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ABSTRACT

The Flute Concertos of Antonio Mahaut (bap.1719 - c.1785)
With an Emphasis on Interpretation and Performance

Antonio Mahaut is recorded as a Franco-Flemish flautist, composer and editor. Although he is not widely known today, some of his compositions, and also a respected flute treatise, were published extensively during his lifetime. His numerous concerti, however, were never published.

This dissertation will examine Mahaut's life and concerti and attempt to place the latter in their historical context with regard to stylistic interpretation. Consideration is given to the extent to which Mahaut's concerti show the influence of the new Venetian solo concerto, popularised by the Italian violin virtuosi, and to the significant influence of Mahaut's French musical education. An awareness of baroque performance practices and the quest for authenticity in performance has created enormous controversy over the application of French rhythmical practices in music outside France. We consider the significant influence of such conventions on late-baroque galant music of which Mahaut's concerti are excellent examples. With regard to ornamentation, we note the limited scope of Mahaut's discussion of this in his Méthode and the considerably broader approach demanded by the notations in the concerti themselves. Discussion is also given to the variety of articulation markings found in the concerti and the extent to which many are derived from Italian violin bowings. Notational characteristics and discrepancies throughout the manuscripts are also treated.

When examining the interpretation of late-baroque music today, much of our knowledge is influenced by the monumental theoretical works of the German galant school and particularly, with regard to the flute, that of Quantz. The question remains however: to what extent can we apply the discussions of Quantz and his contemporaries to Mahaut's music?
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INTRODUCTION

The Flute Concertos Of Antonio Mahaut
(bap.1719 - c.1785)
With An Emphasis On Interpretation And Performance

A Franco-Flemish flautist/composer, Mahaut spent much of his working life in Amsterdam and Paris. Although he wrote many works for the flute, including a respected treatise, and was published extensively during his lifetime, little of this work is widely known today. His numerous concerti, however, were never published and exist only in manuscript, today scattered in libraries throughout Europe including Brussels, Karlsruhe, Regensburg and Stockholm.

As an international centre of music publishing Amsterdam formed a musical cross-road, exposed to a wide variety of styles and, in particular, to the new Venetian solo concerto popularised by Italian violin virtuosi including Vivaldi and Locatelli. In addition Mahaut brought to his concerti the significant influence of his French musical education. Thus his concerti can be seen as a synthesis of French and Italian stylistic conventions, overlaying the Venetian concerto structure and instrumental figuration with French rhythmical practices and ornamentation.

In particular, the revival of baroque practices and the quest for an authentic performance has created enormous controversy and confusion over the application and use of rhythmic alteration. Although there is extensive evidence that both *notes inégales* and overdotting were well established in France, there is little to document the extent to which they applied beyond French borders. Quantz is one of the first to discuss overdotting as an independent
custom outside France, unrelated to *notes inégales*. In particular we note in his discussion the *galant* style overdotting of smaller-value figures. Such figures are abundant in Mahaut’s concerti, dominating much of his thematic material. Thus, whilst Mahaut fails to mention the expressive alteration of rhythm in his *Méthode*, we must not overlook its significant influence on late-baroque *galant* music.

With regard to ornamentation, we note that Mahaut’s somewhat limited discussion given in his *Méthode* does not reflect the considerably broader approach demanded by the notations in the concerti themselves, encompassing the much greater variety and flexibility found in French and Italian sources. Significantly, this contrasts the German *galant* rigid application of the *accented* appoggiatura and indeed the *galant* fashion for the long descending execution. Likewise, Mahaut’s articulation does not reflect the German *galant* adoption of French tonguing syllables, which he claimed are no longer used. Instead his notations show the influence and exploitation of Italian violin bowings, particularly that of the slurred-*staccato*.

