’s information on Chambonnières and its consequences on accompaniment on the viol. The practice of accompaniment on the harpsichord refers to the playing of harmonies, especially the realisation of a figured or unfigured bass line, whereas accompaniment on the viol does not require this skill. The viol is simply a melodic bass instrument. Although the interaction between harmony instruments (harpsichord and theorbo) and the viol have been discussed in theoretical sources, there has been no mention of the viol playing harmonies in a chordal style in any of the French treatises. The practice of a realised bass part on the viol can be safely ruled out.\(^4\)

What Rousseau’s statement may suggest is that accompaniment, whether on the viol or harpsichord, was not a developed skill in France during his time. This does not have any direct implications for our knowledge of De Machy or viol playing. Rousseau further explains:

\[
\text{It is why, I say that each style of playing of the viol has its own merit, and that the one does not diminish the other in any way and that as far as accompaniment is concerned the pamphlet's author talks as a man who does not know about it and carries it out poorly; for me I appreciate it and rely on the skilled and the learned.}
\]

In an effort to justify accompaniment on the bass viol, Rousseau contradicts himself. If Rousseau was truly in the opinion that “each style of playing of the viol has its own merit”, he would have easily embraced the plucking of the viol, as well as other styles of playing as advocated by De Machy. As seen previously, he made no explanation for

this exclusion. Perhaps Rousseau’s decision was influenced by his dislike for all things associated with plucked instruments.

To further justify his abilities in the accompaniment style, Rousseau describes an occasion with a Parisian organist.

And I can even say that one of the skilled organists of Paris told me he was coming to the concert especially to hear my accompaniment, and even if there was no voice it would be his great pleasure to hear me accompany on my own; I do not report this in order to boast, but to show that all skilled people do not despise accompaniment, I shall not tell you the name of the organist, for if the pamphlet's author knew that, he would as soon say that he is an ignoramus and a man without taste.  

Like the previously mentioned “honest lute master”, Rousseau refuses to name the Parisian organist. Although we do not know who this organist is, it seems certain that opinions on his competency were not universally shared.

**Rousseau Justifies the *Traité***

Concerning Sainte Colombe and his opinion of Rousseau’s *Traité*, it appears that accounts from Rousseau and De Machy contradict one another:

The pamphlet's author [De Machy] then throws himself on the comment which comes after the Foreword of my book, where he says a number of things to which I already responded, I only stop at what he says that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe has not read my book, and that consequently he did not approve of it, and on the duel challenge about which I have already talked.  

---

490 Rousseau, *Réponse*, 9-10: Et je puis mesme dire qu'un des habiles Organistes de Paris m'a dit qu'il venoit au Concert particulièrement pour entendre mon Accompagnement, & quand mesme il n'y aurroit point de Voix il se seroit un grand plaisir de m'entendre Accompagner seul; je ne raporte pas cecy pour me vanter, mais pour faire voir que tous les habiles ne meprisent pas l'Accompagnement, je ne vous nommeray point l'Organiste, car si l'Auteur du Libelle scavoit cela, il diroit aussi tost que c'est un ignorant & un homme qui n' a pas le bon goit; trans. M. van der Beken.

491 Ibid., 10: L'Auteur du Libelle se jette aprés cela sur la remarque qui est aprés l'avant-propos de mon Livre, où il dit plusieurs choses ausquelles j'ay déja répondu, je n'arreste seulement sur ce qu'il dit que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe n'a pas lu mon Livre & par consequent qu'il ne l'a pas approuvé, & sur le cartel de defy dont j'ay déja parlé; trans. M. van der Beken.
This statement implies that De Machy and Sainte Colombe corresponded concerning Rousseau’s *Traité*, and Sainte Colombe had neither read it nor approved it. This is partly acknowledged by Rousseau:

I admit that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe did not read my book before it was in print, but it is true to say that it is me who read it in his presence before that time, and that I pointed to him all the places that create disagreement between the pamphlet's author and myself, and that he approved of them, because without that, I would not have been so arrogant as to thank him for his approval and to say so in public. Furthermore, if it was true that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe was in the state of mind the pamphlet's author is reporting, I would have a right to accuse him of ill will because he told me the contrary, but that would be making him a serious insult, to think of him in that way. 492

According to Rousseau, although he received approval from Sainte Colombe on the issues that were in conflict with De Machy’s, Sainte Colombe did not have the opportunity to read his book before it was published. Rousseau did, however, “read it in his presence”.

This account is a very strange one. It begs the question why Rousseau did not simply allow Sainte Colombe to read the unpublished *Traité* himself. This may suggest that Rousseau did not have intention for Sainte Colombe to read it or perhaps Sainte Colombe was unable to read it himself.

Also, as the issues in the *Traité* were discussed orally by Rousseau with Sainte Colombe, there is a possibility that in the process of transmission of information, discrepancies may have emerged. Rousseau does not acknowledge this, and instead accuses De Machy of misinformation, justifying this with Sainte Colombe’s supposed exemplary character.

492 Ibid., 10: *J’avoüe que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe n’a pas lû mon Livre devant qu’il fut imprimé, mais il est vray de dire que c’est moy qui l’ay lû en sa presence devant ce temps-la, & que je luy ay fait remarquer tous les endroits qui sont en dispute entre l’Auteur du Libelle & moy, & qu’il les a apprové, car sans cela je n’aurais pas esté assez temeraire pour le remercier de son aprobation & pour le dire en public. De plus s’il estoit vray que Monsieur de Sainte Colombe eut esté dans tous les sentimens que rapporte l’Auteur du Libelle, j’aurois droit de l’accuser de mauvaise foy parce qu’il m’a dit le contraire, mais ce seroit luy faire une grande injure, d’avoir cette pensée de luy;* trans. M. van der Beken.
Monsieur de Montalan’s Concert

At the concert of Monsieur de Montalan, Rousseau was invited to play after De Visé. Rousseau refused as he felt that it was part of a carefully planned ploy to embarrass him. Rousseau describes the events on the day:

I saw all the people of the clique gathering and letting all those who were not part of their group go, they were talking together and were taking their measures, I did not conceive what their design was, but Monsieur de Visé started to brief me about it by asking if I did not want to hear a sarabande he had composed on viol, which I accepted in good faith, he played two pieces and when they ended everybody got up and left, when Monsieur de Visé getting up said those words, do you want to play? To which I answered no.

He gives the following reasons for believing that he was part of a carefully planned ploy:

Because I could see it was something premeditated. Because there was an audience of only the clique and their friends. Because if Monsieur de Visé had the intention of encouraging me to play, honesty obliged him to present me with the viol to be the first to play, and finally because the compliment he gave me by simply saying “do you want to play?” appeared to me badly digested, and I was surprised to see a Court gentleman like him wanting to engage me to play in such a dishonest way.

There is little evidence in this testimony that proves of any wrongdoings by De Machy, the “clique” or De Visé. In fact, there is no mention of De Machy’s presence at the concert. Nonetheless, Rousseau portrays himself as the victim.

493 I am unable to locate information on M’. de Montalan. He was probably a wealthy patron of the arts who held concerts.
494 Rousseau, Réponse, 11: je vis tous les gens de la Cabale qui s’atrouperent & laissant sortir tous ceux qui n’en estoient pas, ils parloient ensemble & prenoient leurs mesures. je ne concevois pas quel estoit leur dessein, mais Monsieur de Visé commença de m’en instruire en me demandant si je ne voulais pas bien entendre une Sarabande qu’il avoit composé sur la Viole, ce que j’acceptay honnestement, il joüa deux Pièces lesquelles estoient finies le monde se leva & sortoit, lors que Monsieur de Visé en se levant me dit ces paroles, voulez-vous jouer? A quoy je répondis non; trans. M. van der Beken.
495 Ibid.: Parce que je voyois que c’estoit une chose premeditée. Parce qu’il n’y avoit pour auditeurs que la Cabale & leurs amis. Parce que si Monsieur de Visé avoit dessein de m’engager à joüer, l’honnesteté l’obligeoit de me presenter la Viole pour joüer le premier, & enfin parce que le compliment qu’il me fit en disant simplement, voulez-vous joüer? me parut mal digéré & je fus surpris devoir qu’un homme de Cour comme luy, me voulloit engager à joüer d’une manière si mal honneste; trans. M. van der Beken.
While we cannot be completely certain that De Machy did not mastermind this incident or that these events actually took place as recounted Rousseau, these words simply describe De Visé’s desire to hear Rousseau perform. It is possible to speculate that Rousseau was not expected to perform solo at these concerts, as he was engaged at Monsieur de Montalan’s concert as an accompanist. It does, however, seem incredible that the “clique” was involved in making the audience leave the concert.

It is suspicious why Rousseau should not oblige. Rousseau, having put himself on the line with his extremely outspoken Traité, must have surely expected some kind reaction from other musicians, whether it be amicable or not. In this instance, it was the desire of the musicians and their friends in attendance at the concert to hear the author perform. In this light, this should not have been an unreasonable request. Furthermore, Rousseau does not give us any musical reason why he should refuse, except for the situation appearing “premeditated” and De Visé’s words “badly digested”.

Rousseau is convinced that this situation was planned between De Visé and De Machy because of the “duel challenge” that Rousseau had sent to De Machy previously:

The pamphlet's author not knowing how to avoid the duel that was presented to him on my behalf in the presence of his students, thought Monsieur de Visé could help him preserve his honour, they conversed about it together and having recruited the lute Masters who are intriguing and all their friends.

Rousseau does not explain how he presumes that a scheme was devised between De Visé and De Machy, but makes a connection nevertheless. This account of events is a very strange one as it begs the question how Rousseau would have known

---

496 Ibid.: ils les firent trouver au Concert qui ce faisait en ce temps-la tous les Mardis chez Monsieur de Montalan, ou j’accompagne ordinairement.
497 Ibid.: L’Auteur du Libelle ne sçachant de quelle maniere se mettre à l’abry du Cartel qu’on lui avoit presenté de ma part en presence de ses écoliers, crut que Monsieur de Visé pouvoit aider à mettre son honneur à couvert, ils conceterent ensemble & ayant aposté les Maistres de Luth qui sont de la Cabale & tous leurs amis; trans. M. van der Beken.
about the scheme in such detail, yet allow himself to be involved in it. Furthermore, the
invitation to play was not initiated by De Machy, but De Visé. This also raises the
question why De Visé would be willing to be part of such a scheme should it affect his
reputation as a court gentleman.

Concerning the involvement between De Machy and De Visé, Rousseau merely
writes:

He [De Machy] quotes Monsieur de Visé and at the same time gives
a riddle.\textsuperscript{498}

Unfortunately, this riddle is contained in “De Machy’s reply”. It may have been an
insignificant comment, as Rousseau does not take issue with this. This comment simply
proves that De Machy was aware of the happenings at Monsieur de Montalan’s concert.
Because of the lack of information, we are unable to prove his involvement or any
possible scheming with De Visé.

