Title
Three Anonymous French Seventeenth-Century Preludes from the 'Parville Manuscript'

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5kc0j61p

Author
Hung, Melody

Publication Date
2011-05-01

Undergraduate
Three Anonymous French Seventeenth-Century Preludes from the
Parville Manuscript [Berkeley Hargrove Music Library MS 778]

Purpose of Research

The Parville Manuscript is one of the two principle sources of French music that we have from the grand siècle. The Bauyn Manuscript (Rés. Vm7 674–675), in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF), is the other one. University of California Berkeley librarian, Vincent Duckles, acquired the Parville Manuscript after Professor Alan Curtis found the manuscript in the Helm collection, a private collection in Italy. Though many pieces in the Parville Manuscript can also be found in the Bauyn Manuscript, including several of the same mistakes (possibly the result of scribes from both manuscripts copying from an erroneous third source that has since been lost or destroyed¹), the Parville Manuscript is the only source that gives new names to pieces by Louis Couperin, such as Allemande de la Paix and La Complaignante, and contains music that does not exist in any other source, including three wonderful anonymous unmeasured preludes. The purpose of this paper is three-fold: 1) to help musicians understand and play these unmeasured preludes, 2) to step back and take a look at the musical changes happening in Europe, and how that led to the development of the French unmeasured prelude, and 3) to understand the styles of the different French Baroque composers that we know of, in order to narrow down the list of possible composers the three Parville Manuscript anonymous unmeasured preludes can be attributed to.

What are unmeasured preludes?

The term “unmeasured” can refer to both performance style and/or an unconventional way of notating music. All French Baroque preludes are to be performed freely, and most of these preludes are notated without the mixed notation that we are used to—varied note values (quarter notes, eighth notes, half notes, whole notes, etc.) to indicate the duration of each note. Rather, the score is written with a series of whole notes, which I will refer to as whole-note notation. This notation reflects the improvisatory nature of the pieces because it does not specify how long to hold each note.

Example 1: All three of the anonymous preludes are written in whole-note notation, as opposed to mixed notation, where note duration is indicated. Pictured is the first line of the Prelude in F major (the second of the three anonymous preludes in the Parville MS).

This special notation neither implies that the music should be played in whole note values, nor that the performer can choose to play the piece in any manner. Performers must identify the harmonic direction of the piece—on the simplest level, this involves holding notes that belong to a chord, and glossing over notes that do not. In an attempt to understand how a seventeenth-century player would have interpreted an unmeasured prelude, I have identified the harmonies in the way they would have done, by simplifying the piece into a figured bass line. Figured bass is a system in which numbers and accidental signs (sharps and flats) are written above or below the bass line, indicating
chords and harmonies. Figured bass lines indicate strong and weak beats. This aids the performer in determining where to place emphasis and what the general pulse of the piece is. Most unmeasured preludes fall into a common time pulse, and all three of the anonymous preludes fall seamlessly into a common time pulse. To clarify, pulse is different from note values, because pulse allows for more freedom: it dictates simply when a strong beat should occur, but allows for rhythmic freedom between the strong beats. Example 3 shows my reconstructions of the figured bass lines for all three preludes. If played well, the audience will be able to hear the Urlinie—the fundamental melodic line—which may visually be concealed by the spacing and whole-note notation. The Urlinie gives shape to the piece.

Example 2 shows the three anonymous preludes as they appear in the Parville Manuscript. The manuscript contains a total of 149 pieces.

(Please see next page)

---


3 I have copied images of the preludes from Colin Tilney's The art of the unmeasured prelude for harpsichord.
Prelude C sol ut:
Prelude F ut fa:
Prelude G re sol ♮:

Example 2: the three anonymous preludes found in the Parville Manuscript.
Example 3: My figured bass reduction of the three anonymous preludes.
In Example 4, I have taken the three anonymous preludes and added bar lines, rhythm values, and voice leading to suggest one way of playing what the whole-note notation implies:

(Please see next page)

---

Notes on the transcription: The signs / \ were d’Anglebert’s way of notating the direction of an arpeggio. I chose this way simply because it was the most concise way to show the breaking of a chord through the software Sibelius. The slurs indicate that the notes are to be held. If they are tied (meaning that one slurs connects the same two notes together) the latter note should not be sounded.
Prelude C sol ut. MS Parville, p. 204

Anonymous, Transcribed by Melody Hung
Example 4: My transcription of the preludes depicted in Example 2.
Notating unmeasured preludes in unmeasured whole-note notation was relatively short-lived; the preludes were composed from the mid-seventeenth century to the early-eighteenth century. By 1716, many composers began to move away from this whole-note notation by adding note values and bar lines. There are many possible reasons for this. The most probable reason is that people simply could not figure out how to read the whole-note notation. In reprints of certain books, some publishers took the practical step of excluding preludes from volumes.\(^5\) This indicates that most people did not understand how to play from these scores, which probably contributed to its eventual demise.\(^6\)

The purpose of the figured bass reduction and transcription is to provide precursory methods for the general public to begin reading and even improvising unmeasured preludes by looking at the figured bass. It is a pity that such a beautiful and important segment in history has been lost simply because people are unable to read the music.

### The unmeasured prelude arose from the *stylus phantasticus*.

Although the unmeasured prelude is strictly a French phenomenon, it developed as a result of changing musical tastes in Europe. Characteristically, the unmeasured prelude is rooted in the *stylus phantasticus*, or fantastic style. There is no uniform definition of the *stylus phantasticus*—it manifested itself differently in various regions and time periods. The only overarching element that characterized a piece as in the fantastic style was if it was improvisatory in some form or another.

---


\(^6\) Attached is a recording I have made of the three preludes. It would be helpful to look at both the manuscript and my transcriptions while listening.
The origins of this style are attributed to Italy, from a controversy in the sixteenth and seventeenth century over composition for vocal music. The two factions were those who supported reason (*prima prattica*) versus those who supported the senses (*seconda prattica*): “Controversies over the authority of the senses as against the authority of reason (which underlay the rules of musical composition) marked the opening of the era and persisted in diverse forms with different advocates well into eighteenth century.”

Giovanni Maria Artusi (1546-1613), an Augustinian monk, became the representative of the *prima prattica*. This faction believed that following the rules of harmony were considered more important than eliciting an affect: “It pleases me, at my age, to see a new method of composing, though it would please me much more if I saw that these passages were founded upon some reason, which could satisfy the intellect. But as castles in the air, chimeras founded upon sand, these novelties do not please me; they deserve blame, not praise.”

Brothers Claudio and Giulio Cesare Monteverdi were the advocates of the *second prattica*, also known as the modern practice. They promoted a freer use of dissonance, an emphasis on the perfection of the melody, and perhaps most importantly, the importance of text and rhetoric. They strove to break the established hierarchy that suppressed texts, and worked to combine music and text into one expressive entity. In a letter in response to Artusi’s criticisms, Giulio Cesare Monteverdi explained the relationship of music and text, and the importance of melody: “In this kind of music [referring to the *second prattica*], it has been the intention to make the words the mistress of the harmony and not

---

8 (Same), 527.
the servant [thereby elevating the status of words], and because it is in this manner that
his work is to be judged in the composition of the melody.”

Monteverdi questions why the text is belittled in the *prima prattica*: “Do not the
manner of the diction and the words follow and conform to the disposition of the soul?
Indeed, all the rest follows and conforms to the words. The combination of words
commanding with rhythm and harmony obedient to them affects the disposition of
mind.” He cites Plato as support against following the rules of harmony at the expense
of the text: “melodiam ex tribus constare oratione, harmonia, rithmo. [The “melody” is
composed of three things: the words, the harmony, and the rhythm]. Quin etiam
consonum ipsum et dissonum eodem modo, quando-quidem rithmus et harmonia
orationem sequitur, non ipsa oratio rithmum et harmonium sequitur. [And so of the apt
and the unapt, if the rhythm and the harmony follow the words, and not the words
these.]”