Much of our knowledge today, regarding the interpretation of late-baroque music, is significantly influenced by the monumental theoretical works of the German *galant* school, and with regard to the flute, particularly that of Johann Joachim Quantz. The question remains, therefore, to what extent we can apply the discussions of Quantz and his contemporaries to Mahaut’s music. Although written later in Berlin, Quantz’s *Versuch* represents the prevailing style of his earlier post in Dresden, a style dominated by French and Italian musicians including the flautist Pierre Buffardin, also known to Mahaut. It is possible that Quantz’s first-hand knowledge of both French and Italian performance practices help to establish him as a legitimate authority in interpreting the music of Mahaut.
PART I

MAHAUT: COMPOSER, FLAUTIST AND EDITOR
CHAPTER ONE

MAHAUT’S LIFE: A RECONSIDERED BIOGRAPHY

Antoine [Anton; Antonio] Mahaut [Mahault; Mahout; Mahoti; Mahu] was known principally as a respected Netherlands’ flautist, composer and editor. Although little of his work is known or is easily available today, Mahaut was a prolific composer for the flute. His music included many concerti, solo and trio sonatas, duets for two flutes or violins, and a respected treatise: *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre en peu de temps à jouer de la flute traversière*, published in 1759 simultaneously in French and Dutch.

In 1962 Barry Brook suggested a possible birth date of 1720. It is now known, however, that he was baptised on May 4th 1719 at Saint John’s Church in Namur, Belgium. The third child of flautist Oger Mahaut and Marie-Jeanne Bailleux, he came from a family of musicians that included his father, grandfather, uncle Antoine, brother Emmanuel and cousins Françoise and Louis Mahaut. He is thought to have studied under his father and a certain ‘Master Coulon’ in the French style before becoming a member of the Bishop of Strickland’s ‘Chamber’ at the early age of fifteen, along with his brother Emmanuel and cousin Louis. In 1735, according to Moret, Mahaut travelled to London with the Bishop’s entourage where he had the fortune to meet the publisher John Walsh, who subsequently published Mahaut’s *Six Duets for German Flutes or Violins*.

---


Upon his return to Namur in 1737, Mahaut spent one year in the service of the wife of Walter de Colijaeer, commanding officer of the fortresses of Barrière, who later found him employment in Amsterdam and financial support from the States of Freisland and Holland as a reward for his services.

It is not entirely clear in which year Mahaut actually left Namur for Amsterdam; according to the late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century biographical dictionaries of Gerber (1790-92) and Fetis (c.1863), he lived there from 1739. During his time in Amsterdam Mahaut was known as a flute teacher and as a virtuoso. In the *Amsterdamsche Courant* we find an entry detailing a concert to be given by Mahaut on January 31st 1742:

> Mahaut will give a concert on Wednesday 31st January in The Sun on The Nieuwendyk, where he will let himself be heard on the flute traverso with concerti and solos from his compositions. The tickets can be obtained in the City Lion in the Nes and in The Sun for 2 guilders.

Other than his flute *Méthode*, this is the only surviving indication that Mahaut was active in Amsterdam as a performer as well as a composer. Little information exists regarding the venue other than it was a public house at which regular concerts were given. According to Rineke Smilde, announcements of these performances included a number of Mahaut's contemporaries: Hallendaal (1743), Veracini (1746) and the Graf brothers (1751).

---


4 *Amsterdamsche Courant*, 30th January, 1742. ['Maho, zal woensdag den 31 January, Concert geeven in de Son op den Nieuwendyk, alwaer hy zig op de Fluyt Travers met concerten en solos van zyn Composijtie zal hooren laten, De Luten zyn te bekomen in de Stad Lion in de Nes, en in de Son op den Nieuwendyk, 2 guldien het lot.‘]

5 Reede, Rein de. ed., *Concerning the Flute* (Amsterdam: Broekmans and Van Poppel B. V., 1984), p.115. Reede, however, gives no indication as to where these announcements were published or displayed.
Such scant surviving information is perhaps not surprising in the light of our general lack of information regarding the state of music in the Netherlands at this time. What verifiable information we do have is mostly concerned with the second half of the century. In contrast to centres like London, where the idea of the public concert was well established, music in Amsterdam of the early-eighteenth century was, it would seem, a somewhat private affair. Concerts are known to have been given in hostels, private homes and inns, such as Mahaut’s above, but little is known of their content. Few announcements or advertisements for such concerts have been preserved and those that we do have reveal little information. An advertisement of a certain Dr. Morphy’s concert on the Harpe d’Irlande ou Harp de David in the Nouvelles d’Amsterdam on November 1st 1735 is perhaps the first announcement of a public concert to appear in the local newspapers.6