**Rousseau Attacks De Machy**

Once more, while referring to De Machy in the *Réponse*, Rousseau makes a
personal attack on his character:

I now consider the moral reflections by which he concludes his
pamphlet, and I advise him to take them for himself. To not have
such a high esteem of himself, and to make more justice to others;
for that is the sole fault I find with him, and it is what brought him to
make a pamphlet to try to ruin me; remove that flaw from him, you
will find in him a very honest man: furthermore, if he wanted to
listen to my advice, it would be to part with the bad company who
flatters his passion and involves him in nasty businesses; he is right
to say he is only the writer of that work, for I recognise in it nobody
else but him.\textsuperscript{499}

\textsuperscript{498} Ibid: *Il cite Monsieur de Visé & donne en mesme temps une histoire à deviner*; trans. M. van der
Beken.

\textsuperscript{499} Ibid., 12: *Je passe aux reflexions morales, par lesquelles il conclut son Libelle, & je luy donne avis de
les prendre pour luy. De n’avoir pas une si haute esti meal de luy-mesme, & de render plus de Justice aux*
Rousseau contradicts himself in allowing himself to appear a victim of the situation, since it was the publication of his *Traité* that elicited a reply from De Machy. It was his initial attempt to discredit De Machy’s work, which was met with “De Machy’s reply”. Rousseau’s reference to the “bad company who flatters his passion and involves him in nasty businesses” is an attack towards De Machy’s “clique”, which probably includes violists, theorist, guitarists and lutenists; perhaps even De Visé.

Before concluding the *Réponse*, Rousseau makes the most blatant reference to De Machy:

Truly, Sir, I cannot help myself, before ending this response, to tell you that I am significantly touched by the pain that my treatise of viol inflicts on Monsieur M. and that, had I foreseen what happened, I would never have touched on his rules; but who could have known that he would have reacted with such a fit of anger?

In airing his grievances, Rousseau has finally referred to De Machy with “Monsieur M”. Despite earlier explanations concerning the pamphlet’s author, he has taken this risk and admitted to his readers that he has always referred to the “author of the pamphlet” as the “author of the preface”, namely De Machy.

Strangely, despite the many reference to De Machy in his *Traité*, Rousseau asserts the opinion that his actions were justified and did not deserve the adverse reaction that of De Machy. Unlike De Machy’s *avertissement*, which was directed to the public, Rousseau’s *Traité* was specifically directed towards De Machy, which is almost definitely what provoked a response.

---

autres; car c’est le seul défaut que je trouve en luy, & c’est ce qui l’a porté à faire un Libelle pour tâcher de me détruire: Oftez luy ce défaut, vous trouverez en luy un tres-honneste homme: De plus, s’il vouloit écouter mon conseil, ce seroit de se separer des mauvaises Compagnies qui flattent sa passion, & qui l’engagent dans de méchantes affaires; Il a raison de dire qu’il n’est que l’Ecrivain de cet Ouvrage, car j’y reconnois d’autres gens que luy; trans. M. van der Beken.

500 Ibid., 13: *En verité, Monsieur, je ne puis m’empêcher, avant que de finir cette réponce, de vous dire que je suis sensiblement touché de la peine que mon Traité de Viole fait à Monsieur M. & que si j’avois prévu ce qui en est arrivé, je n’aurois jamais touché à ses Regles :Mais qui auroit cru qu’il en eut du venir à de si grands emportemens?;* trans. M. van der Beken.
Conclusion

While the quarrel between De Machy and Rousseau is an argument concerning the different aspects of viol technique and style, it can also be considered a form competitive advertising. After all, their livelihoods were dependent on the sales of their publications as well as their ability to attract students. Failure to do this could have been detrimental to their livelihoods and long-term success as violists.

Although De Machy’s *avertissement* was addressed to the public, Rousseau took it upon himself to criticise De Machy in his *Traité*. In doing so, Rousseau may have implicated himself, allowing himself to appear to possess some of the deficiencies in knowledge concerning the issues raised in De Machy’s *avertissement*.

Rousseau’s preference for melodic pieces reveals his ignorance of the harmonic style, which was prevalent throughout the English style of viol playing. In his *Traité*, he attempts to misrepresents De Machy’s words in the *avertissement* in an effort to promote his ideas on the melodic style. Similarly, the topic of the *tenuès* is in De Machy’s *avertissement* is misinterpreted. Rousseau refers to De Machy’s instructions on chords to denounce his ideas on *tenuès*.

De Machy’s reply outlines the issues that De Machy may have brought up; however, the fact that it was transmitted through a secondary source, Rousseau’s “friend”, and that it was written from Rousseau’s perspective, leaves us in the dark concerning the true nature of De Machy’s reply.

Much of the *Réponse* that has not been mentioned concerns the alleged insults that De Machy directed towards Rousseau, as well as the rationale and defence behind Rousseau’s arguments, most of which have no relation to music or viol playing.

Rousseau’s *Réponse* is written in a style that makes him appear as an innocent victim of an unprovoked argument. He even goes so far as to compare De Machy to Pilate, something that might resonate with his predominantly Christian readers. As in
the Traité, he takes advantage of religious rhetoric, while quoting from the Latin Bible, giving himself credibility in his Réponse. He also quotes from the Roman rhetorician, Quintilian, possibly with the intent of appearing learned.

As seen in this analysis, much of the information in the Réponse is questionable. For example, the issue of the ports de main, which is one of the main topics of debate, is explained in every possible way, except in its musical relevance. Rousseau’s explanation entirely depends on the reputations of other violists and their supposed point of view. This is analogous to other efforts in the Traité, where he simply aligns his views with influential and reputable authors.

Similarly, the question of the viols relative success as a melody or harmony instrument is given a similar treatment by Rousseau as he mentions Marais, Meliton and other “skilled Masters” in defence. Also, he continuously reiterates the point that viols and plucked instruments were unrelated organologically. This reveals Rousseau’s lack of understanding and knowledge of the viol and its repertory, suggesting that Rousseau was not a true master of his instrument.

There are also some very strange accounts from Rousseau, where he admits De Machy’s claim, but gives an unsatisfactory explanation. For example, when De Machy claims that Rousseau confessed that he did not know how to play harmonic pieces, Rousseau explains that he has gained skill from the 10 years of work he has assigned himself while in Paris.

Rousseau refers to Hotman many times in his argument; however, it is almost certain that these accounts bear no truth. It is very unlikely that he ever met Hotman, as he had been dead for 13 years by the time Rousseau had come to Paris. Rousseau even erroneously cites information concerning Hotman from De Machy’s avertissement.
Rousseau also refers to many famous people in his Réponse, but strangely does not name some of them, such as the honest lute master, the Parisian organist and the certain “skilled Masters”.

Rousseau’s invention of the technique of *tenuës de bien-séance* and his later explanation for its use demonstrates his lack of conviction in his ideas on technique. His misreading of De Machy’s instructions concerning the *tenuës*, whether intentional or not, exemplifies the careless approach that permeates his writings.

Rousseau’s aversion to players of plucked instruments is a difficult one to understand, as almost every viol player that has been discussed in this thesis is also a player of plucked instruments. The connection between both instruments is an obvious one, yet Rousseau is obstinate on this point. This provokes us to question the quality of Rousseau’s initial education as a violist.

Thus, Rousseau’s efforts to criticise the works of De Machy appear overly trivial. Although Rousseau may have detected a few consecutive octaves in the harmony of De Machy’s compositions, these situations are isolated. Likewise, the lack of a few *tenuë* markings in prints of De Machy’s music is of little consequence. As *tenuës* are part of standard technique, an experienced violist would almost instinctively do a one in these cases.

The supposed unpleasantness at Monsieur de Montalan’s concert may indicate that many violists other than De Machy were probably quite displeased with Rousseau. While we cannot be sure if the events at Monsieur de Montalan’s concert happened as described by Rousseau, it suggests that other musicians were also intent on scrutinising the abilities of the author of the Traité.

On the other hand, De Visé’s supposed scheming with De Machy may indicate that he was one of De Machy’s followers. If this were the case, it shows that De Machy may have had his fair share of reputable supporters.
As we do not have more information concerning the resolution of this quarrel, it is uncertain who the true victor was at the time. Because the stylistic preference of the day tended to favour melodic pieces and Sainte Colombe’s *port de main*, it has become widely accepted nowadays that Rousseau was the victor. This view is simplistic because it only takes into account one school of viol playing, one which was led by Sainte Colombe, Marais and their students. Unfortunately, we have little information concerning the attitudes of other violists of the day, particularly those that do not have any connection with Marais. Perhaps it is only through the practical execution of these different techniques as described by De Machy that we will truly understand them.
Chapter 6

De Machy’s Two *Ports de main*

The argument between De Machy and Rousseau can be seen as one of the earliest efforts by violists to develop a universal standard on viol technique in France. It is unsurprising that immediately after De Machy’s initial effort in his publication of the *Pièces de Violle* that we see the appearance of the treatises by Rousseau and Danoville, published only two years later in 1687. Marais’ also included short *avertissements* in his *pièces de violes*, which gave basic instruction to players, mainly in notation, fingering, bowing and ornamentation.

The demand for viol literature during the late 1680s seemed to reflect the steady growth of viol playing in France, which appears to have been dominated by a school of violists with connections to Sainte Colombe. Although this may suggest that the ideas advocated by Rousseau in his *Traité* gained favour throughout the general public, it is unlikely that followers of De Machy - especially those of his “clique” - were so easily swayed. Apart from the musicians mentioned in Rousseau’s *Réponse*, we are left in the dark concerning the activities of De Machy’s followers as we have almost no information concerning them.

In this chapter, it is my intention to explore the central issue of the argument between De Machy and Rousseau: the *ports de main*. By examining other historical writings, I hope to uncover the reasons for De Machy different viewpoint from Rousseau’s. Based on my practical experimentation, I hope to elucidate the different physical actions as described in his book. With a broader scope of historical and practical knowledge, the topic of the *port de main* will be discussed.
Left Hand Positions on the Viol

De Machy was aware of the practices of many foreign violists and possibly managed to copy their music or acquire their books. Concerning the use of tablature, De Machy states:

The Italians, Germans, Poles, Swedes, Danes & English have always followed this maxim; & the illustrious Monsieur Hautemant [sic] also used it for teaching, as can be proved by several pieces written in his hand, in Paris & elsewhere…. In regard to tenuës, if one examines the pieces of foreign authors, which are famous, one will see that they are indeed observed there; and therefore it should not pass for a novelty.  

It is possible that De Machy came across the work of the English violist Christopher Simpson. The Division-Violist, or An Introduction to the Playing upon a Ground, is considered to have been one of the most influential viol treatises of its day. First published in 1659, its success saw it reprinted in 1665 in an expanded bilingual version in English and Latin.

Simpson was greatly admired by many of his contemporaries. The first edition included a collection of poems by the most established musicians of the day: Charles Colman (d.1664), John Jenkins (1592-1678) and Matthew Locke (c.1621-1677). It is in Simpson’s treatise that we see the first mention of the position of the left hand’s thumb, being behind the first finger.