The *stylus phantasticus* essentially developed out of the *seconda prattica*, when
Girolamo Frescobaldi, an Italian harpsichordist, took the *seconda prattica* and applied it
to keyboard instruments. Frescobaldi’s *Primo libro di toccate* (1615) is now known as a
primary example of the *stylus phantasticus*. His music embodied the characteristics the
*seconda prattica* advocated: a shift into monodic writing (a melody accompanied by a
bass line) with the melody imitating a singer’s vocal lines, including florid running
passages and ornaments, and a greater emphasis of the soloist. Since the music is
improvisatory, it is interpreted and played differently from performer to performer.

---

9 Strunk, Oliver. *Source readings in music history: The Baroque Era*. Edited and revised
10 (Same), 538-541.
Athanasius Kircher—a Roman Jesuit who influenced the world with his revolutionary treatise on music, the *Musurgia Universalis*, published in 1650—coined the term, *stylus phantasticus*, crediting Frescobaldi as the inventor of this style. Though pieces in the fantastic style are to be performed freely, the performer must understand harmony in order to be able to perform it.¹¹

The fantastic style is especially suited to instruments. It is the most free and unrestrained method of composing, it is bound to nothing, neither to any words nor to a melodic subject, it was instituted to display genius and to teach the hidden design of harmony and the ingenious composition of harmonic phrases and fugues.

Kircher indicates that Frescobaldi’s *Primo libro di toccate* and works by Frescobaldi’s student, Johann Jacob Froberger, were models of the fantastic style. Due to Kircher’s widespread fame as a polymath, copies of his *Musurgia Universalis* were sent throughout Europe, and even to more remote places, such as Brazil and China.¹²

The publication of Kircher’s *Musurgia Universalis* (1650) overlapped with the origin of the unmeasured prelude in France. The creation of this prelude in France was largely due to Johann Jacob Froberger, who traveled from Germany to Italy to study with

---


Frescobaldi. After his studies, Froberger moved to Paris in 1652 and brought with him the style that he had learned from the master, Frescobaldi.

Froberger was almost certainly acquainted with major French composers, including lutenists, such as Denis Gaultier and François Dufaut. His “skill as organist and harpsichordist, and as an original and sympathetic personality must have made him a welcome and interesting addition to Louis Couperin’s circle of friends in Paris.”

Couperin was one of the most prolific composers of the unmeasured prelude. Though Louis Couperin did not invent the unmeasured prelude, he was “the first to invest them with substance and grandeur.” His music is marked with Froberger’s influences: Louis Couperin wrote an unmeasured prelude titled, *Prelude a l’imitation de Mr. Froberger*, which borrows its opening from Froberger’s Toccata no.1 in A minor (1649).

Furthermore, the relationship between Froberger and Couperin’s music is evident in the *Bauyn Manuscript*—a major source of Louis Couperin’s music—which also contains many of Froberger’s compositions. We know for certain that he was friends with Charles Fleury, a French lutenist, who was also known as Monsieur Blancrocher. Froberger wrote a beautiful *tombeau* for his friend’s death (November 1652), after his friend died in his arms after falling down a flight of stairs. The tombeau, though written with note values and bar lines, is to be played in an unmeasured and free way.

The unmeasured prelude would ultimately develop out of a combination of the *stylus phantasticus* and the *style luthé* (specific to French Baroque music). This style

---

originated from lute music of the late 16th century.\textsuperscript{16} This style exploits the decay of sound, and is basically a glorification of the arpeggio, an important lute figure.

According to Manfred Bukofzer, "The broken style was characterized by rapidly alternating notes in different registers that supply, in turn, melody and harmony. Seemingly distributed in arbitrary fashion over the various registers, the notes produced in their composite rhythm produce a continuous strand of sound."\textsuperscript{17}

Froberger took elements from the French style luthé, combined it with the elements of the stylus phantasticus that he learned from Frescobaldi, and wrote toccatas that would contain the stylistic framework of the French unmeasured preludes. These toccatas would contain rhythmic values and meter, but it was common knowledge to play them freely. The unmeasured preludes would essentially be a French articulation of the toccata, an Italian form.\textsuperscript{18} The clavecinistes would approach writing this music from the other end of the spectrum—the notation would be unmeasured, but the pieces themselves would have a pulse. The notational dress disguised this musical fact, but the difference was for the player’s eye, not the listener’s ear.

**Influences from the French Baroque Lute Preludes and the style luthé**

The harpsichord unmeasured prelude would take many elements from the lute prelude, especially the lute’s natural ability for nuance. The lute outlines a chord “by means of an arpeggio which breaks back, and is filled out with passing notes between its upper components. This method, with the chord widely spaced in the bass and having


progressively closer intervals towards the treble, is particularly suited to the lute.”¹⁹ The lutenists would hold the notes that belonged to the same chord, preserving the tones that belong to the chord. *Prelude C sol ut* from the *Parville Manuscript* is a keyboard example of this:

![Prelude C sol ut example](image)

This excerpt is in soprano clef, and is taken from the end of the second system. The notes are C#, D, E, and G. The slur lines indicate which notes to hold onto—in this case, the C#, E, and G.

A main objective of the lute prelude is to balance rhetoric and texture: the melody often alternates between the bass and the treble. In general, keyboard preludes exploit the treble recitative-like texture more (an element of the *stylus phantasticus*), as opposed to the lute preludes.²⁰ Oftentimes, in keyboard preludes, the two lines will imitate each other, providing a formal structure, which a player looks for when trying to decode the unmeasured prelude.

Lutenist Denis Gaultier warned the player to play slowly in order to avoid the very common fault of muddling the music. Colin Tilney echoes this when he states that the unmeasured preludes “must be played with the utmost sensitivity and delicacy of nuance, particularly pieces written in the lute style (preludes, *pieces luthées*).”²¹ Certain

---

clavecinistes of the unmeasured prelude tended to be more influenced by the lute than others; their writing style and notation reflects this.

**Scholarship on Unmeasured Preludes**

Davitt Moroney has written extensively on the subject of the unmeasured prelude. His two articles, "Prelude non mésure," for *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, and "The performance of unmeasured harpsichord preludes" provide a context to which I am able to place these three preludes in. Furthermore, in Moroney’s preface to *Louis Couperin: Pièces de Clavecin*, he writes not only on Louis Couperin, but also on the unmeasured prelude, as Couperin was one of the earliest writers of the whole-note unmeasured prelude. Colin Tilney’s three-volume *The Art of the Unmeasured Prelude for harpsichord* surveys the development of the unmeasured prelude from 1660 to 1720, by looking at the most famous French composers and their works. The first volume contains facsimiles. The second volume contains modern transcriptions of the facsimiles. The third volume contains commentaries on the music. He also provides information on notation and paleography, ornamentation, and performance practice. Alan Curtis’ article, “La musique classique française à Berkeley,” provides detailed information not only on the *Parville Manuscript*, but also on other manuscripts, and UC Berkeley’s early music collections. He lists the pieces found in the *Parville Manuscript* in the appendix.

---

24 Curtis, Alan. "La musique classique française à Berkeley: Pièces inédites de Louis Couperin, Lebègue, La Barre, etc.," *Revue de musicologie* 56, no. 2 (1970): 123–64. (I have included the catalog of pieces in Appendix 2).
I am indebted to Paul Prévost’s detailed account of the three anonymous preludes.\textsuperscript{25}

Bruce Gustafson’s \textit{French Harpsichord Music of the Seventeenth Century: A Thematic Catalog of the Sources with Commentary} has been resourceful during the research process, providing not only a list of general characteristics of the manuscript, but detailing and extracting main points from each piece.\textsuperscript{26} Now, let us look at our three anonymous preludes.

**The Parville Manuscript and the Anonymous Preludes**

**Contents of the Parville Manuscript**

The manuscript is 350 pages total, but only 283 pages have been notated on. Pages 284-350 are ruled, but blank. The format of the manuscript is in oblong quarto. The contents are 19x26 cm, and the size of the cover is 20x27 cm (smaller than the Bauyn Manuscript, and is devoid of works by Frescobaldi and Froberger, except a solitary gigue by the latter on p. 57 f). The cover is stamped, full leather, with gilt-tooled binding.