In addition to these privately organised occasions, organ concerts, supported by the Church, were also a regular institution in the Netherlands. These, however, included not just organ music but instrumental concerts as well. In 1739 Mattheson writes of hearing the ‘incomparable’ Corelli performed in Dutch churches at concerts that were “not during the service, but at Vespers or after the service, not only on the organ but also violins, at concerts which were often arranged to give capable players an opportunity to exercise their art”.7

---


In this second quarter of the century, the Netherlands was also welcoming numerous travelling virtuosi and a number of renowned foreign composers resided in the country for some time, particularly in Amsterdam. Two such composers who came to be well-known and active in the Netherlands, and as such must be considered to have been a significant influence on Mahaut's own work, were the Italians Antonio Vivaldi and Pietro Locatelli, bringing with them the latest style of violin playing. In 1738 Vivaldi was invited to conduct a music festival celebrating the first centenary of the Municipal Theatre (Schouwburg) of Amsterdam. In addition, he is thought to have visited the city previously to meet with the publishers Estienne Roger and Michel Charles le Cène who had successfully engraved all of Vivaldi's instrumental works. Thus, the Dutch public came to have a taste for concerti and sonatas, particularly those of Italian origin. When the writer P.J. Grosely attended a concert in Amsterdam in 1772, he commented: "I had the feeling that I was again at the concerts of Rome and Naples. It was the same music, the same taste and the same perfection in all parts of the execution".

A significant part of Amsterdam's considerable attraction for composers and foreign virtuosi was its emergence during the first half of the eighteenth century as an international centre of music publishing. In Amsterdam alone, the publishing houses included those of

---

8 Often such travelling musicians would break their journey to London by stopping in Amsterdam or The Hague to give concerts, thus gaining sufficient funds to continue their journey. See an account given by Charles Burney in *An Eighteenth Century Musical Tour In Central Europe and The Netherlands*, ed. Percy A. Scholes, vol. II (London, 1759), p.225.

9 For further information regarding this festival see Marc Pincherle, *Antonio Vivaldi et la Musique Instrumentale* (Paris, 1948), p.24; and D.F. Scheurleer, *Het Muziekleven in Nederland in de tweede helft der 18e eeuw in verband met Mozart's verblijf aldaar* (The Hague, 1909), p.211-212. Scheurleer also quotes a source that in 1764 claims "descriptions of such events were growing so numerous that a small library could be filled with them," p.214.

Roger, Mortier, de la Coste and Chareau, Witvogel, Hummel, Schmitt, Olofsen, Covens and Markordt. Numerous foreign composers from Italy, France and Germany sent their works to be published in Amsterdam, guaranteed of a wide distribution. In his important work on Vivaldi, Pincherle notes the “capital importance” of these publishers “for the history of the period from which would emerge the sonata and the Classical symphony”. The publishing business in those days, however, did not conform to strict controls as it does today and pirated editions were common practice. As a result, many composers would undertake the printing of their own works. In a newspaper advertisement for example, quoted by Koole, a musician warns the public “not to buy Witvogel’s unauthorised edition of his Trios, which he himself will sell for half the price complete with figured basses”.

Similarly, on the 20th July 1751, Mahaut obtained a Privilege from the States of Holland and Westfrieland. In it he is registered as a ‘composer and music master’ and is granted a patent to publish his own works for the period of fifteen years (see Plate 1):

The States of Holland and Westfrieland acknowledge [that] Antonio Mahaut, composer and music master, resident at Amsterdam, that he, suppliant, wishes that all the music works that he has made or will make will see the light in print, and while publishing all these works in an unsurpassable way by copper engraving and printing involves great expenses, suppliant fears not without reason that some self-interested people might have the intention, as soon as suppliant has published, to partly or entirely reprint the same [works], which would not only cause suppliant great damage, but also he would be deprived of his time, effort and work.

To avoid this, suppliant humbly requests that it may please to benevolently benefit suppliant with our patent for the period of fifteen subsequent years, to solely print all

---

11 Pincherle, Vivaldi, p.294.

his musical works or those suppliant will still make, at such a fine for the offenders as
we wish to decree.