When you are to set your fingers upon the Strings, you must not grasp the Neck of your Viol, like Violin; but rather (as those that Play on the Lute) keep your Thumb on the back of the Neck,

---

501 Sieur de Machy, 3: *Les Italiens, les Allemans, les Polonois, les Suedois, les Danois & les Anglois ont toujours suivi cette maxime; & l’illustre Monsieur Hautemant s’en servoit aussi pour enseigner, comme on le peut justifier par plusieurs pieces écrites de sa main, qui se trouvent à Paris & ailleurs; Sieur de Machy*, 6: *Pour ce qui est des tenuës, si l’on examine les Pieces de Autheurs étrangers qui ont esté fameux, l’on verra qu’elles y sont bien marquées, & que par consequent cela ne doit pas passer pour une nouveauté.*

opposite to your fore-finger; so as your hand may have liberty to remove up and down, as occasion shall require.\textsuperscript{503}

This refers to the first \textit{port de main}, as was previous discussed, by De Machy.\textsuperscript{504}

Another English source, John Playford, states in his \textit{An Introduction to the Skill of Musick} (1674):

\begin{quote}
In the posture of your Left-Hand, observe this Rule: Place your Thumb on the back of the Neck, and opposite to the Fore-Finger.\textsuperscript{505}
\end{quote}

Playford’s instructions represent a summary of those of Simpson’s; however, Playford mentions treble and tenor viols, while Simpson does not. Other English publications, such as Thomas Mace’s \textit{Musick’s Monument} (1676), also use Simpson’s treatise as a model for their ideas on viol technique. Although Mace’s observations represent a slightly different account of viol technique, he expresses his admiration for Simpson and acknowledges Simpson’s contribution in his book. He writes:

\begin{quote}
The Viol is an Instrument, so very much in use, and so many Profess’d Teachers upon It, that It may seem Impertinent to give Directions concerning It; especially since that Excellent Master, Mr. Christopher Simpson, has done It so very well already.\textsuperscript{506}
\end{quote}

As there is no contradictory information concerning this in all the other English treatises, we can safely conclude that Simpson’s left hand technique was universally accepted and practised by all violists during this time. This is significant, as the practice of playing the viol unaccompanied was predominantly an English one, which likely influenced violists in France.

\textsuperscript{503} Christopher Simpson, \textit{The Division-Viol or the Art of Playing Extempore Upon a Ground} (London, 1665), 4.
\textsuperscript{504} See chapter 2 on “De Machy”.
\textsuperscript{505} John Playford, \textit{A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick} (London: 1674), 101.
\textsuperscript{506} Thomas Mace, \textit{Musick’s Monument} (London, 1676), 247.
Left Hand Positions on the Lute

Admittedly, there are not any other examples of violists writing about the left hand position until De Machy. This could be seen as a sign of general acceptance of the left hand technique prior to the onset of the ideas by De Machy and Sainte Colombe. There are, however, some writings on the lute that do mention the left hand thumb position on the lute.

While one can argue that the left hand position of the lute should have no relevance to the viol, the fretted fingerboard of both instruments suggests that its technique should be similar, if not the same. Most of the information that is presented in the Réponse that is allegedly derived from De Machy alludes to this fact. It is also important to remember that almost all French violists of the period were also players of plucked instruments.

Probably the earliest existing method that discusses the left hand position on the lute is Thomas Robinsons’ Schoole of Musicke. He writes:

First sitting upright with your body, leane the edge of the Lute against the table, and your bodie against the Lute, not too hard for hurting your Lute, neither too softly for letting of it fall, for the table, your bodie, and your right arme, must so poyes the Lute, that you have your left hand at libertie to carie to, and fro, at your pleasure, letting the middle part of the neck of the Lute, slide up and down the brawne of the thumb which is against the nayle of the said thumb, houlding out the wrest of the hand, and alwaies carrying your thumb against your forefinger in any stop whatsoever, for so shall your hand be the more comelie, the more readie, and with the more ease, stop any stop the cleaner….

In this situation, there is a strong parallel to De Machy’s first port de main, and an explanation of the reasoning for the thumb’s position is given.

The Burwell lute tutor explains:

507 See chapter 5 on “Rousseau Refutes the Knowledge of the Lute Masters”.
For the left hand the posture of it is more difficult. The Thumbe must be placed vnder the Necke of the Lute betwenee the forefinger and the middle finger and betwenee the brimme of the necke and the middle of it, walking with the hand vpp and dowe the necke of the Lute soe that the hand be lifted vpp and thrusted by the wrist in the forme of an Arche. And therein consiste the grace of the hand.  

It appears the author has given a compromise position for the thumb. This corresponds to neither of the *ports de main* of De Machy.

Mersenne, writing about the lute, describes the position of the thumb as follows:

Now so that one may play entirely with this liberty, which consists of the position of the left hand and of exercise, the thumb must be placed above the first fret close to the end of the fingerboard on the side of the treble string, in such a way that its tip is placed on the said fret and turned toward the head of the lute.  

While Mersenne does not refer to the thumb opposing the first finger, it is clear that the position described presumes the left hand is in the position to play on the first fret.

A manuscript, from an early eighteenth-century Swedish source, states:

The left hand shall be kept so that the thumb only is placed at the very bottom of the neck opposite the treble string. The other fingers shall be placed on the fingerboard in a semicircular shape, well separated from one another. The fingers shall never be lifted much above the strings when they are moved from one stop or position to another. It is much easier to play when the fingers are close to the strings. The thumb shall always be placed on the neck opposite the index finger on the fingerboard. When the index finger moves the thumb follows. The thumb shall never be placed on the bass side of the neck, but always on the treble side. The playing will then become more beautiful and easier.

---

509 Dart, “Miss Mary Burwell’s”, 23.
It is clear that, even at this late date, the position of the first *port de main* was preferred to any other on the lute.

Modern Examples of Left Hand Technique

In recent times, there have been a number of instructional books and methods written for violists. *Play the Viol* by Alison Crum is arguably the most well known book for this purpose. While this book does well in explaining most of the rudimentary issues concerning viol playing, it does not discuss the left hand position in detail. Crum adopts Sainte Colombe’s approach:

> Place your thumb opposite the second (middle) finger and lightly grip the fingerboard on the third string just behind the third fret, that is on the side nearest the nut. Your thumb should rest gently no more than half-way across the neck and the second finger should be arched and parallel to the frets.\(^{512}\)

Although Crum does not make an explanation for her decision, this highlights the general unquestioned adherence to Sainte Colombe’s *port de main* amongst modern violists.

Margaret Panofsky’s *Bass Viol Technique* is a far more concise manual for violists. It contains many examples and exercises for both the left and right hand. However, it does not include any historical information. Concerning the position of the left hand, Panofsky explains:

> The hand is placed in the first position with the first finger at the second fret, with the fourth finger at the fifth fret, and with the middle fingers held down between them. The thumb, held straight and on its inner side, is placed lightly behind the neck, opposite the second finger, just below the third fret.\(^{513}\)

---


Clearly, there is a strong adherence to Sainte Colombe’s *port de main*. Throughout the rest of her book, she reiterates the thumb’s position, but provides no explanation for it. Martha Bishop’s *Viola da Gamba Method* prefers a more diplomatic approach. Instead of advocating one position for the left hand, Bishop explains:

> Because there are so many approaches to bowing and left hand technique, I have purposefully avoided saying anything which would contradict another teacher’s approach. Instead I have given a basically chronological listing of translations from original sources on fingering and bowing techniques.\(^{514}\)

The listing of historical sources in Bishop’s method includes the instruction by De Machy as well as that of Playford. Bishop confirms that this information is corroborated by Simpson, Mace and Mersenne (on the lute). As discussed earlier, all these authors favour the position that is described as De Machy’s first *port de main*. Information on the other *port de main*, the one favoured by Sainte Colombe and his followers, is cited from Danoville’s *L’art de toucher le dessus et basse de Viole* (1687). Bishop states this advice is corroborated by Rousseau.

> While Bishop’s method gives us a clear summary of the different techniques used by historical violists, the lack of a deeper explanation of both left hand techniques leaves us in the dark concerning the usefulness of both techniques from the point of view of a modern student violist.

> The *Golden Viol* by Grace Feldman is one of few instructional books that suggest the use of the first *port de main*. Feldman writes:

> Curve the thumb so that it contacts the neck of the viol where the corner of the thumbnail touches the pad. Make a circle with your index finger and your thumb. Where the finger touches the thumb is the proper place of contact. Its normal position in on the same fret level as the finger or, for some players, a little further up the neck, between the first and second fingers.\(^{515}\)


However, Feldman appears not to be definite about the exactness of the position of the thumb, which makes her advice on the position of the thumb one of arbitrary choice.

The most recent explanation for the left hand technique appears in *The Viol* by Otterstedt. She explains:

> I think the reason for this development is to be sought in the increasing use of the stretched position (i.e. the hand covering five frets instead of four, with the forefinger stretched out), of which Demachy and Marais made ample use, whereas it is rare in Simpson (in descending scales), and there is only one place in Ganassi where it is clearly needed (in *Lettione seconda*, ‘Recercar primo’ has double stops at the end which require streches).  

Although Otterstedt’s explanation is entirely plausible, she makes it clear that extensions on the viol had always existed despite the lack of a discussion of the second *port de main* in historical sources. This highlights the importance and usefulness of the first *port de main*, since it was clearly described and utilised in spite of the need to perform extensions on the viol.

**Conclusion**

While there appears to be a strong preference for the Sainte Colombe’s *port de main* in modern tutors, there is certainly no true consensus amongst modern violists. This perhaps highlights the fact that this technique might not be an issue amongst modern violists.

Despite the strong historical evidence advocating an overall preference for the first *port de main*, Sainte Colombe and his successors seem to have completely disregarded this. One is inclined to wonder how a well-established technique, and one

---

516 Otterstedt, 208.
517 It is physically impossible to make an extension without the thumb opposing the second finger.
that allowed so many violists and lutenists of the past to achieve so much, could become so easily abandoned.

The adherence of the later historical violists to Sainte Colombe’s *port de main* has resulted in the overall acceptance of this technique amongst most modern violists. While this technique has been useful in performing much of the later French viol repertory, the lack of attention towards the practices of earlier violists has resulted in present-day violists losing this technique. The next section of this thesis will discuss De Machy’s *ports de main* and attempt to explain the advantages of its use.

**A Possible Explanation**

Through my personal practical experience of De Machy’s *pièces* as well as the French viol and theorbo repertory, I will attempt to explain the possible reasons of the two differing *ports de main*, hopefully clarifying the issue.

*Fig. 60* A relaxed hand position.

It can be observed in figure 60 that the thumb and index finger lie across each other when the hand is at rest. This is the most natural position, as it requires no effort. This more relaxed position is similar to the first *port de main* (Fig. 61). One should experience no strain in placing one’s fingers chromatically upon the frets. This can be said to be a possible rationale for De Machy’s first *port de main*. 