**Date of the Parville Manuscript**

According to Professor Alan Curtis, in his article \textit{Musique classique française à Berkeley}, the present binding of the manuscript dates from about 1760. However, this only tells us information about the binding of the book, and reveals nothing about the content of the manuscript, except for the fact that it was completed before 1760. For all intents and purposes, oftentimes, the binding might have worn out due to use and/or circulation, and would need to have been bound again. However, the contents of the


manuscript narrow down the time frame. The latter part of the *Parville Manuscript* includes a steady string of compositions by Italian Jean-Baptiste Lully, who had been chosen over Chambonnières by Louis XIV, as a major musical influence in the French court. Lully’s masterpiece, *Armide*, concludes the *Parville Manuscript*. Furthermore, the majority of the works in the manuscript must have been copied post 1686, due to the inclusion of *Acis et Galathée* by Jean-Baptiste Lully, which premiered at the Château d’Anet on September 6, 1686. Lully’s piece is #29 in the manuscript, which falls in the first few pages of the manuscript. However, the manuscript probably was completed not too long after 1686, because Lully died that year, and few people were still playing his music on the harpsichord fifteen years after his death. The fact that his music is heavily copied throughout the manuscript allows us to narrow the time frame of this manuscript’s start and completion.\footnote{To see the order of works in which they appear in the manuscript, please refer to the Appendix 2. Lully’s pieces appear throughout the manuscript.}

Louis Couperin is also an important composer to look at in regards to dating the manuscript; the manuscript contains the most pieces by Louis Couperin. His works, copied by different scribes, are also distributed throughout the manuscript. Louis Couperin is an important figure because he died early (1661), composing many works in only ten years. According to Davitt Moroney, in his preface to the *Louis Couperin: Pièces de Clavecin*, “Le Gallois’ famous letter to Mlle Regnault de Solier concerning music (1680), shows that his reputation was still alive a generation after his death…However, less than ten years later, if Titon du Tillet’s vague assessment in *Le
Parnasse français (1732) is a guide, all detailed knowledge of Louis Couperin’s achievement had been lost.”  

Location  

Lully’s inclusion in the manuscript reveals information: though Jean-Baptiste Lully was an Italian by birth, he adopted France as his country because Louis XIV granted Lully the highest office to which he could aspire to—that of surintendant de la musique de la chambre du roi on May 16, 1661. In addition, the amount of works by Louis Couperin suggests that the Parville Manuscript was most likely copied in Paris. According to Professor Davitt Moroney in his preface to Louis Couperin: Pièces de Clavecin, “his death at the age of about 35 denied him the opportunity to establish for himself an international reputation…Furthermore, dying in 1661, just before the art of engraving keyboard music had been perfected in France, his reputation immediately following his death depended on those few people fortunate enough to possess manuscripts of his pieces. (Those manuscripts which survive suggest that knowledge of his music was to a large extent limited to Paris.)”  

Characteristics of the scribe and/or composer:  

The manuscript is a typical keyboard score, with two 5-line staves, and three systems per page. According to musicologists Alan Curtis and Bruce Gustafson, approximately seven or eight scribes copied various works into this manuscript. The primary hand copied #1-104 (except #68a). The second hand copied two dances by Lully

---

30 To see the order of works in which they appear in the manuscript, please refer to the Appendix 2.
and three anonymous preludes (#105-109), and various other scribes copied the rest of the manuscript (#110-149).\textsuperscript{31}

The three anonymous preludes are written in whole-note notation, which dates the piece, and already narrows down possible composers. Paul Prévost, in \textit{Prelude non m\'esure pour Clavecin}, emphasized the importance of note placement and spacing in an unmeasured prelude—with no written-out meter and note values, the way the notes appear on the score inevitably affects the way we play the music. Prévost stated that in regards to most of the unmeasured preludes in the \textit{Parville Manuscript}, not much thought was given to presenting the music in an easy to read format: there was an “inaccurate/clumsy superposition [placing one above the other] of the two staffs of the system [which] creates what appears to be simultaneous interventions between the right hand and the left hand. They appear to be playing notes at the same time because they are clumsily copied.”\textsuperscript{32} However, he praises the scribe of the three anonymous preludes, stating that these preludes “are copied with great care and do not present any overlap.” Furthermore, Prévost comments the movement from that one pair of staves to the next was “treated in an equally careful way, to avoid all ambiguity about what notes are to be held on.” An example of this:

(Please see next page)

\textsuperscript{31} Gustafson, Bruce. \textit{French Harpsichord Music of the Seventeenth Century: A Thematic Catalog of the Sources with Commentary, 2\textsuperscript{nd} volume}. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1979, 429.

\textsuperscript{32} Prévost, Paul. \textit{Le Prelude non m\'esure pour Clavecin (France 1650-1700)}. Editions Valentin Koerner, Baden-Baden & Bouxwiller, 1987, 110.
The notes at the end of line 4 (soprano clef)—C, E, and F—are clearly tied to the notes at the beginning of line 5 (soprano clef).

Paul Prévost concluded that the scribe “perfectly understood the notation that he was using,” leading Prévost to propose that “we should perhaps have the hypothesis that the composer and the copyist is one person.” If we assume that the scribe and the copyist are one person, we can also look at the notation and handwriting to narrow down possible composers of these three preludes. Furthermore, composers of the French Baroque can be identified by way of notation and use of ornamentation. The three anonymous preludes contain the same sparse ornamentation throughout—mostly trills and mordents, and occasionally, appoggiaturas.

I believe these three preludes were by the same composer because they share similar characteristics. The preludes are about the same length; each prelude is composed of six lines of music. They contain the same melodic licks (this term that jazz musicians use to refer to musical ideas, is perfectly fitting here). The harmonic breakdown of the three anonymous unmeasured preludes is straightforward and consistent:

(Please see next page)
Chart of Harmonic Analysis for the Three Anonymous Preludes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C sol ut</th>
<th>F ut fa</th>
<th>G re sol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C: I &lt;&gt; G: IV V7</td>
<td>1. I (V7) I &lt;&gt; ii</td>
<td>1. I V7 I6/4 V7 I &lt;&gt; I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: I V7/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I6/4 V7 I &lt;&gt; V7/V</td>
<td>2. I6 V6/V V7 (vi) V/V V &lt;&gt;</td>
<td>2. V6 IV V7 V7/V V in D: V7 I IV I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ii I6 IV V</td>
<td>4. I ii6 V7 I</td>
<td>4. IV (v6) V/V V6/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I6/4</td>
<td>5. I6/4 V7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
Beginning: Establishes the key of C with a C pedal in the beginning of the prelude. Modulates to the dominant.
Middle: Briefly touches on the dominant of new key, by going through circle of fifths (V/V) and returning back to C major.
End: Glorious C major, with strong cadential 6/4.

Summary:
Beginning: Establishes the key of F with an F pedal in the beginning of the prelude.
Middle: Doesn’t quite modulate to the dominant, though it is hinted at with the secondary dominants, and a strong V-I cadence in C (G7-C).
End: Glorious F major, strong cadential 6/4 and even cadences twice in F at the last line.

Summary:
Beginning: Establishes the home key strongly with a cadential 6/4 in the first line.
Middle: Once again, modulates a dominant fifth away (the A reoccurs several times).
End: Moves back to the home key, and stays mainly with the subdominant, dominant, and tonic of the home key.

Before attempting to attribute the three preludes to major composers of the period, I had to consider that an amateur might have composed the preludes. However, this seems unlikely because the three preludes are sophisticated, both in layout and in harmonic and melodic content. Furthermore, all the authored works in the Parville Manuscript are written not by amateurs, but by distinguished lutenists and clavecinistes.

Other manuscripts, such as the Borel Manuscript, contain works by amateurs such as Madame Comtesse de la Bieule.

---

33 The symbol, "<>," marks the end of a phrase.
Among musicologists, there is a consensus that d’Anglebert was probably the composer of the three preludes. However, it is possible that a composer with no preludes attributed to his name wrote these pieces. It would be satisfying to be able to attribute them to an author such as Chambonnières—many of whose dances are in Parville Manuscript, but who left no recorded preludes—or to others whose second books either failed to appear (d’Anglebert) or contain no preludes (Le Bègue). In addition to the three anonymous preludes, the *Parville Manuscript* contains fourteen preludes by Louis Couperin and one prelude attributed to Joseph La Barre.