... this form, thereof the 20th July 1751

Which did W.v. Maanen.13

Indeed, on the 26th October 1751, we find a publication announcement in the
Amsterdamsche Courant for two sets of Mahaut’s works, three months after his request for
a patent:

Today is published: A. Mahaut, VI Sinfonie a piu strumenti, at 6 fl., VI Sonata da
camera a due flauti traversière (Op. 4), all with Privilege.14

The fact that these works were in fact published by Mahaut himself is confirmed in a
catalogue of works held by the University Library at Leiden:

Due to earlier stipulation in the Privileges, granted to printers by the States of Holland
and Westfriesland, that for each work a bound copy must be sent to the appropriate
state university - the library of the present State University (Leiden), owes its small
collection of music works, of which a list follows hereunder:

... Mahaut, Antonio: VI Sinfonie a piu strumenti (algemeen privilegie van 1751)
VI Sonata da camera a due flauti traversière (Op. 4) (algemeen
privilege van 1751)
VI Sonata da camera a tre., due flauti traversière o due violini e
violoncello o basso continuo.15

13 ARA, Staten van Holland, ‘inventarisnr., 1705’. Archives of the Staten van Holland (Algemeen
Rijkarchief), folio 226.

14 Amsterdamsche Courant, 26th October 1751. ['Op heden word nitgegeven: A. Mahaut, VI Sinfonie a piu
stromenti, a 6 gl., VI Sonata da camera a due flauti traversière (Op. 4), Alle met Privilegie’]

15 Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis (The Journal of the Society for
Netherlands Music History), Bovesteenen, vol. III, 1874-81, pp. 111-113. ['Muziekwerken in de
Universiteitsbibliothek te Leiden. Aan de vroegere bepaling in de Privilgien, door de Staten van Holland
en Westfriesland aan drukkers verleend, dat van ieder werk een ingebonden exemplaar aan’s Lands
Hoogeschool gezonden moest woorden, heeft de bibliotheek der tegenwoordige Rijksuniversiteit een
kliene verzameling muziekwerken te danken, waarvan de lijst bier volgt.']
Plate 1: Privilege, granted by the States of Holland and Westfriesland on the 20th July, 1751.

HAN DE EERSTE GROOT
SPEERSTE HOFFE STAATEN
VAN HOLLANDT, EN
WESTFRIEDLANDT, DOOR WIE
AFGEROND, GEEIIGNIC GEGEVEN.

Gestemt Schuldige Een Bedrijfijt te koemen.
Antonio Mahaut, Composituur en Mediek Mestler,
woonende te Amsterdnam, het dat hij Suppliant van Willendt is, om alle Zynne Mediek-Verken die gemaakt
Zyn, of nog van hem staan gemaakt te worden, door
Zyn Druck in't leit te geven, en dezelf daar te grote
kosten moesten worden aangestaet, om alle die
zwichten op een Onverbeeitelijkige-Wijde in't keep
te doen Brijken in't drucken, zoo is den Suppliant
niet fonder reden berigt, dat enige baaftuige
Menschen, hun toele moge maaken, om zoo dra,
den Suppliant Zyne Mediek-Verken in't leit:
vaam te geven? Detzelve gescheel of geseicikel met
't drukken, waar door den Suppliant niet alleen
graste Schaefe boude komen t. Byen, maar ook van
Zyn Tij, Meeite en Arbeijt, Zestuiken bijven,
Om 't welke voor te koemen. Zee leerto hij
Suppliant Zij t. U. DE EERSTE GROOT, Speerste
Meeite.
Volmaaendig vertederende, dat het Eerst-Dele-Goed
Moogende behagen mag den Suppliant
geestgundelijk te benificeeren met deseelme actij.
om voor de Tijd van Sijlten-After een vlijende
Jaaren, alle Sijne Musick-Werken die gemaakt:
Zijn, of door hem gemaakt nog gemaakt Haan te
worden, alleen te mogen doen drucken, op deuende
pane-tenens de overtrekend, als tijt Eerst-Dele-Goed
wij orden.
Mogende datte geven te Statuiren.

Erwôte, nupro 4 maart gemelde.
Jaer vor zijnde den 25uyl 1751.