As for the second *port de main*, De Machy explains that it is required during an extension, i.e. when extending the interval between the first (index finger) and the fourth (little finger) finger. This physical action usually affects the first finger, extending backwards, towards a lower fret. However, one may also allow the first finger to remain while extending the rest of the hand. During an extension, it is physically impossible to stretch the index finger backwards while keeping the thumb across it. In fact, as one extends, the thumb naturally moves, opposing the second finger (middle finger). This is similar to the *port de main* as invented by Sainte Colombe and used by his students (Fig. 62); however, it is not the same as De Machy’s second *port de main*. 
De Machy gives us further information concerning his second port de main:

And for the second [port de main], where one must extend it [the hand], it is necessary to place the thumb closer to the edge of the neck, the second finger opposite the thumb, with the first finger more extended, unless a chord makes it necessary to have it rounded; the wrist in this position is not as round as in the first [port de main]: For the elbow, it should be against the hip….\(^{518}\)

What this describes is not a simple extension, but a very dramatic physical action (Fig. 63). This is also witnessed by Rousseau.\(^{519}\)

---

\(^{518}\) Sieur de Machy, 5: *Et pour le second qui est celui où on la doit étendre, il faut placer le poulce plus au bord du manche, le second doigt à l'opposite du poulsce, le premier doigt plus étendu, à moins que quelque accord n'oblige de l'avoir en rond; le poignet dans cette position ne doit pas estre si en rond que dans le premier: Pour le coude, il faut qu'il soit contre la hanche.*

\(^{519}\) See chapter 5 on “De Machy Executes the two Ports de main”.
This strongly suggests that De Machy owned a large viol, which would require a far greater stretch for extensions. Although we do not have information on the kind of viol De Machy owned, we do know that there existed bass viols of different sizes. In a letter to Prince Friedrich Wilhelm of Prussia, Jean-Baptiste Forqueray describes how his father used two sorts of bass viol, “one for pieces, and the other for accompaniment”.\(^{520}\)

This evidence supports our observations on surviving historical French instruments, which fall into two distinct sizes. Smaller viols have vibrating string lengths of about 68 cm, while larger ones are around 73 cm.

De Machy may have owned one of these larger viols. It is certain that the luthier, Colichon, whom De Machy was in contact with, made viols in these different sizes. A study of Colichon’s remaining bass viols by Dietrich Kessler reveals that Colichon made bass viols with a small or large body.\(^{521}\)

There is also a possibility that De Machy may have been a small man with a short left hand stretch. Although we have no evidence for fact, this remains the other only logical explanation for the necessity of the second port de main. The second port


\(^{521}\) Dietrich Kessler, "A Seven-string Bass Viol by Michel Colichon," Journal of the Viola da Gamba Society of America 19 (1990): 55-56. Of the six remaining Colichon bass viols in museum collections, three are small (c. 67cm body size) and three are large (c. 70cm body size).
*de main* would be absolutely necessary for a violist who did not have sufficient stretch in executing extensions.

Another explanation for the use of the first *port de main* is the ease of executing chords in this position. Because of the chordal nature of De Machy’s writing, it is physically more natural for the thumb to remain behind the first finger during these instances.

Fig. 64 De Machy, *Pièces de Vielle, Prelude*, first book, page 15, 1st stave.

![Prelude](image)

Fig. 65 Chord of A major.

The above hand shape (Fig. 65) is required for the final A major chord on the stave (Fig. 64). If the thumb is held under the second finger, an enormous strain on the hand is created.

Another explanation for the use of the first *port de main* concerns the use of the fourth finger. When the thumb is placed under the first finger, there is greater leverage, allowing more strength and pressure on the other fingers. This is especially noticeable on the weaker fingers, such as the third and fourth fingers. This strength is required
throughout the music, owing to the chordal style of the solo viol writing, which is possibly influenced by theorbo fingering technique.

When a chromatic fingering on the theorbo is not possible, a compressed fingering scheme is required, especially with instruments of very long string lengths (>80cms). Because of this, the fourth finger is almost exclusively used, instead of the third finger. The resulting strength using the first port de main allows greater facility and dexterity. This is especially noted with ornamentation using the fourth finger, something extremely prevalent in music for both viols and plucked instruments.

Fig. 66 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, Allemande, first book, page 17, bar 1-4.

![Fig. 66](image)

Fig. 67 A common contracted hand shape.

A contracted hand shape is used regularly in De Machy’s music (Fig. 67). This is required in performing most of this allemande (Fig. 66), e.g. the last 2 double stops in bar 1, the last chord in bar 2, the first double stop in bar 3 and the first double stop in bar 4, forcing the hand to remain in this contracted position for most of the time. All of these situations require the fourth finger to be swift in executing the ornament. The
ornaments on the 3rd and 4th beats of bar 4 also require the use of the fourth finger to execute the ornament. This example clearly demonstrates the importance of the fourth finger in performing De Machy’s music.

Conclusion

The explanation of De Machy’s intentions through these images clearly illustrate that the techniques advocated in the Pièces de Violle were devised by a man who was a true master of the viol. Despite the rejection of these ideas by some violists of the past and present, its practical use in viol playing is evident. De Machy’s contribution on this issue is invaluable towards present day viol playing, giving us a better understanding in the techniques available to violists of De Machy’s time.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

The clear bias against De Machy of some modern writers reflects the influence of the words of Rousseau in his *Traité* and *Réponse*. Because of this, many of the special and interesting qualities, specific to De Machy’s music alone, seem to have been disregarded. This attitude of modern writers also reflects on the way original sources are sometimes treated. With regard to the works of De Machy, there is a sense that much of the information has been taken at face value, without considering the biases and historical circumstances that early writers, like Rousseau, may also have had.

This reinforces the importance of having a thorough understanding of the history of the viol, especially in the context of the music in which it was created. So often, solo viol music by other composers is overshadowed by the *Pièces de viole* of Marais. It is sometimes forgotten that his predecessors, including De Machy, also played an important role in the development of the viol.

Hotman, who appears to be the initiator of the French style of viol playing, is probably the most important viol teacher of the time. His efforts in nurturing the talents of De Machy and Sainte Colombe have produced wonderful works from these composers, not to mention the effect his two students had on the development of viol playing in France.

In addition, Dubuisson has been largely an underrated violist. His negative portrayal by Rousseau in the *Réponse* is contradicted by the reputation he may have had amongst his contemporaries, as reported by Le Gallois. Much of the music that remains by him suggests nothing of his inadequacies. His contribution towards the viol repertory is invaluable, especially in the development of the “classical” suite form.
While Marais was arguably the most successful violist in his time, his humble beginnings as a viol composer is overlooked by the universal acclaim that he later enjoyed throughout Western Europe in the Baroque era. With the small press runs of publishers at the time, it is unlikely that Marais *Pièces à une et à deux violes* were initially met with the widespread favourable response and demand that his later publications had.

Close analysis of Rousseau’s *Traité* and *Réponse* has shed new light on Rousseau’s abilities and character. Although there is little information on the abilities of Rousseau a violist, he was probably was not a performer of the calibre of De Machy. Antoine Forqueray, and his son Jean-Baptiste, may have been the last few exponents of the harmonic style in France. Fortunately, glimpses of unaccompanied music, written in a later style of music (that of the later French Baroque), can be appreciated in the *Pièces de viole* published by Jean-Baptiste Forqueray. Their insistence in performing and composing in the harmonic style must have partly been influenced by the strong solo viol tradition in France of which they surely were aware.

Sainte Colombe *le fils* is the last composer to every publish viol music in this French harmonic style. Although his music was probably old-fashioned by the time, the appearance of other pieces from violists like Dubuisson and De Machy alongside Sainte Colombe *le fils’* pieces in manuscript (MS A 27) clearly show that solo music of this style was still in favour amongst some violists.

The solo viol tradition also owes much to the lute, especially regarding the practice of ornamentation. The developments in ornamentation on the viol were probably influenced by the ornaments that these violists, who also played plucked instruments, produced on their lutes and theorbos. These effects, when transferred to the viol, allowed the viol to achieve the same level of expressive playing that is characterised by many of the French lute and theorbo works of the time. De Machy’s
attempt at transferring this language of ornamentation to the viol represents the first
published attempt at a codified system for ornaments for the viol, which was a system
used on the instrument throughout the Baroque era. Such an innovation by De Machy
was certainly a revolution for the viol.

   It is hoped that the analysis of Rousseau’s Traité and Réponse have provided a
better understanding of the events that involved both him and De Machy during the late
seventeenth century. Rousseau’s attempt in discussing the origins on the viol in his
Dissertation highlights its unreliability as a source of factual information. His
propensity to use the words of other as his own in an effort to appear credible is
analogous to his attempt in the Réponse to associate and align himself with his teacher
Sainte Colombe. While this may have been adequate justification for Rousseau, it begs
the question why a musical explanation could not be provided, and more importantly,
why present-day scholars and violists have continued to rely on Rousseau as the only
credible source regarding De Machy.

   Rousseau’s attempts in the Réponse to discredit De Machy seem to rely on the
notion that the viol did not develop for plucked instruments. Therefore, anything that
shares similar practices with the lute, such as the use of the first port de main, reading
from tablature or playing in the harmonic style is viewed unfavourably by Rousseau.

   It appears Rousseau was so intent on discrediting De Machy that he may have
been intentionally misrepresenting information from his avertissement. An alternative
explanation for this would be Rousseau’s inability to interpret De Machy’s writings
because he was not sufficiently literate. While this suggestion may appear far-fetched,
it partly explains why Rousseau’s Réponse may have required the involvement of one
of his friends to warn him about Machy’s reply. It may also explain why it may have
been published by his friend.
The Réponse also provides many anecdotes that are explained in very peculiar ways. Many of the accusations by De Machy are not refuted on their own merits. They are instead deflected to other rationalisations.

Although much of the information in Rousseau’s Traité and Réponse is questionable, they are the only existing source of historical information on De Machy other than his Pièces de Violle and avertissement. The very fact that the information about De Machy appears in such an unreliable secondary source as Rousseau’s documents should be a clear sign to present-day violists and scholars that these cannot be relied upon for information about him. Unfortunately, much of the information in these documents have been taken at face value, seriously tarnishing the historical reputation of De Machy.

Although we have historical information concerning the techniques used by historical violists such as the ports de main, the practical usage of these techniques in present-day performance can never be exactly recreated. Unlike instrumentalists of the violin family, violists do not possess the privilege of an unbroken tradition of viol playing from the masters of the past. It is hoped that the ideas brought forth concerning the two ports de main will be further examined in practice, so that we may truly understand the intentions of De Machy.

The works of De Machy have been overlooked and their importance has been very much underestimated. It is hoped that this thesis has shown that De Machy’s place in the history of viol playing is a more significant one than he has previously been accorded by modern scholars. His Pièces de Violle, other than being a remarkable set of viol suites, have helped to pave the way for other musical developments of the time.

Ultimately, it is hoped that this thesis has aided in improving the general reputation of De Machy amongst present-day violists and scholars. This new information will give us a better understanding of the development of the viol in
France, while advancing ideas and technique of viol playing for future generations of violists to apply to all kinds of viol music.
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Appendix A

Avertissement from De Machy’s Pièces de Violle (1685)

When De Machy published his Pièces de Violle en Musique et en Tablature in 1685, he included a lengthy avertissement. It is considered the first published treatise on viol playing in France. It contains specific instructions on teaching methods, technique, notation, styles of viol playing as well as interesting descriptions concerning the practices of other violists of the time.