**Who wrote these three anonymous unmeasured preludes?**

I am going to compare the three anonymous unmeasured preludes to unmeasured preludes attributed to composers. In the case that a particular composer does not have unmeasured preludes attributed to him, I will look at other evidence. Here is a list of French composers, arranged in two categories. The first category is unlikely composers of the anonymous preludes, arranged by their year of death. The second category includes likely composers of the anonymous preludes, also arranged by their year of death:

(Please see next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Number of preludes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlikely Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Couperin (1626-1661)</td>
<td>14 preludes were first discovered in the Bauyn MS. 2 more were discovered in the Parville MS (C minor and G major).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etienne Richard (1621-1669)</td>
<td>2 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Hardel (birth date is unknown-1678)</td>
<td>0 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph de la Barre (1633-1678)</td>
<td>1 prelude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Le Bègue’s (c.1631-1702)</td>
<td>5 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre (1665-1729)</td>
<td>4 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspard Le Roux (first known appearance of him in a publication in 1690 as a musician-1707)</td>
<td>4 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Marchand (1669-1732)</td>
<td>2 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis-Nicolas Clérambault (1676-1749)</td>
<td>2 preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Philippe Rameau (1683-1764)</td>
<td>1 prelude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Couperin (1668-1733)</td>
<td>0 unmeasured preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Champion Chambonnières (1601/2-1672)</td>
<td>0 preludes that we know of. Study Chambonnières suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Henry d’Anglebert (1629-1691)</td>
<td>3 preludes exist in printed books (1689). A fourth prelude (C major) was discovered in autograph MS Res. 89ter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composers found in the Parville Manuscript, that we can almost certainly eliminate (organized by date of death)

Louis Couperin (1626-1661) was a famous student of Chambonnières. He was brought to Paris in 1650 or 1651 under the patronage of Chambonnières. From 1650/51 to his death in 1661, he wrote at least 200 works. Louis Couperin wrote for the harpsichord, and did not carry particular loyalty to the lute.

The style of the three anonymous preludes does not match with the style of Louis Couperin’s preludes. Couperin’s preludes contain “long melodic and scalar passages, occasional chromaticism, frequently shifting key centers, number of sequential patterns,

---

³⁴ Moroney provides an extremely useful timeline of Louis Couperin’s life in the preface of Louis Couperin: Pieces de Clavecin, on page 6.
inventive melodic line shifting between the treble and bass registers. Modulations are continually thwarted and interrupted, resulting in a powerful sense of harmonic growth, expressed in conjunction with quietly elegant turns of phrase.\textsuperscript{35} Couperin’s music is not imitative of the lute preludes, and is rather more focused on dramatic gesture, whereas the three anonymous preludes of the \textit{Parville Manuscript} are predominantly chordal and imitative of the lute preludes. The anonymous preludes occasionally contain scalar passages, and the key center shifts, but not in the dramatic way that Couperin’s preludes do.

There are two courantes attributed to \textbf{Etienne Richard (1621-1669)} in the \textit{Parville Manuscript}, and they are separated from each other by about a hundred pages: an A minor courante and a G major courante. The Bauyn manuscript contains eleven pieces attributed to Richard (including two preludes), but they appear in seven different locations in the manuscript. The two preludes are paired together, an A minor prelude followed by a D minor prelude. In \textit{The Art of the Keyboard} Series, Gustafson comments on the style of the two preludes attributed to Etienne Richard: “The two Richard preludes appear to be rare examples of Parisian organ music from the 1650s...The two pieces by Richard have some similarity to the \textit{plein jeu} preludes, but they are considerably more expansive than the short versets by Nivers, and their interest derives more from the variety of motivic ideas and contrapuntal play...Like toccatas in the tradition of Froberger, Richard’s preludes do not appear to have been conceived exclusively for one type of keyboard instrument. They might well have been played on the harpsichord, as

well as on the organ.” An extract of the D minor prelude from the *Bauyn Manuscript* shows that the prelude is fundamentally different than the anonymous preludes. It is measured, and contains none of the significant melodic licks that belong to the anonymous preludes. The anonymous preludes are suitable for only the harpsichord, whereas Richard's preludes could be for the organ. This prelude is interested in motivic ideas and contrapuntal play, which is not the emphasis in the anonymous preludes:

![Musical notation]

**Jacques Hardel (birth date is unknown-1678)** was an exceptional student of Chambonnières’, and was a favorite of the court of Louis XIV. Today, we don’t know much about him, and cannot be certain which member of the Hardel family (includes

---

three generations of instrument makers and musicians) the eight works presented here are to be attributed. The Parville Manuscript contains two of his works, including an Allemande in D minor and a Gavotte in A minor. Jean Le Gallois’ Lettre de Mr Le Gallois à mademoiselle Regnault de Solier touchant la musique, published in 1680, tells us that among Chambonnières’ pupils, Hardel was the one who most perfectly imitated him; to such an extent that some have had no trouble judging him the equal of his master.” 37 Hardel inherited Chambonnières’ sense of a melodic line, and also imbibed a strong sense of direction in his bass lines. We only have eight pieces by Hardel today: a courante for lute, a six-movement harpsichord suite in D minor, and a harpsichord gavotte. The suite, which consists of an allemande, three courantes, a sarabande, and a gigue, is one of the earliest examples of a complete "classical" French suite. There are no records of an unmeasured prelude composed by Hardel. His two pieces in the manuscript occur in the first half of the manuscript, nowhere close to the three anonymous preludes, which occur in the latter half of the manuscript. There are no strong reasons to suggest that he composed the three anonymous preludes, as the only surviving harpsichord suite that we have is not even in C, F, or G.

Joseph de la Barre (1633-1678) was quite a famous organist in his time—he belonged to a musical family, and succeeded his father as an organist of the royal chapel. There are only a handful of dances attributed to La Barre, and a prelude signed ‘La Barre’ found in the Parville Manuscript.38

Microfilm copy of a Prelude in D minor from the *Parville Manuscript*, composed by a “Monsieur de la Barre,” most likely Joseph de la Barre, as the *Parville Manuscript* contains other pieces by him.

La Barre is not likely to be the composer of the preludes. His prelude is measured and contains mixed notation, whereas the anonymous preludes are in whole notation.

Chordal movement is really only present strongly in the beginning and the end of la Barre’s prelude. The rest of the piece mainly involves the left hand accompanying a right hand melody. Our three anonymous preludes involve melodic movement in both the left and right hands, quite consistently interspersed between chordal movements.

Furthermore, the anonymous preludes and la Barre’s prelude do not share any melodic licks. In general, La Barre’s prelude is simpler than the anonymous preludes.

In Nicolas Le Bègue’s (c.1631-1702) preface to his first book, he writes about the difficulty of notating preludes: “I endeavored to notate the preludes with as much clarity
as possible, as much for consistency of performance as for the playing style of the harpsichord, in which one separates the notes of chords and strikes them one after the other very quickly, rather than striking them together as on the organ.”

His following comment shows a distaste for the notational system: “If one encounters something a little difficult and obscure, I hope the clever person will attempt to remedy it, in view of the great difficulty in rendering this method of preluding intelligible to everyone.”

Le Bègue’s preludes are partially measured—to distinguish that different note-values carry specific rhythmic implications—reflecting a move away from whole-note notation. Writing in 1684, Le Bègue saw the unmeasured prelude for harpsichord as neither profound nor mystifying. He included preludes only in his 1677 book of suites and not in his second collection a decade later.

His preludes are fundamentally different than the Parville Manuscript. Not only are there no similar melodic licks, the prelude reflects a different approach to composing and thinking of French Baroque preludes:

(Please see next page)

---


Prelude en d la re sol, from Le Bègue's first book of suites.
Prelude en G ré sol ut b, from Le Bègue's first book of suites.\textsuperscript{41}

Thankfully, other composers continued the tradition of writing unmeasured preludes. *Clavecinistes* such as Marchand, Clérambault, and Rameau all used a notation first adopted by d’Anglebert for the printed preludes of 1689. In d'Anglebert's printed notation, whole notes are used to indicate harmonic pitches, but melodically important segments are indicated with mixed notation. Shorter notes do not always imply an increase in speed.

**Elizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre (1665-1729)** wrote preludes that were partially in the Italian style. She published her first book of harpsichord music in 1687, and second book in 1707. No pieces from the *Parville Manuscript* are attributed to her. La Guerre employs a variety of note values, following a procedure inaugurated by Le Bègue in his harpsichord book of 1677. But while Le Bègue uses this variety to provide rhythmic differentiation, La Guerre seems to employ mixed values primarily to delineate musical function, similar to the practice of d’Anglebert (though her first book appeared two years before d’Anglebert’s). Her harpsichord book of 1687 contains thirty-four pieces that are in four key groups: D minor, G minor, A minor, and F major. The suites are generally in this order: Introductory movement, allemande, courante I, courante II, sarabande, gigue(s), other. Her consistency is noteworthy; in no other seventeenth century French harpsichord collection is there such uniformity of content. Her harpsichord book of 1707, divide into two key groups (D minor and G major), and are arranged as follows: allemande, courante, sarabande, gigues, other. Except for the lack of an introductory movement, the format of these suites is identical to the composer’s first harpsichord book. La Guerre was clearly a woman with purpose; in the dedication of her
1707 work to Louis XIV, she reminds the king of the importance of his patronage, while praising and exalting him:

Such happiness for me, Sire, if my latest work may receive as glorious a reception from Your Majesty as I have enjoyed almost from the cradle, for, Sire, if I may remind you, you never spurned my youthful offerings. You took pleasure in seeing the birth of the talent that I have devoted to you; and you honoured me even then with your commendations, the value of which I had no understanding at the time. My slender talents have since grown. I have striven even harder, Sire, to deserve your approbation, which has always meant everything to me...

Elisabeth Jacquet de la Guerre is known for her keyboard writing in cantatas and sonatas, Italian genres. Stylistically, it is unlikely that she would compose the anonymous preludes. Unmeasured preludes usually can be divided into two main groups, toccatas or tombeaux. The former relate to the Italian toccatas of Frescobaldi and Froberger and the latter refer to the elegiac tombeaux composed, mostly by the French, in honour of dead teachers, patrons or friends. Her preludes were in the style of toccatas. In fact, one of her preludes was entitled the Tocade. Generally, La Guerre partitions her preludes into three sections: unmeasured, mouvement, and unmeasured. The mouvement section contains bar lines, meter markings, and note values. This format is incompatible with the three anonymous preludes, which were written in a purely French style; the tombeau-allemande style in normal measured notation is characterized by a slow tempo, a freedom of rhythm and a characteristic opening motif of a melodic scale rising a fourth.

Gaspard Le Roux (first known appearance of him in a publication in 1690 as a musician-1707) wrote four preludes that share some melodic licks with our anonymous preludes.

---

The lick of a broken triad moving upward, with a written out passing note in between the notes that belong to the triad, is present throughout Le Roux and d'Anglebert's preludes, as well as the anonymous preludes.

Fourth line of *Prelude F ut fa*

We will explore this same "lick" when we look at d'Anglebert's preludes. It makes sense that there are similarities between Le Roux's preludes and d'Anglebert's preludes, as Le Roux was heavily influenced by d'Anglebert, from which he "copied directly 15 of the 18 ornament signs, along with their explanations." However, d'Anglebert's preludes contain more licks that ultimately match the unmeasured preludes. Furthermore, Le Roux's notation of mordents differs from that of the anonymous preludes'. Le Roux notates mordents as pincés (which resemble end parentheses, and appear on the right side of notes) in his preludes, whereas the mordents in the anonymous preludes are indicated by pincements: \( \frac{\text{ }}{\text{}} \). None of Gaspard Le Roux's works are in the *Parville Manuscript*, and Le Roux's suites are in D minor, D major, A minor, A major, F major, F# minor, and G minor. His F major suite already contained a prelude, and he did not write suites in C or G. It is unlikely that Le Roux is the composer.

---

Le Roux's preludes do not resemble the three anonymous preludes. Pictured above is the Prelude of the D major suite.\textsuperscript{44}

Louis Marchand (1669-1732) composed two books of harpsichord pieces. The first book was announced in the Mercure galant of August 1699 and was published again with a new title page by Christophe Ballard in 1702.\textsuperscript{45} The second dates from 1702 and was re-edited by C. Ballard the following year. His first book of pieces for the clavecin contains two preludes that occur one right after the other: a G major followed by a G minor prelude. When he published it, he put bar lines and note values. The preludes do not contain similarities to the three anonymous preludes. There are no common melodic licks. No works attributed to Marchand appear in the Parville Manuscript. There are no weighty reasons to believe that Marchand is the composer of the anonymous preludes.

(Please see next page)

Marchand's G minor prelude is unmeasured, but shares no similar licks with the anonymous preludes. His style is different. In the middle of line two, he writes a triadic figure that he then commences to sequence up three additional times. He writes a chromatic descending bass line in line three. His opening melodic phrase is much more florid than the opening phrases that we see in the three anonymous preludes. His ending is different than the three identical endings of the anonymous preludes. The G major prelude deviates even more from the style of our three preludes.
Louis-Nicolas Clérambault (1676-1749) wrote two unmeasured preludes, one in C minor and one in C major. They do not contain melodic licks similar to the anonymous preludes.

Microfilms of Clérambault's 1734 *Troisième livre de pièces de clavecin*.
Jean-Philippe Rameau’s (1683-1764) *Premier Livre de Pièces de Clavecin* was published in 1706, and contains only one prelude. Roughly two-fifths of it is unmeasured, and the rest of it is in a strict 12/8 section. The unmeasured section contains characteristics not found in the three *Parville Manuscript* preludes. First, the harmonies in the Rameau are much more radical. There is a prevalent pattern in the left hand, where the left hand leaps the range of an octave or larger, down and then back up. This pattern repeats four times in the unmeasured section:

![Music notation](image)

The above pattern does not occur in the three anonymous preludes.

The last noteworthy unmeasured preludes were written around 1720. François Couperin (1668-1733), known as Le Grand Couperin, wrote a 1716 treatise, *L’Art de Toucher le Clavecin*, which was a major work that marked the demise of the unmeasured prelude. His preludes deliberately avoid the unmeasured notation; he meticulously includes ornaments, bar lines, note values, and even fingerings. He writes a pretext regarding the preludes. Not only are Le Grand Couperin’s preludes different than the three anonymous preludes in the Parville Manuscript, none of his pieces are included in the *Parville Manuscript*. 
Composers that may have composed the three anonymous preludes: d’Anglebert or Chambonnières

Jean Henry d’Anglebert (1629-1691) was most likely a pupil of Chambonnières, and was influenced immensely by lute repertoire. Most people attribute these three anonymous unmeasured preludes to him.

The Pieces de Clavecin (1689) was d’Anglebert’s only published work, published only two years before his death. Rès 89ter is a manuscript that contains d’Anglebert’s pieces in his handwriting. Though his published works of the preludes are in mixed notation, his handwritten versions are in whole notes. Rès 89ter contains at least four different types of handwriting. The four preludes in Rès 89ter are in handwriting number one, which is probably the handwriting of Jean-Henry d’Anglebert: “It is flexible, dexterous handwriting, visibly that of a professional musician very accustomed to writing music…Comparison of the signatures by Gustafson points to the same conclusion.”

Because the three preludes are in whole-note notation, I will be comparing the three anonymous preludes of the Parville Manuscript to d’Anglebert’s preludes written in the whole-note notation.

If we accept that d’Anglebert wrote the preludes on Rès 89ter, and that the composer was also the scribe of the Parville Manuscript (as suggested by Prévost), we can compare the preludes to see if the notation and writing style point to the same composer. Both d’Anglebert and the composer of the anonymous preludes have consistent writing; the three anonymous preludes are in one handwriting, as are d’Anglebert’s preludes in Rès 89ter. However, without even looking at musical

---

similarities and differences between d’Anglebert’s preludes and the anonymous preludes, we can see that the handwriting is different.

First, the handwriting from Rès 89ter attributed to d’Anglebert (left example) and the handwriting for the three anonymous preludes (right example) are different:

Secondly, d’Anglebert consistently uses the figure below to show the end of a prelude:

The author of the unmeasured preludes consistently uses a different figure to show the end of a prelude:

Thirdly, the slur lines (known as ténues) are notated differently. In the d’Anglebert preludes from Rès 89ter, they are notated consistently in a neat, horizontal manner:
But in the *Parville Manuscript*, the *ténues* are written quite differently:

The handwriting of the clefs and accidentals are also different. If we conclude that the composer of the *Parville Manuscript* is the same as the scribe, then the composer cannot be d’Anglebert due to the quite obvious different handwriting. However, if Prévost is incorrect, and the composer and the scribe are different people, than d’Anglebert still could possibly be the composer of the *Parville Manuscript*.