T' Welde inendo,  

[Signature]
In his entry regarding Mahaut in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Roger Cotte suggests that Mahaut made at least two trips to Paris in about 1740 and 1755. This was likely to have been principally to visit the French publisher Le Clerc who, around 1740, published Mahaut’s Opera Prima, VI Sonata a flauto traversière solo e basso. A number of Mahaut’s works also appeared subsequently in Le Clerc’s catalogue between 1752 and 1760, including the 1er recueil de pièces françaises et italiennes and the Sonates à quatre partie. During these trips to Paris and certainly prior to residing in Amsterdam, Mahaut undoubtedly came into contact with renowned French flute virtuosi including Blavet and Michel de la Barre, both of whom performed regularly at the Concert Spirituel, the most popular series of subscription concerts in Paris since they began in 1725. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Mahaut himself performed at these concerts.

In addition to his earlier visits to London with the Bishop of Strickland, and to Paris, Mahaut is believed to have travelled widely including journeys to Dresden, Augsburg, Lyon and Berlin. There is certainly a strong likelihood that Mahaut did indeed visit Dresden, principally in the light of his association with Pierre Gabriel Buffardin (1690-1768), the famous French-born flautist and teacher of Quantz who lived and worked at the Dresden court from 1715 to 1750. Mahaut was obviously familiar with Buffardin’s innovation to improve the flute’s intonation by using a screw for the cork within the head-joint. Mahaut describes this and its advantages in detail in the introduction to his Méthode, despite the

---

17 A classified catalogue of Mahaut’s works appears in chapter two.
18 For more information regarding the development of flute playing in France, see Jane Bowers, The French Flute School; 1700-1760, (Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1977).
19 Moret, Paul. ‘Moret Notes’.
general assumption that it was the invention of Quantz who takes credit for it in his *Versuch*. Two of Mahaut’s concerti manuscripts (Concerto in e minor and Concerto in d minor) bear a dedication to Buffardin, and according to Moret he in fact composed these two *concerti a cinque* in Dresden.  

In addition, the only German publication of Mahaut’s work for the flute, *VI Sonata da camera a tre*, also carries a flattering dedication to Buffardin:

Dedicated to the Most Illustrious Signor Buffardin, Virtuoso First Flautist: The pure friendship with which you honoured me during my stay in Dresden prompts me to take the liberty of dedicating to you these Sonatas for Two Flutes and Basso Continuo, hoping that you will accept them as a mark of my gratitude, and with the same kindness with which you made me welcome.  
I have the honour indeed of being your most humble servant,  
Antonio Mahaut.  

The second German musician possibly well-known to Mahaut was Johann Christian Schickhardt (1782-1862), a travelling musician whose compositions included a number for the flute. Schickhardt’s background came from the courts of Hamburg, Weimar and Cöthen. He also spent many years in the Netherlands during which time he held a post at the University of Leiden around 1745. It has been suggested by Dr. Jos Woulters, in a Dutch radio series broadcast in 1960 and later published by *Radio Nederland Wereldomroep*, that

---

20 Moret, Paul. ‘Moret Notes’. The manuscript of these concerti now reside in the Brussels Conservatoire Royal de Musique Bibliotheque. (see chapter 2 for a full catalogue and location of Mahaut’s works).

21 Mahaut, A. *VI Sonata da camera a tre*... (Augsburg: Johann Christian Leopold, n.d.) [‘Dedicato Al Molt’ Ilustre Signore Buffardin, Virtuoso e Primo Sonatore di Flauto Travers: L’Amicitia candida, donde Lei m’ha honorato durante il mio soggiorno à Dresden, mi gova prendere la libertà di dedicarle queste Sonate à Due Flauti Traversieri e Basso continuo, lusingandomi che Lei le riceverà come Marca della mia Riconoscenza, e col medesimo buonocchio, con che accolse quello, che hà l’honore di rimanere in effetto. Ossequiosissimo Servo Antonio Mahaut’].
Mahaut was at some time 'Music Master' at Leiden University\textsuperscript{23} and thus possibly a colleague of Schickhardt's. No records, however, have been found to support this claim.

Although residing in Amsterdam since 1739, Mahaut also returned regularly to Namur. His Symphonies No.1 in F major and No.5 in D major are likely to have been the "beautiful instrumental symphonies" played by the brothers of the Mahaut family and their friend Bailleux, in a concert given in Namur in 1744 for the Prince of Gavre, representative of the Empress Marie-Thérèse.\textsuperscript{24} These symphonies were later published in Augsburg by Johann Christian Leopold between 1746 and 1748.