This English translation of the avertissement is presented alongside the facsimile of the original publication. This facsimile can be found in Viole de gambe: méthodes et traits published by Fuzeau and Demachy: Pièces de violle published by Minkoff. In an effort to retain the flavour of the original source, the punctuation of the original document has been used wherever possible.

522 Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, Vm 7 6264.
523 This translation was made by me and checked by Dr. Robin Adamson.
524 Paul Lescat and Jean Saint-Arroman, eds., Violé de gambe: méthodes et traités (Courlay: J. M. Fuzeau, 1999)
525 Demachy, Pièces de violle (Genève: Editions Minkoff, 1973)
Avertissement tres-necessaire pour connaître les principales regles qui enseignent à bien jouer de la violle, & à éviter les abus qui se sont glissés depuis quelque temps sur cet instrument: Avec ce qu'il faut observer pour y composer des Pieces, outre les regles ordinaires.

AVERTISSEMENT A VERY NECESSARY PREFACE TO LEARN THE principal rules that teach [one] how to play the viol well, & to avoid the abuses that have slipped in over time with this instrument: with what must be noted to compose pieces for it, in addition to the ordinary rules.

Several people of merit have asked me why up to now no one has published a book of pieces for the viol, like those that have been published for other instruments, especially those that only make harmony. The principal reason, in my opinion, is that some want pieces in music [notation], & others in tablature: this would necessitate a double expenditure [of effort]; whereas with other instruments, one or the other would be sufficient.

Also, to satisfy the curiosity of those who are in doubt as to whether one should favour tablature or
music to learn to play this instrument, I say that one can play the viol in three ways, just as with the theorbo & the harpsichord. One can likewise pluck it; which can be considered a fourth way: But the first & most ordinary, is that of playing pieces of harmony, which is characteristic of all instruments played solo. And since this has always been considered the true way of playing the viol, I shall start by stating my feelings on this matter, & then we will speak about the others.

I say therefore that it is very certain that one can learn to play much better in this manner by tablature than in music, especially for those people who do not know how to read music. For proof of this, it is known that music is subject to various key changes; that one must observe flats & sharps; and in addition unisons, not only on the open strings, but also on those which are not; furthermore, very often these notes should be doubled on those strings which are open. And one quite frequently encounters chords on same string, which it is necessary to make on other strings, which causes great confusion, especially to those who are beginners; and this discourages them. For this reason, tablature is used for pieces for the lute, theorbo, guitar & other instruments with a neck, & which only make harmony; since all these difficulties are not encountered [with such instruments].

This method puts a person in a position to practice from the very first lesson, since one can learn tablature
in a moment: but it is not the same for music. The shortest way is always the best. The Italians, Germans, Poles, Swedes, Danes & English have always followed this maxim; & the illustrious Monsieur Hautemant [Hotman] also used it for teaching, as can be proved by several pieces written in his hand, in Paris & elsewhere.

After all, is not tablature the same as music, which contains two essential things, intonation & measure? The letters of tablature are for the first, & the values which are on the top of the letters, are for the second. I have always composed pieces for either one or the other, according to the inclination of the people whom I had the honour to teach.

As regards those who learned by music, & have become accustomed to it, it does not matter how they learn pieces; although one is sometimes rather confused, particularly in those pieces without clefs, which only the author can hear properly. But with tablature all is revealed.

As for the rest, to give full satisfaction to all the lovers of this instrument, I have had engravings made of some pieces in music, & others in tablature, which are contained in two books, different from one another, & in several keys. I have chosen for music those pieces that can easily be put into this notation without causing any difficulty: There are some that are filled out in both ways, some which are less so, but nonetheless make harmony
from the beginning to the end. I have included long & short pieces to please everyone.

One can play the Préludes as one wishes, slowly or quickly: They are neither extremely difficult nor very long, except for a few, so as not to diminish the number of pieces, not wanting to enlarge my books any further.

Had I wished to follow my inclination, I should have published only one book of pieces in all kinds of modes, transposed as well as natural, minor & major, even in different tunings; & some pieces to be plucked: but it would have been necessary to have recourse to tablature. So as to take no risks, I have taken the middle way, waiting for [the passage of] time to make the rest known.

As for the second way of playing the viol, which consists of accompanying oneself, or singing one part while playing the other, it is necessary to learn this by music notation, especially since this is what it is intended for. As it is for the third [way of playing the viol], which is the playing of parts [in a consort], or over the parts, while playing the bass or the treble viol; I have never taught them differently. What I said concerning the advantage of tablature, is only in regard to pieces which are to be played solo: This is why it is not important how one learns them. I am not claiming to make any innovations, I am simply expressing my thoughts freely.

I now consider the rules, which are necessary for playing this instrument well, because there are few who know them. To speak about them in general would require a whole volume. It is sufficient to be familiar only with those rules it is
Absolutely essential to know. It must be noticed, therefore, that there are two ports de main for the viol, just as for the lute, the theorbo & the guitar. The first is to put the thumb in the middle of the neck, & the first finger opposite the thumb, always round, except when one is obliged to lay it flat. The wrist must also be round, & the elbow a little raised. This [port de main] is used whenever one is not obliged to extend the hand.

And for the second [port de main], where one must extend it [the hand], it is necessary to place the thumb closer to the edge of the neck, & the second finger opposite the thumb, with the first finger more extended, unless a chord makes it necessary to have it rounded; the wrist in this position is not as round as in the first [port de main]: For the elbow, it should be against the hip so that all that one cannot do in one, must be observed in the other: And by this means one can play everything without difficulty.

One must be careful to use the required fingerings, while observing the tenuës, which are very important for three reasons. The first consists in holding the sounds to maintain the harmony. The second is used to avoid cacophony or wrong tones: And the third is to have the hand positioned where it is needs to be, & likewise the fingers.

As for the tenuës, they are extremely meticulously observed on the Lute, & other instruments with a neck, which make harmony, and also on the harpsichord.
It is certain that by carefully following all these rules one cannot but play well. But one of my astonishments is having noticed that, except for some people skilled in viol playing, there are few, even among those who make a profession of it who have heard anything about these rules, which are so essential to the instrument. On the contrary, they will scorn them, as is usual with the majority of ignorant people. What has always contributed to the perfection of this instrument is seen by them as a defect—even though the most illustrious players have always so strongly recommended [such rules] that they have never composed pieces which did not respect these rules. One should not judge by the first pieces, because one is not usually successful when one begins; but should judge by recent ones, written in their hand.

In regard to tenués, if one examines the pieces of foreign authors, which are famous, one will see that they are indeed observed there; and therefore it should not pass for a novelty.

Others scarcely reason logically, saying “each to his own way”. It is true any author can differ from another in his compositions, & can even have a different style of touch, just as everyone differs in writing, & in almost everything: but as for the rules they must be general & based on the same principles. Anyone who upheld the opposite view would form principles which worked only by chance & by caprice. This would become apparent when they fell into the hands of skilled people.
Finally, to respond to those who wish to persuade [people] that pieces of a single melodic line are preferable to those which are harmonized, I say that they are more wrong than they think, as they reveal in this way that they know nothing of the latter. And when they quote pieces with a single melody by some skilful man, to justify themselves using his example, they do not notice that they are written for several viols: which is easy to recognise. A person can have an excellent hand & play beautiful songs pleasantly, even though they have a single melody: but it is necessary to compare this to a man who plays perfectly on the harpsichord, or organ, with only one hand: the simple performance might be pleasant; nevertheless one would not call that playing the harpsichord, nor the organ.

It is the same with those who wish to limit the viol to single melodic pieces. This has never been the custom for this instrument when played solo. He who knows how to do more, can certainly do less when he wants to. They believe that they have given good reasons for it, by saying that chords prevent one from writing beautiful songs & ornaments; & that therefore, one cannot play so tenderly. Thus the treble viol & other instruments of this nature would be preferred over all those that I have mentioned for harmony. They are assuredly mistaken. When a man knows his profession well, chords should not prevent him from composing beautiful songs with all the ornaments necessary for tender playing: And it is only those who use only one port de main, & who very often do not use one at all, who feel this way.
I agree that these difficulties are encountered in pieces not written expressly for the instrument, such as opera arias & other pieces, & that it is better on such occasions to give preference to the melody & the ornaments, rather than to chords which would prevent one from playing them: but in pieces composed for the viol, one must avoid, as far as possible, interrupting the harmony in them. It is not that I want people to write profusions of chords that have no use when they are not done according to the rules for the instrument prescribed, however good they are for the music.

I speak to those who do not care to put on paper everything that comes into their heads, without asking whether what they do is appropriate for the hand, the bow & the rest; & who believe they are protecting themselves from all the reproaches that one might make, by saying only, that provided people like what they write, that is enough for them. This is a response without any foundation, since one can say that people have always preferred the bad to the good.

I return to the chords. One can leave them out, but let it be done with prudence. They are extremely pleasant in some situations, when one knows to play them well: And one must avoid [playing the chords/removing the chords in] all the places which require tenuës & ornaments, if they cannot be played there.  

I thought it would be appropriate to explain here how one should play ornaments and so on. It is necessary that the tremblement should be leant on according to the value of the note, & played evenly. The petit tremblement, which is what is called a

---

526 This statement is ambiguous. See chapter 5 on “Tenuës” for an explanation.
Fig. 76 De Machy, Pièces de Violle, page 9.

The tremblement sans appuyer, or to press one finger against another, while pressing only very slightly on the string. The martellement is played by raising the finger from the note or the letter, as soon as it has been played, and putting it back down at the same time. The double martellement is made the same, except it is doubled. The port de voix, which one calls the cheutte on the lute & other instruments, is done by anticipating one note or letter to another. The battement must be started with the finger raised, & continued like the tremblement. The aspiration which is also named the plainte, is played by shaking the finger on the fret. There are people who want to call it a miaullement [meow] by allusion. When a martellement is [played] with the tremblement, the petit tremblement, or the port de voix, one must always play it last. The uni-son ordinaire or simple, is the same sound as an open string, or another stopped string. When it is doubled, two strings are played together. The tenuë ordinaire is marked with a line, to show that one must not lift the finger from the note or the letters until all those included in it are finished. The tenuë de notes assumes that two crotchets notes makes one minim in value, & similarly with the others.

The coulé d'Archet is to play several notes or letters, with only one bow stroke, while pushing or pulling the bow; & what is called the coupé is played by half raising the bow, to carry it over other strings, avoiding the ones in between.
the two. The same thing is done on those which are adjacent, when one is obliged to do
so, particularly when the notes or letters are dotted, & when it is necessary to animate
those which come after the dots, either by pushing or pulling the bow, without retaking
the arm. One must always coordinate the wrist with the arm; because when playing
only with one or the other, as some players do, one would never accomplish anything
worthwhile.

I claim to instruct only those people who, without knowledge of these rules,
wish to compose pieces; because everyone prides themselves on it today. And in order
to do it well, I explain the difference there is between harmony & melody. Melody is a
simple song; a song which, when accompanied by one or more different Parts, voices
or instruments, is called harmony. To understand this, it is necessary to make a
distinction between two sorts of instruments: some usually only make melody, like the
flute, the violin, the treble viol, etc.; to these, to make them harmonious, one adds parts.
This is not necessary with the other instruments which make harmony by themselves,
as with the harpsichord, the lute, the theorbo, the guitar & the viol, when played solo.