**What musicologists say about the preludes:**

Colin Tilney states that the preludes are stylistically similar to d’Anglebert’s preludes, but suggests that they may not be d’Anglebert’s because he had already written pieces in those keys: “except for the prelude in F, their keys do not correspond to d’Anglebert’s statement that he had prepared suites in “all the other keys:” *Je n’ay mis des pieces dans ce recueil que sur quatre tons, bien que j’en aye compose sur tous les autres. J’espère donner le reste dans un second Livre.* 48 A G major prelude already existed in the 1689 printed book and a different C major prelude exists in the autograph manuscript *Rès 89ter*. Alan Curtis believes that the three pieces bear similarities to d’Anglebert’s whole-note preludes, found in *Rès. 89ter*. Curtis posits that these three pieces were perhaps meant to appear in d’Anglebert’s second book. It is even possible that d’Anglebert wrote these three preludes, intending them to be part of his first book,

48 The opening sentence of d'Anglebert's preface to his 1689 publication.
but changed his mind, and put in other preludes that he preferred instead. This is not an uncommon process. For example, J.S. Bach substituted and replaced pieces in the Well-Tempered Clavier. Tilney argues that the three preludes are not quite the finished product, but rather a kind of rough draft; a “cinema verité—a transmission of what actually happened before the notation was cleaned up and the contents were scrutinized more critically.”

In her book, Jean Henry d’Anglebert and the 17th Century, Beverly Scheibert writes: “These fine examples of the prelude non mèsure deserve to be better known. Their brevity makes them suitable for those who wish to become acquainted with this style, and their structure is easily grasped.” She writes that the composer of the three preludes is d’Anglebert, because “all three are short, roughly comparable in length to the Prelude in C major from D’Anglebert’s MS Rès. 89ter, with opening gestures resembling his.” But despite the similar openings, she states that “the final cadence of the Prelude in F is the only cadence that is similar to d’Anglebert’s.” Furthermore, Scheibert acknowledges the fact that the harmonic treatment of the preludes is similar to d’Anglebert’s preludes, but neither the scalar passages of the Prelude in C major are typical of his work, nor the notation of the mordents. If we assume that the scribe and the composer of the three anonymous preludes are different people, this notation of the mordent can simply be attributed to the scribe’s preference.

Davitt Moroney briefly mentions the three unmeasured preludes in his article, *The Performance of Unmeasured Harpsichord Preludes*, and attributes them to d’Anglebert:

“Furthermore, three of the anonymous, unique preludes in *Parville*, grouped together and not serving as preludes to other pieces in their keys, are probably also by him [d’Anglebert], since they contain many fingerprints of his style.”

**General structure of our anonymous preludes and musical motives:**

When comparing the whole-note style in d’Anglebert’s hand (found in Res. 89ter), with the *Parville Manuscript*, we find many similarities. Firstly, the composer of the three anonymous preludes seems to be thinking more in terms of writing for the lute, due to the emphasis of chords in all preludes. D’Anglebert’s preludes, which center around the sounding of chords rather than motivic detail and sequences (unlike Louis Couperin) resemble lute preludes—generally, his preludes contain long chains of chords interrupted by fairly rare amounts of scalar passages. As Ledbetter describes, d’Anglebert’s preludes contain “periodic harmonic architecture that is similar to the longer lute preludes of Pinel and contrasts with the more capricious movement of Couperin.”

Secondly, the tessitura, or overall range, of the anonymous preludes, remains around the center the keyboard. Similarly, the tessitura of d’Anglebert’s preludes is solidly balanced around the middle of the keyboard; he does not explore register to the same extent that Louis Couperin does. However, he uses a considerable variety of texture; there are multiple layers in the music, created by the chords. Similarly, the
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preludes in the *Parville Manuscript* are textured. In my transcription of the three preludes, I have indicated the variety of texture in the *Parville Manuscript*, in the multiple voices. Thirdly, the structure of d’Anglebert’s preludes is similar to the structure of the three anonymous preludes. D’Anglebert’s preludes begin with the movement of upper parts over a pedal, followed by a section of comparatively rapid chord change with more movement in the bass. All three anonymous preludes begin with a pedal that heavily establishes the key. The next section consists of rapid chord changes, and the bass takes more of an active role in moving the piece forward. Then, the pieces dwell on the dominant, the fifth of the key. After the cadence in the dominant, the next section begins with a single voice in the treble that expands the range of the piece. This general pattern occurs in the three anonymous preludes.

Harmonically, the anonymous preludes are similar to each other, and bear similarities to d’Anglebert’s. However, with the exception of the C major prelude, three of d’Anglebert’s preludes are much lengthier, and also more harmonically complex. This supports Tilney’s proposal of the preludes as a *cinema verité*.

One of the most compelling similarities between the anonymous preludes and the preludes of d'Anglebert, are what Davitt Moroney was referring to when he wrote of musical fingerprints; what I have referred to as “licks.” I believe differently from Scheibert when she states that “the final cadence of the Prelude in F is the only cadence that is similar to d’Anglebert’s.”

Each of the unmeasured preludes ends with the same lick:

---

This lick occurs in many of d’Anglebert’s preludes. For example, line 3 of his G minor prelude in Rès 89ter:

The ending of d’Anglebert's G minor prelude also contains this lick:
A cadence within d’Anglebert’s D minor prelude also contains this lick:

The openings of d’Anglebert’s preludes are generally very similar to the anonymous preludes. For example, the opening statement of d’Anglebert’s G major prelude is almost identical to the opening statement of the anonymous Prelude F ut fa:

Anonymous Prelude F ut fa:

D’Anglebert's Prelude in G:

The ending lick of the above example is the same lick that establishes the home key in the first line of G re sol ♯ (bottom left example), and the lick that establishes the dominant (D) in the third line (bottom right example).
Another lick that consistently appears in the *Parville Manuscript*, is a broken triad that moves upward, with a written out passing note in between the notes that belong to the triad. Here are just a couple of examples:

Fourth line of *Prelude F ut fa* (above example)

First and second line of *Prelude G re sol ♮* (above two examples)

This lick occurs throughout d'Anglebert's preludes. Here are just three examples from the first page of d'Anglebert's *G major prelude*:

However, there are clues that point away from d'Anglebert as the composer of the anonymous preludes. There are also common licks that occur throughout d’Anglebert’s preludes, but are found nowhere in the anonymous preludes. One lick that d'Anglebert reuses is not found in our anonymous preludes:
Whereas d’Anglebert includes sections of strictly chordal movement, our anonymous preludes contain melodic material evenly placed between chordal movements. Perhaps the anonymous preludes are the bare bones models that d'Anglebert later would work from and expand, adding those sections of strict chordal movement. However, if this was the case, then we would have expected to find the preludes in the keys that he was composing his other suites in (as Tilney points out), and longer licks, rather than short melodic licks here and there. One could posit that the C major and G major anonymous preludes were the bare bones that d'Anglebert later expanded, but this is unlikely as the d'Anglebert preludes do not share any significant sections with the corresponding anonymous preludes.

Furthermore, the *Urlinie* in the anonymous preludes is extremely clear. However, the *Urlinie* is not as obvious in the d'Anglebert preludes. This could be because the line gets obscured and cut apart by the chordal sections that d'Anglebert adds within the skeletal framework. Though d'Anglebert is by far the likeliest composer of the anonymous preludes that we have found so far, there are differences that prevent me from confidently attributing the preludes to him. His influence is undeniable; there may have been another composer, who had either heard d'Anglebert and/or learned from him, or had taught him the basics to which d'Anglebert later expanded. This brings us to Chambonnières. We know that Chambonnières was the champion of the melodic line. He also wrote suites in these keys.
Jacques Champion Chambonnières (1601/2-1672) was “the founder of the French school of harpsichord playing.” Unlike his student d’Anglebert, who mostly wrote in direct imitation of the lute, Chambonnières was a composer and arranger working in different idioms in a common style. Unfortunately, no preludes survive by him.