Two symphonies in Mahaut's Op.11, No.4 in c minor and No.6 in A major, were performed on June 21\textsuperscript{st} 1751, as part of a celebration to mark the laying of the first stone of the new Saint Aubain's Cathedral in Namur. As was customary during religious feasts at this time, the last movements of the symphonies conclude with a diminuendo and with no proper ending, designed as they were, to be played between two motets. The musicians performing these works are known to have included members of the Camerata: Pierre Bailleux, Jean-Charles Jadin and Oger Mahaut (Antonio's father), also a renowned 'flute maestro'.\textsuperscript{25}

In about 1760 Mahaut settled in Paris where Moret suggests that he met Gossec and Gaviniès. Also according to Moret, one of Mahaut's symphonies was performed at a concert in 1770 that included works by Philidor, Duport and Gossec, for which he received


\textsuperscript{24} Moret, Paul, \textit{Moret Notes}.

\textsuperscript{25} Moret, Paul, \textit{Moret Notes}. 
“outstanding recognition”. His Italian airs, sung by Mademoiselle Le Clerc, are said to have been “highly appreciated”.26

This is the last we hear of Mahaut although Gerber suggests that he fled his creditors to a French monastery.27 It is perhaps more likely, however, that he returned to Namur, where in 1778, his niece, the harpsichord player Marie-Thérèse Mahaut, is recorded as teaching at the Ursuline Convent “in place of her relative”.28

26 Moret, Paul, Moret Notes.


28 Moret, Paul, Moret Notes.
CHAPTER TWO

THE WORKS

A Catalogue

The scant surviving biographical detail discussed in the preceding chapter, whilst significantly expanded from our previous knowledge of Mahaut’s life, seems in no way to reflect Mahaut’s true importance as a musician and composer and respected place in the musical life of Amsterdam, suggested by the extensive publication of his works during his own lifetime. His compositions were published in Paris by Le Clerc, Boivin and La Chevardière; in Amsterdam by Witvogel, Olofsen and Hummel; in Augsburg by J.C. Leopold; in Lyon by Le Goux and in London by J.J. Walsh. Surviving manuscripts of his works are to be found today in libraries scattered across Europe including Paris, London, Cambridge, Brussels, Zurich, Amsterdam, Leiden, Karlsruhe, Schwerin, Regensburg, Copenhagen and Stockholm.

These manuscripts, however, are clearly notated in a variety of different hands, suggesting one of two possibilities: that Mahaut travelled much more extensively than we have been able to discover, during which his works were copied by local musicians in the towns that he visited, or that they were on the other hand copied by travelling musicians passing through Amsterdam, Paris or even Namur, who chanced to meet or hear Mahaut before returning to their own towns with the copied manuscripts.1 With only a few exceptions, it is

1 More discussion regarding these possibilities is found in the following section: The Concerto Manuscripts and Their Sources.
therefore, interesting that many more duplicates of Mahaut's works are not found in these surviving copied manuscripts. Indeed, in most cases, only one manuscript copy of each work is extant today, implying that the majority of Mahaut's original manuscripts notated in his own hand have sadly been lost. It is perhaps significant, however, that the manuscripts of the two concerti thought to have been composed in Dresden for Buffardin are among a collection of four concerti all by the same hand now residing in Brussels. Whilst it has not been possible to compare the handwriting with any other known to be Mahaut's, it is certainly possible that these are in fact in Mahaut's own hand, particularly in the light of their proximity to his home town of Namur, to which we know he continually returned to perform, and in which his family continued to maintain a significant musical presence.