I only explain this to prove the necessity of making harmony when one plays
alone, since there is agreement that this is the soul of music. When some learners want
to play pieces with a single melody, for their own satisfaction, it is good to give them
some, especially when they are not capable of anything else; & even to play some of
these pieces for those who like them this way.

It seems to me that I have sufficiently expressed my feelings concerning the
rules which are least familiar &
most necessary; it only remains for me to sing the praises of the viol: but since this does not besemi me as well as it might with a person who does not make it his profession, I shall say nothing, other than that the voice is the model for all instruments, & this instrument is one of the best [at imitating it].

I finally declare to all those who acquire my books, & even those who do not acquire them, that they will honour me if they would like to consult me about my pieces, & about what I am proposing. I shall be in a position to receive them at my home on Saturdays, from three to six o’clock, when I shall demonstrate to them the application of all the rules of which I have spoken, & the necessity for observing them on the Viol, no less than on any other instruments where they are in use.

My principal intention in this has not been to set myself up to criticise, even though I have written a rather long discourse, which I believed was necessary, since it is the first made in print on this subject; but simply to give those who are skilful something to emulate, so that they can follow the path I have set before for them, & share their work with the public. I shall be very happy & extremely rewarded for my small essay, when I see the results that I expect; & this will encourage me to go further.
Appendix B

Réponse de Monsieur Rousseau (1688)

This is possibly the first English translation of Rousseau’s document in its entirety. The translation was done by Dr. Micheline van der Beken and edited by myself. The page numbers as in the original are noted in the square brackets.

A facsimile of the original can be found in Viole de gambe: méthodes et traités.\textsuperscript{527} A modern edition of the can be found in Une querelle sur le jeu de la viole en 1688: J. Rousseau contre Demachy.\textsuperscript{528}

Monsieur Rousseau's reply to the letter of one of his friends who had warned him of a defamatory pamphlet that had been written against him.

Published by his friend.

Sir,

I am very indebted to you for the obliging letter you wrote to me, I don't know how I could show enough gratitude for all your kindness, particularly that of having applied yourself to retain the content of the defamatory pamphlet the author of the preface has written against me, which has been read to you. You must have such a good memory as to have remembered all that you are telling me, and you also must have great patience to have taken the trouble to write it down with such accuracy. But allow me to tell you that I cannot believe that what you are telling me is from him, for the reasons that I am going to tell you. Firstly it is not his style and the work is made up of added pieces, because I can tell that different people have been working on it, each one bringing his own bits and pieces to it and that is what makes me believe that it is a conspiracy from people who had no other purpose but to bring discord between he and I. Secondly, how could it possibly be the work which he boasted of having produced against my treatise of the viol, and that for more than a year that he has been working on it he would have produced only insults, abuse and calumnies as arguments, he who reproached me my lack of charity when I so much as called one port de main only something he used to call two ports de main; for is it out of charity that he would treat me so badly and that he would slander me. You know well that this is not the way to defend oneself and that if all those who are holding differing views in the arts and in the sciences defended themselves only with foolish remarks, the Halle and the Place-Maubert would get the upper hand of the sacrosanct Faculty, and there would be no thief, no swindler willing to give ground to all the Sorbonne's doctors.

The third reason that makes me believe again that this pamphlet does not come from him, is a conclusion I draw from what you say that his first aim was to have it printed and to dedicate it to Monsieur de Sainte Colombe (nice dedication) but that having changed his mind for reasons you do not know, he took the decision to have a few copies made and to sneakingly disseminate them everywhere in Paris in order to destroy me without my knowing. That is not credible, he is not capable of such cowardice, and he has too much heart and honour for that; for such an action is called, in proper French, to assassinate a man from

\textsuperscript{527} Paul Lescat and Jean Saint-Arroman, eds., Viole de gambe: méthodes et traités (Courlay: J. M. Fuzeau, 1999).
\textsuperscript{528} Lesure, “Une querelle”: 181-199.
behind, he knows how I handled it by sending him a challenge to duel and I think he will do the same: Thus, Sir, spare me from having to answer your prayer that I respond to every article of this pamphlet for it is not worth it. However, when I consider the trouble you took to write it in order to let me see it, and the part [2] you take in what concerns me, I would be too ungrateful if I did not answer your request; here is therefore my thought in short, and I assume for the purpose that this pamphlet has been written by the author of the avertissement, something I don't believe, that is why I shall always refer to the author of the pamphlet.

The pamphlet's author, after having said that he was forced to waste his time responding to my treatise of the viol, calls me a usurper of the quality of the viol Master as if I had not received it from the Masters.

I answer to this that much more than having wasted his time he used it very poorly and that he would have been better off using it to give his son a good education, for a defamatory pamphlet is a nasty education for him, and it is a very bad way of inspiring him to form opinions like a decent man.

And regarding the quality of a Master, I never thought a viol master had to be admitted by other Masters as one admits the Master cloggers, and that if it happened that they put a Master's degree on it, the one that is making so much noise might well be refused; a sensible person answered him once cautiously on the subject, what qualification do you want him to take since his playing is appreciated by everybody and is earning him good Louis d'or, do you want him to proclaim himself Master blacksmith? But let us ask him where he received this Master qualification he is denying me, who is the hero who proclaimed him, and where are the patent letters of his so called Master's degree, if he can produce them I promise him to let him see mine in at least as good and due form as his can be. He reproaches me for having talked of the origin of the viol and to have quoted passages from authors in Latin, as I found them, arguing that of all the famous that were for each instrument, not one has taken the trouble to find out from where his [instrument] was coming from, this is an extremely strong conclusion, we will have to consult the university in order to reply to it.

He then talks about the port de main, and it is a dispute only about the name rather than the thing; for if we examine what I said in my treatise, we will know that we agree on the same thing and that the only difference is that the author of the pamphlet names two ports de main in his avertissement something I name one port de main only, according to the precept of all the Masters, for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe never distinguished two ports de main, Monsieur Marais who learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe recognises one port de main only, the late Monsieur Meliton who had also learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe and who perfectly knew the characteristics of the viol, never said nor taught that there was such a thing as two ports de main, finally I call here on Monsieur des Fontaines and all those who learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, if they ever heard him mention two ports de main, this is why I was right to say that the author of the avertissement calls ignoramuses all the Masters in general who are unaware that there are two ports de main, when he says that it is essential that one should not be unaware of it, and when all the Masters except him never said anything about it or even heard about it; was I not right to rank myself along those ignoramuses, since I only mention one port de main, just like them?

The author of the pamphlet tries here to surprise the public by the account he makes [3] of an interview he says he had with Monsieur de Sainte Colombe on the manner of laying the hand, saying that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe never distinguished two ports de main, Monsieur Marais who learned from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe agreed that you had to put the thumb under the middle finger, and sometimes under the first finger, I will grant him that, but I refute that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe ever considered that one should call it two ports de main, on the contrary Monsieur de Sainte Colombe said that if he had asked his opinion on that subject before having his avertissement printed, he would have advised him not to suggest that there was two ports de main in the viol playing.

In regard to his son, of whom he then speaks, it is true that one day Monsieur de Sainte Colombe told me that the pamphlet's author had brought him his son and that he had played the viol in front of him, that he found him a good looking boy and that he had some talent, and that it was a pity he was not in his hands and that he believed he would do something good of him.

He is asking if it is in my village that I learned what I am putting forward; but he needs to learn that the capital of the Bourbonnais,529 from where I come, is well worth that of the Pontieu.530 That the town of Moulins is worth that of Abbeville, and that a territory managed by a General Treasurer is worth a territory without Provincial Assembly and I also want to bring to his knowledge that the place of birth does not guarantee people's merit and that I would like to have come out of a molehill in the deserts of Arabia and have all the virtues and merits a honest man can have.

He says I learned only for a month under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, but Monsieur de Sainte Colombe himself answered on this, that this reproach was to my advantage, since I learned more during
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that month than what others take years to learn. As a matter of fact this time was enough for me because when I learned under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe I had been playing the viol for three years and I was teaching it, I only put myself under his discipline in order to learn how to hold my hand better than I did.

The pamphlet's author is boasting of having given me a few lessons, if I now believed he could do that, I would go and pray him to give me these lessons; but for the salvation of his honour he should not brag about it. You will know that at the time I was learning under Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, I was staying with the good man Colichon, the Luthier, who lived at that time at the end of the rue de la Harpe where the pamphlet's author quite often called, and when he saw that I was learning how to play the viol from Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, he told me I had chosen a Master who did not know how to play the viol, that he did not hold his hand properly, that the seventh string he was using on the viol was a folly, for you will notice as a parenthesis, that the pamphlet's author at that time was very poorly positioning his hand, as we shall see hereafter, and was using only six strings, he did more because having looked at the pieces Monsieur de Sainte Colombe was giving me, and that I could show written in his own hand, he said this was a man who did not know how to write pièces, that there was only melody and no harmony, and that all the pieces he saw from him were not authentic pièces de viol e that if I wanted he would show me. Finally, to make it short, he made himself such a nuisance about it that I went to his place to see his technique, but when I tasted of it once I did not have [4] enough bad taste to leave Monsieur de Sainte Colombe. Judge for yourself if the pamphlet's author should boast of having given me a few lessons, and if he should press me to recall it; because I can bring forth several witnesses who know what contempt he had for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe's playing style, depreciating him everywhere, and preferring against him the playing style of the late old du Buisson who was carrying his hand very poorly.

He wants for viol playing to follow the rules pertaining to plucked instruments. I refuted this in my treatise and I refute it again for the reasons I have given, one only needs to thoroughly examine the issue to see the truth, I shall only say that I asked, some time ago, a highly skilled and honest lute Master, who is not one of the conspiracy clique, if he knew two ports de mains to play the lute, he laughed saying that he knew two of them, one for the right hand, and one for the left hand, and he added that to say there are two ports de main was pure quibble from some individual who wished to singularise himself.

Here he makes a big fuss out of a retraction and a contradiction he blames on me because he cannot conceive of things. I said for the port de main that one should put the thumb under the middle finger, and after having established that rule, I say that sometimes one has to put the thumb under the first finger for an easy execution of some chords; and he calls that retraction and contradiction, because he does not know that general rules must first be established and then one can talk of exceptions, I refer to those who know how to write in the Arts and in the sciences, one must have a mind full of contradictions to find any such thing here.

The comparison he draws between his two ports de main from the difference of a person who is sitting and one who is standing is exaggerated, I must admit that in the way he plays he makes this difference appear dramatically, in that he constantly raises high his elbow and then he glues it against his hip and one should think seeing this continual movement that he is playing some musette with bellows; you can see if Monsieur de Sainte Colombe plays like that and if he holds his elbow stuck against his hip, which gives the arm and the hand a crippled aspect.