David Fuller’s article in *Grove* on Chambonnières summarizes the ups and downs of Chambonnières’ career, and opens many doors for us to posit whether or not this great composer could have been the author of the anonymous preludes. We know that Froberger, an important figure in sparking the innovation of the French keyboard unmeasured prelude, arrived in Paris in 1652, but it seems as though Froberger knew of Chambonnières’ compositions as early as 1649:

In the Netherlands, Constantijn Huygens was busily spreading his fame to anyone who would listen, and it was apparently through him that about 1649 Froberger received some of Chambonnières’ pieces. It cannot have been later than 1651 and was probably a year earlier that the three Couperin brothers, Louis, Charles and the elder François, came from nearby Chaumes to Chambonnières to serenade the lord of the manor on his name day, surprising and delighting him to such an extent that he launched all three in the Parisian musical world.

After Froberger arrived in Paris in 1652, he became involved in the circle of clavecinistes who innovated the unmeasured prelude phenomenon—this group certainly included Chambonnières. Chambonnières is credited to be pivotal in the creation of the French harpsichord style, though there are not many surviving sources from the first half of the 17th century that we can directly point to. It is unlikely that he did not compose any unmeasured preludes, as he was in correspondence with Froberger and clavecinistes, and his keyboard music reflects the influence of the lute style:

---

The dark years of Chambonnières biography — the period between 1611 and about 1635 — correspond exactly to the pinnacle of the French lute school, and one can only imagine that he and other possessors of harpsichords, of which inventories show that there were many, did not hesitate to play their favourite lute pieces as best they could, in the manner of the handful of anonymous early keyboard transcriptions, both French and German, that survive...He has long been credited with transferring the diaphanous lute style of Ennemond Gaultier and his contemporaries (the *style brisé*) to the harpsichord...\(^{56}\)

According to David Fuller’s character assessments of Chambonnières:

“It is consistent with what we know of Chambonnières the man and with reports of his later activities that he would have set out deliberately to ‘cash in on’ the immense success, particularly the social success, of the lutenists...\(^{57}\) If that's the case, he certainly would have composed unmeasured preludes, especially during its exciting beginnings.

Chambonnières was extremely active as a musician, composer, and dancer in the royal court of Louis XIII. He played for paying concert series, dating back to October 17, 1641. When the king died in 1643, and Anne of Austria became regent, she commissioned him to buy a harpsichord for her son, Louis XIV. Chambonnières was a prominent harpsichord teacher who had the power to catapult the three Couperins into fame. He was so popular, that there was even talk of him to tour the Netherlands.

However, in 1657, Chambonnières’ fortunes took a drastic turn for the worst. On February 14\(^{th}\), King Louis XIV engaged Etiènne Richard as the harpsichord teacher, rather than Chambonnières. That very spring, Chambonnières lost a lawsuit that forced him to sell land for much less than it was actually worth. His wife then separated from


him. According to Titon du Tillet, who published notes on the lives of poets and
musicians, there was a plot to put Louis Couperin into Chambonnières’ post, but
Couperin refused out of loyalty to his teacher.

A former admirer of Chambonnières, Dutchman Christiaan Huygens, expressed
disappointment after hearing Chambonnières play and sing an air on 20 December 1660,
which ‘seemed to me only mediocre:’ and on 14 September 1662 he wrote:

The situation of the Marquis de Chambonnière would be pitiable if he had not
put on such airs in the past. The last time I saw him he tried again to make me
believe he was no longer playing the harpsichord – he would indeed be
unfortunate now if he did not possess that métier.

This remark is in sharp contrast with praise by Mersennes in the early 1630s:

After listening to the harpsichord played by the Sieur de Chambonnières … I can
only express my feeling by saying that one should hear nothing afterwards,
whether one desires lovely melodies and fine accompanying parts mingled
together, beauty of rhythm, fine touch or lightness and speed of hand … it can be
said that this instrument has met its ultimate master.

Chambonnières’ fortune and pride further dwindled after 23 October 1662, when
d’Anglebert took over his post because Chambonnières could not accompany from a
bass line. Violist Jean Rousseau had remarked:

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.

Chambonnières refused to learn the basso continuo; learning this new skill would
have appeared as if he was forced to fit into a new generation ushered forth by an
unwelcome competitor (Lully had been appointed as Surintendant de la musique de la
chambre in 1661.) Playing basso continuo would have decreased his status at the court, to
a mere hired professional in a larger orchestral machine who could be discarded.
Similarly to d’Anglebert, Chambonnières published harpsichordist pieces only two years before he died. However, unlike d’Anglebert, when Chambonnières published two volumes of harpsichord pieces in 1670, his reputation was damaged and diminished. When he died two years later, he was in difficult financial circumstances. Though no preludes exist in manuscript sources and in his published works, one may posit that he composed preludes for his suites, but felt as though they were not developed enough to be presented to the public, especially since the style of these preludes differs from Louis Couperin's widely circulated and popular preludes. Historically, it makes sense that these preludes belong to Chambonnières, as the preludes seem to have been composed earlier than later; they do not resemble the later composers, such as Rameau or Le Grand Couperin, but rather, earlier composers, such as d'Anglebert.

**Looking at notation and ornamentation: D'Anglebert or Chambonnières?**

The *Parville Manuscript* contains the following ornaments:

- **Arpeggio** (notated as appears in Chambonnières’ ornament chart). This ornament only appears one time in the three preludes, at the beginning of *Prelude C sol ut*.

- The arpeggio, from Chambonnières’ ornament chart

D’Anglebert specifically notates an arpeggio with a slash across the stem in his ornament table: “the lutenist’s oblique bar through the stem of the note whose slant

---

58 See Appendix 3 for Chambonnières’ and d’Anglebert’s complete ornament charts.
indicates rise or fall." Of course, even the unmeasured preludes in Rè s 89ter do not contain the lute oblique symbol, because rhythm durations are not indicated; there are no stems to put the slant on. None of his preludes, whole note or mixed style, contain the vertical wavy arpeggio figure that begins Prelude C sol ut. Rather, he writes out the notes of the chord in the order that he wants them to sound:

![Mordent Example](image)

An arpeggio ornament is only written once in the unmeasured preludes. All other times, the notes of the chord are written out in whole note notation, in the order that they are to be played. Therefore, we must look for more definite clues within the music, such as mordents:

![Mordent Example](image)

Example taken from first line of Prelude C sol ut.

Mordents are written in two ways, and are a major notational difference between the d'Anglebert preludes and the anonymous preludes. The one pictured on the second note in the above example is known as the *pincement*, and appears in all three preludes, especially in C sol ut. This notation was included in Chambonnières’ ornament charts, but not in d'Anglebert's ornament charts. Mordents are also notated as *pincés*, pictured on the right of the third note in the above example. D’Anglebert's unmeasured preludes

are filled with *pincés*, and the *pincé* is notated in his ornament chart. The *pincé* only appears once in *Prelude C sol ut*; it is written in a little darker and appears squeezed in between notes, as if it were an afterthought by the scribe.

Trills do not help us distinguish between d'Anglebert and Chambonnières, as trills are in both composers’ ornament charts, and are notated throughout the *Parville Manuscript*:

![Trill Example](image)

Another ornament is the *port de voix en montant* (appoggiatura), which is notated two times in *Prelude C sol ut*, and once in *Prelude f ut fa*, at the beginning of line three. The ornament is not the mordent, but rather the slur line between the second and third note of the below example:

![Port de Voix Example](image)

This was an important ornament in the French Baroque. "Each time he [Chambonnières] played a piece, he would add *port de voix* passages."\(^{60}\) Though the *port de voix* is only notated a couple of times, it can be added throughout the preludes. For example, a keyboard player could add a *port de voix en montant* at the end of *G re sol ♮* (when it moves from G to A in the example below (in baritone clef):

![Port de Voix En Montant Example](image)

---

However, Chambonnières notates *port de voix* differently than the way they appear in our anonymous preludes:

\[ \text{Port de voix} \]

D'Anglebert, on the other hand, notates his *port de voix* in the same way that it is notated in the anonymous preludes:

\[ \text{Cheute en port en descendant} \]
\[ \text{Cheute en montant} \]

Another ornament that occurs in the anonymous preludes is the *cheute fur une notte*:

\[ \text{Cheute fur une notte} \]

*Cheute fur une notte* (filling in notes) is notated in the manner of d’Anglebert and not Chambonnières, who refers to this ornament as a *coulé* (and indicates filling in notes as a line between notes).\(^{61}\) However, Chambonnières might have adopted a different system of representing this ornament due to the whole-note notation of the unmeasured preludes.

(Please see next page)

\(^{61}\) See appendix for ornament chart.
Last thoughts

Chambonnières arranged his pieces for clavecin in this order: C major, D minor, D major, F major, G minor, and G major. It is logical that he would compose preludes for his suites in C major, F major, and G major.

Pieces in C major
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Gaillarde
Gigue La Verdinguette

Pieces in F major
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Sarabande

Pieces in G major
Allemande
Gigue
Courante
Courante
Sarabande ‘Jeunes Zephirs’
Menuet

The three anonymous preludes closely follow the groupings of pieces by Chambonnières, in C, F, and G respectively:

Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Le Moutier; C-Dur
(Couperin, Louis: Le Moutier; C-Dur)
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; C-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; C-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; C-Dur

(17 pieces in between)

Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: O beau jardin; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; F-Dur

62 See appendix for d'Anglebert's complete list of published works.
(La Barre, Joseph: Courantes; F-Dur)
(Couperin, Louis: Galliards; F-Dur)
(Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; F-Dur)
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Chaconnes; F-Dur

(7 pieces in between)

Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Gigues; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Canaries; G-Dur

(8 pieces in between)

Anonymous: Preludes; C-Dur
Anonymous: Preludes; F-Dur
Anonymous: Preludes; G-Dur

Of the unmeasured preludes that are attributed to composers, d'Anglebert's preludes most closely resemble the anonymous preludes. However, I have mentioned differences that prevent me from identifying d'Anglebert as the composer with absolute certainty. The composer of the preludes most likely associated with d'Anglebert; the composer may have been a student who imitated the basic framework d'Anglebert's preludes and copied certain licks, or a teacher who set up the basic framework of unmeasured preludes that d'Anglebert would take and expand. Chambonnières is a likely candidate.
Appendix

Appendix 1: Scribes, and the pieces they copied:

A: #1-104 (except 68a)
B: 105-109
C: 110-111
D: 112-137
E: 138-143
F: 144
G: 68a, 145-147
H: 148
I: 149

Appendix 2: Order of compositions:

Couperin, Louis: Preludes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; d-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Preludes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Gigues; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Canaries; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Pastourelle; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Gavottes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Chaconnes; d-Moll
Couperin, Louis: La Complainte; d-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Allemandes; d-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Allemandes; d-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Courantes; d-Moll
Gaultier, Ennemond: Courantes; d-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Sarabandes; d-Moll
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Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: La Toute belle; d-Moll
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; a-Moll
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: La Loureuse; d-Moll
Hardel, Jacques: Allemandes; d-Moll
Anonymus: Airs; d-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: L' Amour malade. Excerpts. Arr
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; D-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; D-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Chaconnes; D-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; D-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Acis et Galatée. Excerpts. Arr
Couperin, Louis: Allemande de la paix; e-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; e-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; e-Moll
Froberger, Johann Jakob: Gigaes; e-Moll
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Gigaes; e-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; g-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; g-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; g-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; g-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Passacaglias; g-Moll
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; g-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Courantes. Arr; g-Moll
Anglebert, Jean-Henry d': Courantes; g-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Isis. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Le triomphe de l'Amour. Excerpts. Arr
Anonymus: Ah petite bruneette; g-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: La Mignonne; a-Moll
Richard, Etienne: Courantes; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; a-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Psyché. Excerpts. Arr
Hardel, Jacques: Gavottes; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Gavottes; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Minuets; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Minuets; a-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Courantes; a-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Courantes; a-Moll
La Barre, Joseph: Gigaes; a-Moll
Rossi, Luigi: Passacaglias; a-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; C-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; C-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Le Moutier; C-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Le Moutier; C-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; C-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; C-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; C-Dur
Pinel, Germain: Sarabandes; C-Dur
Anglebert, Jean-Henry d': Chaconnes; C-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Amadis. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Acis et Galatée. Excerpts. Arr
Couperin, Louis: Rigaudons; C-Dur
Lebègue, Nicolas-Antoine: Gavottes; C-Dur
Anonymus: Gavottes; C-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; c-Moll
Couperin, Louis: La Precieuse; c-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; c-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; c-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Gigues; c-Moll
Couperin, Louis: La Bergeronnette; c-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; F-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; F-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; F-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: O beau jardin; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; F-Dur
La Barre, Joseph: Courantes; F-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Galliards; F-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; F-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Chaconnes; F-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; G-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; G-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Courantes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Sarabandes; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Gigues; G-Dur
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Canaries; G-Dur
Richard, Etienne: Courantes; G-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; G-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Chaconnes; G-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Galliards; G-Dur
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; e-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Allemandes; h-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Courantes; h-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Sarabandes; h-Moll
Anonymous: Preludes; C-Dur
Anonymous: Preludes; F-Dur
Anonymous: Preludes; G-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Passepieds. Arr; G-Dur
Anglebert, Jean-Henry d': Dans nos bois Silvandre s'écrie. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Amadis. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Thésée. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Proserpine. Excerpts. Arr
Anonymus: Rigaudons; g-Moll
Anonymus: Rigaudons; g-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Armide. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: La pastorale comique. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Atys. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: ?Atys?. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Persée. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Persée. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: La grotte de Versailles. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Les Plaisirs. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Psyché. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Flore. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Thésée. Excerpts. Arr
Anonymus: Minuets; C-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Isis. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Le triomphe de l'Amour. Excerpts. Arr
Anonymus: Gigue du Prince d'Orange; G-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Le bourgeois gentilhomme. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Thésée. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Thésée. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Thésée. Excerpts. Arr
Anonymus: Entrée; g-Moll
Anonymus: Entrée; g-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Les Muses. Excerpts. Arr
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Les Muses. Excerpts. Arr
Gaultier, Ennemond: Les Plaisirs; g-Moll
Anonymus: Rigaudons; g-Moll
Gaultier, Ennemond: Rigaudons; a-Moll
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: La naissance de Vénus. Excerpts. Arr
Anglebert, Jean-Henry d': La Bergère Annette. Arr; g-Moll
Anglebert, Jean-Henry d': Minuets; g-Moll
Couperin, Louis: Preludes; a-Moll
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: Le Printemps; a-Moll
Lebègue, Nicolas-Antoine: Gavottes; C-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Psyché. Excerpts. Arr
Chambonnières, Jacques Champion de: La Sotise; C-Dur
Lully, Jean-Baptiste: Armide. Excerpts. Arr
Appendix 3: Chambonnières’ ornament chart (top) and d’Anglebert’s ornament chart (bottom).

Appendix 4: Chambonnières’ complete list of works:

Book 1

Pièces in A minor
Allemande la rare
Courante
Double de la courante
Courante
Courante
Sarabande
Galliarde

Pièces in C major
Allemande “La Dunquerque”
Courante ‘Iris’
Courante
Sarabande de la Reyne

Pièces in D minor major
Allemande ‘La Loureuse’
Courante ‘La toute belle’
Courante de Madame
Courante
Sarabande
Courante ‘Les Barricades’
Gigue ‘La Madelainette’
Gigue

Pièces in F major
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Courante
Sarabande

Pièces in G minor
Pavanne ‘L’entretien des Dieux
Courante
Sarabande
Courante
Sarabande
Gigue ‘La Vilageoise’
Canaris

Book 2

Pièces in C major
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Gaillarde
Gigue ‘La Verdinguette

Pièces in D minor
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Courante
Sarabande
Pièces in D major
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Courante
Sarabande

Pièces in F major
Allemande
Courante
Courante
Sarabande

Pièces in G minor
Pavanne
Gigue
Courante
Gigue ou il y a un Canon

Pièces in G major
Allemande
Gigue
Courante
Courante
Sarabande ‘Jeunes Zephirs’
Menuet
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