I ask in turn the author of the pamphlet, of whom he learned how to play the viol: it is, he will say, from the illustrious Monsieur Hotteman, he is right to call him illustrious and he could not honour him enough, I am asking again, did he know how to play the viol well? This is, he will say, a ridiculous question for a man who calls himself a Master of viol; but I know as well as he does, how much obliged we are towards him and how skilled he was. I am asking for a third time, did he hold his hand correctly? Did he observe and did he acknowledge two ports de main to be absolutely necessary for the viol playing, following the rules of the avertissement that calls ignoramuses all those who do not observe these things he calls essential? The pamphlet's author would not dare to say yes, for Monsieur de Sainte Colombe and all those who learned from Monsieur Hotteman would give him a denial. If he admits that he was not observing these things, he confesses at the same time that Monsieur Hotteman was an ignorant, and myself I am drawing another conclusion that, since Monsieur Hotteman was highly skilled and was charming all his auditors [5] without observing nor acknowledging two ports de main, that those two ports de main are not absolutely necessary, whether they are in effect or in name, in order to be a skilled viol Master, and that it is only a formality which has its uses.

It has been about fifteen or sixteen years since the pamphlet's author was thinking highly of the late old Dubuisson, however everybody knows that he was holding his hand very poorly and it did not prevent him from being skilled in his own way.

At that same time, the pamphlet's author, who calls himself a student of Monsieur Hotteman, was carrying his hand very badly like his Master, and he was condemning Monsieur de Sainte Colombe for his port de main that is the same that is presently in usage, he must therefore conclude in spite of
himself that at that time he was an ignoramus, since he was not observing the things he calls essential today. I ask him now from whom he learned how to hold his hand differently from what he used to do, he will say it is by watching Monsieur de Sainte Colombe play, and he boasted about it, if it is true, why not have thus given him all the honour in his avertissement, instead of awarding it to himself through his term of two ports de main of which Monsieur de Sainte Colombe never talked; but one should say that he did as the authors of heresies who, in order to create a religion as they like take in other religions what suits them, and reject what does not suit them, for he has created for himself a way of playing that is not that of Monsieur Hotteman, nor that of Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, he mixes it to it some lute, some guitar and anything that pleases him and that is why he wants the Masters of lute, theorbo and guitar to be the true judges of playing the viol, which is absurd; however I do not blame him for having created for himself a fashionable way to play, for everyone in that matter must align themselves with the strength and size of their hand, and that as regards students one should not do as some practitioners who prescribe a same remedy for all ailments, I mean one must treat them according to how they are naturally disposed, driving them as much as possible towards perfection without impeding them with too much formality, because if one should listen to the pamphlet's author, it seems that the strict observance of the formalities of playing the viol are as necessary as salvation.

The pamphlet's author reproaches me for not holding my hand properly, I admit I do not hold it as he does, and (according to him) this is enough to be reproved in viol playing, but is he right to reproach me for not holding my hand like him, for since he believed he could create for himself a manner of holding the hand on the viol according to his whim, why does he not want me to have the same privilege? He will say his is the best one, but I refute it and I uphold that my students hold their hand better than his and more naturally.

The pamphlet's author then makes an outline of the parts of my viol treatise and he rejects almost all of them, but it is easy to see by the manner in which he talks about it that he knew nothing or that envy prevents him to make me justice, therefore I shall not waste my time refuting what he says about it, the benefits several persons are reaping from it are enough proof to me of its usefulness.

Furthermore I can say that the most skilled men we know examined it and judged it quite useful and that only the avertissement's author and his clique talk badly of it.

[6] He then considers the playing of the melody and in order to answer what he is saying about it, I shall be pleased with him if he composes a piece of simple melody that should be tender, and that he executes it in a manner that is pleasant.

Regarding the pieces of harmony, where it is not always followed, he can continue to blame Monsieur de Sainte Colombe, as he started to do it at the time I was learning, all he also has to do is put on the same rank the late Monsieur Meliton of whom one can show pieces in the same way and in general of all the skilled Masters.

Notice that he says one cannot make as much harmony on the plucked instruments as on the organ or the harpsichord, and that one cannot do as much with the viol as with the pluck instruments, and from there I draw the conclusion that since the viol chords are more sterile to create harmony than are other instruments, it must be allowed to discontinue it when one judges it appropriate, and it is the custom.

The pamphlet's author wishes to see some of my pieces.

In that I shall satisfy him, but he should not be surprised that, since he is so passionate I shall not fully use his own judgement as my authority; he said about those of Monsieur Marais that they were not made for the hand, he does not, however, execute them with his foot, and everybody is playing them, if he says the same about mine he will honour me greatly, for his own there is only him to play them, and his students on who he uses strappado to bring them to it.

He says that in order to please, it is necessary to please people who have genius and good taste.

I grant him that, and I add that one should make one's best to try and please everybody, but let him produce persons of genius and good taste whom his playing pleases, apart from the people of his clique who have been his coadjutors in the works of the pamphlet.

We have presently arrived at the tenuës, which he calls the famous question.

When I talked of the tenuës de bienséance I said they were necessary for all viol playing, and I called them like that because it is an inappropriate figure for the hand to have the fingers raised for no reason. But you will notice that I did not say one had to give them that name, and that those who did not name them are ignorant.

Regarding tenuës of harmony he accuses me of a contradiction because I said they had to be observed on a regular basis and that, however, that regularity did not have to be so exact that one could not from time to time do without in favour of something more considerable, but I leave that to be decided by persons who understand the French language.

Now the question is to see if I told the truth and to come to the point, I am going through a very long discourse which seems to me quite useless.

Therefore I say and I maintain that one can sometimes do without tenuës on the viol. That all masters have believed this liberty to be necessary and have practiced it. That from the proper admission
by the pamphlet's author in his *avertissement*, Monsieur Hotteman did not practice *tenué* on a regular basis (even though he was a skilled man and was playing theorbo very well) that the pieces [7] of all skilled Masters are a convincing proof of it. But the pamphlet's author will not yield to those truths, he needs something stronger. Well then, let us give him an author he cannot reject, this appears impossible at first sight, but no, I challenge him to talk evil of the one I am going to quote. Who can he be? you will ask me, it is himself, and in order for you to be convinced of what I am saying, please take the trouble to open his pieces book and see if he did not himself take some liberties in the *tenué* for which he condemns such liberties, and that he did so without design or necessity. Please examine from the 3rd to the 4th bar on page 19. From the 10th to the 11th bar on page 20. From the 11th to the 12th and from the 13th to the 14th bar on page 23. The 5th, the 6th and the 7th bars on page 28. Furthermore, since the pamphlet's author says one should observe *tenué* so as to hold harmony sounds and avoid dissonant ones, why is he not as regular in practicing them for the high notes as well as for the low, since same effects result from it. But what one must admire still more, is the emphasis with which he talks about false relations and composition liberties as if one did not know that they are birds he just discovered in a shrub as a novelty, for proof of that please take the trouble to examine his pieces, you will find in it pretty rough liberties, and if you do not accuse him of having made two octaves one after the other in the 9th bar on p. 21 and from the 17th to the 18th bar on p. 22. You will at least admit that this is not worth much, and that a nice melody would be much more bearable than such a nasty harmony, but I challenge you to dispense with two perfect octaves whilst rising up stepwise at the end of the first part of his first allemande. This is what I have noticed in his first suite for I only examined that, and still hastily. I shall consider it more exactly when I get the time, with the rest of it. I pray you for your part to see the nice harmony with which he pretends to enchant the skilled ones.

After that I don't think it is necessary to answer about his sending me back to the plucking Masters, he means to talk about those of the clique, but even if they were all of that opinion, I argue that it is not for them to judge about an instrument the features of which they do not know and that this judgement belongs to the viol Masters, and even if the pamphlet's author who has such a loathing for Latin is going to swear at me I shall quote this passage from *Quintilian*: *felices artes si de iis soli artifices judicarent.*

He says that I asked him what *tenué* were.

Apparently he does not remember it. I asked him if it was never allowed to dispense with it, and I asked the same question to Monsieur de Sainte Colombe who was of a contrary opinion to his.

He says I confessed to him that I did not know how to play pieces of harmony, but the duel challenge I sent him a year ago shows the contrary.

He says that I came out all of a sudden in one night like a mushroom, that two days ago I made up my mind to compose vocal and instrumental music.

[8] To that I answer that I have lived in Paris for twelve years and that not finding myself endowed by a spirit or inclination to advance myself through manipulation or through women's intrigues, nor by wine that is the usual way of getting acquainted with people, I thought myself obliged to make all possible efforts to acquire some credit through my work, and having convinced myself of that necessity, I applied myself ceaselessly and with so much regularity that for ten years now I did not give myself one day of respite. I now ask if so assiduous a work, joint with some natural disposition cannot have given me enough exposure to perform in public.

He says that I am the monkey of music but he does not make me a great insult because I admit I am trying to imitate skilled people in their works, but not to steal from them as he says I do, and so that everyone can know about it and what I can do, I offer to put the score of my works into the hands of capable and non-suspect persons and I shall submit to any corrections they judge necessary if what he says happens to be true, and at the same time I challenge the pamphlet's author to give likewise the score of his pieces for examination.

I could not be more impressed than by the liberty he takes to blame the rules I gave for *port de voix* and the *cadence* in my music method; saying that Masters of singing make fun of it, because he knows himself what singing is, he who asks what that is a *beau trait*, who argues in his pamphlet that one has never used this term in the playing of instruments, let him ask Monsieur Couperin, and it will be known to him through *beaux traits* which he embellishes his pieces with, what they call a *beau trait*, and he will learn as well that Monsieur Couperin does not make himself the slave of a *tenué* so much that he cannot leave it when he finds something more pleasing to put in its place, although *tenué* are more definitely obligatory on harpsichord than on viol. But let us go back to the Masters of singing whom the pamphlet's author is talking about, will you not be surprised if I tell you that it is of the illustrious Bacilly and of himself that he means to talk, and that they got together to take proceedings against me for a label
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on a bag? For the pamphlet's author boasted of being one day with the said Bacilly in a street and that seeing one of my posters, the aforesaid Bacilly, who does not know one music note, made a judgement on the aforementioned poster that my rules were worthless, and the pamphlet's author bowed assent. But Monsieur Lambert, Monsieur d'Ambruys and other Masters who know music and singing don't talk like that.

I shall post on the first day a third edition of the aforesaid method which I improved a lot, I do not doubt that this improvement will be criticised by the pamphlet's author, but I do not fear him, nor do I fear his clique.

Here we are now, at the tablature where he reproaches me for absurdities.

Tablature has its advantages and its faults, and the pamphlet's author does not understand that my Viol Treatise is being made only to teach learners, I was right to say that one could not distinguish from the tablature the natural keys of transpositions and I challenge him to teach them to learners as I teach mine through music, and that he could give them definite rules for the appuyer and trembler of the cadence, sometimes on the [9] whole tone, sometimes on the semitone as I advised in my treatise, and this makes me think that he does not understand them. To say the truth, one should say that the tablature for the viol is the ABC, and that if Monsieur Hotteman and the other Masters used it and are still using it, as I am presently using it myself, it is for the sake of those who either do not want, or cannot learn music; but we know enough why the pamphlet's author wants to ruin music in order to make the tablature reign.

He enters here in mockery against the four kinds of necks, which I have advised, and the manner in which he is talking about it makes me almost believe he is coveting the post of the late Dominiue; in any event I challenge him to perform a very simple piece of music which I shall present to him and which will not be of my making, without having recourse to these necks that he calls trifle; a great number of people who are using them with pleasure and effectiveness are not of his opinion.

He then talks about the rules I gave for the practice of ornamentation but what he says is so poor that I should not answer it; I shall only say that it is a bad reason to say that one cannot give demonstrative rules of a thing because nobody has taken the trouble to do so.

He says that I have not talked of plucking the viol, I did not think I had to do so, because it is not in playing that it is used and it should not be. I admit that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe is admired for it, but it is a particular diversion that he gives himself by his practice of plucked instruments.

He makes all these efforts to destroy the playing of accompaniment, calling it a rough play, without spirit, graceless, and that one can practice with one finger only as he told several people; but if his friends who gang with him were willing to talk in good faith, they would well and truly say the reason why the pamphlet's author has to talk like that of the playing of accompaniment.

In order to achieve his goal, he says that the late Monsieur de Chambonnières never wanted to accompany on the harpsichord and that he loathed accompaniment, I answer that the pamphlet's author does the same in the same spirit, for who does not know that Monsieur de Chambonnières did not know how to accompany, and that it was for that reason that he had to give up his responsibility at the King's and to make do with Monsieur d'Anglebert; and as regarding what he says of the late Monsieur Couperin it is not, and never has a knowledgeable man despised accompaniment, for everybody knows that one needs more science and spirit to accompany well than in playing of pièces, because the routine in pieces added to some natural disposition makes sometimes learners excel over their Masters; it is why, I say that each style of playing of the viol has its own merit, and that the one does not diminish the other in any way and that as far as accompaniment is concerned the pamphlet's author talks as a man who does not know about it and carries it out poorly; for me I appreciate it and rely on the skilled and the learned. And I can even say that one of the skilled organists of Paris [10] told me he was coming to the concert especially to hear my accompaniment, and even if there was no voice it would be his great pleasure to hear me accompany on my own; I do not report this in order to boast, but to show that all skilled people do not despise accompaniment, I shall not tell you the name of the organist, for if the pamphlet's author knew that, he would as soon say that he is an ignoramus and a man without taste.

Let us now consider Transposition. I let capable people and those who know what a concert is, judge if one practices Transposition only as a concession, for myself I argue that it is out of necessity, otherwise it would never be practiced, and the necessity arises when voices cannot suffice to the extent of their parts, for being too high or too low, as also when one wants to make a contralto sing a mezzo-soprano or haute-contre, I mean this when it is a piece for a single voice, and with other parts as well.

The pamphlet's author makes it clear that what I said about Transposition frightened him, when I said one should be able to play high pieces as low ones, and low ones as higher ones. And in order to destroy that he makes a comparison that should frighten small children, and at the same time he offers a method of his own making; but I challenge him to try it out, and there is nobody who could put it to practice without making errors at every moment: I mean to say, without producing tones where only semitones are required, and semitones where there should be only tones. I am satisfied that highly skilled people approved it and found it quite useful, and that several persons presently use it in order to perfect themselves, and without much effort.
The pamphlet's author then throws himself on the comment which comes after the Foreword of my book, where he says a number of things to which I already responded, I only stop at what he says that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe has not read my book, and that consequently he did not approve of it, and on the duel challenge about which I have already talked.

I admit that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe did not read my book before it was in print, but it is true to say that it is me who read it in his presence before that time, and that I pointed to him all the places that create disagreement between the pamphlet's author and myself, and that he approved of them, because without that, I would not have been so arrogant as to thank him for his approval and to say so in public.

Furthermore, if it was true that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe was in the state of mind the pamphlet's author is reporting, I would have a right to accuse him of ill will because he told me the contrary, but that would be making him a serious insult, to think of him in that way.

As regards the duel challenge, everybody knows that the pamphlet's author, disparaging me everywhere as much as he could, I sent him a duel challenge to play against him the pieces of harmony, to accompany and to transpose; to which he answers that he has got some repugnance to commit himself with me, it is not necessary for me to dwell any longer on that, everyone knows the reason and it is very easy to guess.

[11] He says that Monsieur de Sainte Colombe disapproved of me in that. He does not say the truth, Monsieur de Sainte Colombe found what I did was appropriate, to make the noisy tongue of the pamphlet's author keep quiet.

He quotes Monsieur de Visé and at the same time gives a riddle.

I am annoyed that he gave the name of Monsieur de Visé, because the respect I have for him would have made me keep for myself what the pamphlet's author forces me to say, here is the story.

The pamphlet's author not knowing how to avoid the duel that was presented to him on my behalf in the presence of his students, thought Monsieur de Visé could help him preserve his honour, they conversed about it together and having recruited the lute Masters who are intriguing and all their friends, they went to find them at the concert that was taking place every Tuesday at Monsieur de Montalan's, where I usually accompany, then the concert that had lasted two long hours having come to an end, I saw all the people of the clique gathering and letting all those who were not part of their group go, they were talking together and were taking their measures, I did not conceive what their design was, but Monsieur de Visé started to brief me about it by asking if I did not want to hear a sarabande he had composed on viol, which I accepted in good faith, he played two pieces and when they ended everybody got up and left, when Monsieur de Visé getting up said those words, do you want to play? To which I answered no, for the following reasons. Because I could see it was something premeditated. Because there was an audience of only the clique and their friends. Because if Monsieur de Visé had the intention of encouraging me to play, honesty obliged him to present me with the viol to be the first to play, and finally because the compliment he gave me by simply saying “do you want to play?” appeared to me badly digested, and I was surprised to see a Court gentleman like him wanting to engage me to play in such a dishonest way.

I thought of making a comparison on this story, but because Monsieur de Visé would have found himself in such an ugly position, I do not want to give him reason to complain about me and I shall be content to tell you that in another concert Monsieur de Visé told me in private that he was comparing a tenuès on the viol to a Louis d’or, and a beau trait to a double, I told the story of that opinion to two highly skilled men, the first answered that he could not believe it, and that Monsieur de Visé would make it known by this that everything shiny is not necessarily gold. The second one said that one should interpret it in his favour and that after having said that he compared a tenuès on the viol with a Louis d’or, he had then meant to say that he was comparing a beau trait on the viol to a double Louis d’or.

The pamphlet's author concedes that the different that divides us is the port de main and the tenuès and he calls that the essential rules to play the viol well, and I call them two formalities, one of which consists in the name only, and I say that to call that essential rules to play the viol well, is to make the accessory the principal, and to prefer formalities to one's own rights.

[12] In order to play viol well, the essential rules are to draw a beautiful sound from the instrument, and to play with freedom and spirit; let us presently examine on that model the playing style of the pamphlet's author and we shall know if he was right to decry mine in order to esteem his.

However, for lack of a name in a small formality and of a little permit in another, the pamphlet's author makes me lose my case, and in the assembly of his clique of which he pretends to be a simple clerk he reads to me my sentence by which, after several insults, it is ordered that my posters be torn apart, and my book reduced to pieces and bits, but he should allow me to lodge an appeal against that judgement, which apparently has been pronounced after supper or at least after a good dinner, and to appeal to competent judges, enlightened and passionate. And when he adds that he is innocent of the sentence's rigour, let him remember that Pilate did not talk differently.

I now consider the moral reflections by which he concludes his pamphlet, and I advise him to take them for himself. To not have such a high esteem of himself, and to make more justice to others; for
that is the sole fault I find with him, and it is what brought him to make a pamphlet to try to ruin me; remove that flaw from him, you will find in him a very honest man: furthermore, if he wanted to listen to my advice, it would be to part with the bad company who flatters his passion and involves him in nasty businesses; he is right to say he is only the writer of that work, for I recognise in it nobody else but him.

Here it is, Sir, a small part of what I could answer; for you see well that I kept silent on several issues that need to be refuted, which would not be difficult for me, since I knocked down the two difficulties of the port de main and of tenüés, that are the subjects of the discord, and to which he boasted that I could not respond: but it so happens that truly the avertissement's author is the author of the pamphlet, you will see then that I will let nothing pass and that I shall speak much louder of the things I only lightly touched on, and that all the encounters and stories that he is quoting and that he is not reporting, because he has not invented them yet, will only be phantoms. I should also wish that the cabbalists come in the open, for I have a few good things to tell them; I shall expose them for all eyes to see in a light in which they have not been seen yet, meanwhile the pamphlet's author can be assured that all the insults he throws at me, that of usurper, false-devout, envious, malign, ambitious, ignorant, man of ill will, malicious, arrogant, Doctor Fariole, blinded, uneducated, ridicule, a man that could scare the devils, foolhardy, devoid of good sense, extravagant, and generally all the invectives with which he charges me, do not trouble my rest, and if I have to lodge an appeal in Justice, it will be from good counsel and without passion. And so that you can know I have no animosity against him, I wish that his work was not of the nature of vipers, which tear to pieces the womb that gave life to them. Let him be as happy and content as I am, and let his affairs be in no worse state than mine. In the eyes of those of his clique, who made with him a formal vow to destroy me, I can address to them these words of David: Surrexerunt in me testes iniqui & mentita est iniquitas sibi.

Truly, Sir, I cannot help myself, before ending this response, to tell you that I am significantly touched by the pain that my treatise of viol inflicts on Monsieur M. and that, had I foreseen what happened, I would never have touched on his rules; but who could have known that he would have reacted with such a fit of anger? so much so that he told a few people that he never offended God as much, as since he has seen my treatise: would you not say that the disagreement that exists between he and I, is an affair of the least importance; and that all his wealth, his honour, and his reputation depend on it: however if one examines the issue, one will find that no subject could ever deserve less to lead to such excess; for no one could make me see that I said anything in my treatise that could make anyone suspect he is not a skilled man, and an honest man; it is only about the name of a formality, and about a little liberty taken in another, which are two things that Monsieur Hotteman who was his Master and a very skilled man was not practicing either in name or in effect; and for that you see to what height he has carried this disagreement, then that he did not believe there was any more reasonable way of avenging himself against the so-called injury he thinks I do him by disputing these two formalities, than to flare up in invectives and calumnies against me, without considering that the insults are only harming those who tell them, and that it is the reason of those who have none: for me, I would have far more reasons to get angry against him when I see his pamphlet; but far from it, I am touched with compassion for him, and I wish him to reflect on how little reason he has to push things to such extremes.

I notice that you pray me at the end of your letter, to leave with you the choice of response that you will give; I do not know for what purpose you address that prayer to me, but I want to believe that you will make good use of it, that is why I entrust it to your caution, and I pray you to not only dispose of the answer, but also of the person who could not recognise enough the token of friendship you gave him on that occasion, while waiting that I give you marks of it, please receive the protestation that I make you to be all my life, with all possible affection, sincerity and recognition.

MONSIEUR,

In Paris, the 30th October 1688.

Your very humble and obedient servant.

ROUSSEAU.