Interestingly, one unpublished trio sonata, *Sonata a3, D dur, duo flauto traverso con cimbalo o violoncello*, is duplicated in four different manuscripts by four different copyists, held in London, Karlsruhe and two in Stockholm. The Karlsruhe manuscript and one of the two in Stockholm match the hand of the concerti in each respective collection. The second Stockholm manuscript forms part of a collection by the Swedish music lover, Johann Gustaf Psilanderhielm (1723-1782), and carries the stamp of the *Utile Dulci Society*, an order of music and literature in Stockholm, founded in 1766, whose collection of music was donated to the *Musikaliska Akademien* between 1795 and 1806-08. The London manuscript, however, is remarkably similar in its notation and handwriting to the Brussels concerti and, as such might again represent Mahaut's own hand, particularly considering his earlier

---

2 See Mahaut’s catalogue of works in Table 1.

3 See discussion in the following section: The Concerto Manuscripts and Their Sources.

4 There is however, some confusion as to the authorship of this trio sonata, an identical manuscript can be found in Brussels attributed to Johann Gottlieb and Carl Heinrich Graun [see Matthias Wendt, *Die Trios der Brüder Johann Gottlieb and Carl Heinrich Graun* (inaugural diss, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität: Bonn, 1983)].
extended visit to London between 1735 and 1737 as part of the Bishop of Strickland’s entourage. The sheer number of the ‘copied’ manuscripts, together with their wide dissemination throughout Europe, is in itself evidence of the extent of Mahaut’s considerable popularity.

In particular, it was Mahaut’s symphonies, solo, duo and trio sonatas that were most extensively published during his lifetime by the long list of publishers given above. Significantly, as might be expected, in these we find many duplications in which some works were published simultaneously in France, Holland and London, or within a short time of each other. For example, his opera prima, *VI Sonata a flauto traversiere solo e basso*, was published in Amsterdam by Witvogel around 1739, shortly before the same group of sonatas appeared in Paris in 1740, published by Le Clerc. Similarly in 1751, Mahaut himself published his *VI Sonata da camera a due*, libra I,\(^5\) one year before a publication announcement by Olofsen in Amsterdam appeared, on the 11\(^{th}\) November 1752, for both libra I and II of the same collection of sonatas.\(^6\) Both volumes were then later published by John Walsh in London around 1756 and 1758 respectively. Likewise, publications of Mahaut’s *Ier recueil de pièces francaises et italiennes* . . . and his *2ème (nouveaux) recueil de pièces francaises et italiennes* . . . were also duplicated, the former in Paris by Le Clerc in 1757 and La Chevardière in 1761, and the latter in Lyon by Le Goux in 1759 and in Paris by La Chevardière in 1761.

\(^5\) Publication announcement to be found in the *Amsterdamsche Courant* on the 26\(^{th}\) October, 1751.

\(^6\) *Amsterdamsche Courant*, 11\(^{th}\) November 1752.
Manuscripts of the majority of these published works have not survived or remain lost at the present time. There are, however, a number of exceptions. A manuscript of *Ier recueil de pièces francaises et italiennes*... exists in Karlsruhe, as does the sixth sonata in G major of Mahaut's *VI Sonata da camera a due*, libra I. Neither of the manuscripts is in Mahaut's hand, but they are clearly notated by the same copyist as the Karlsruhe concerti (to be discussed in the following section). A manuscript copy of the collection, *VI Sonala da camera a tre*, subsequently published by Johann Christian Leopold in Augsburg, is to be found in the *Mecklenburgische Landesbibliothek* in Schwerin. The manuscripts have undoubtedly been in this library since the mid-eighteenth century, forming part of a collection entitled *Catalogus Musicalium* put together between the years 1746 and 1767 by the then secretary, T. Casper (d.1767). The collection is understood to have been made for the Countess Luise Friederike (1722–1791), daughter of Prince Lugwig of Wurttemberg-Stuttgart. Significantly, on the 2nd March 1746, 'she married Count Friedrich ("the holy one") of Mecklenberg-Schwerin and thus it is conceivable that the Countess brought the manuscripts with her from Stuttgart to Schwerin in the year 1746.

In contrast to Mahaut's many solo and trio flute sonatas, the solo concerti exist only in manuscript, having never been published during his lifetime. This is perhaps explainable in such a time of changing patronage, in that generally concerti were less often published than smaller chamber works, the latter being more appealing and appropriate to the amateur musician, who in turn formed a greater part of the publishers' market. Whilst no date is given on any of the concerto manuscripts, they are saturated with melodic and rhythmic figures of the *galant* and, importantly, many traits of the early-classical style. In this light it is unlikely that they were composed before 1750 and certainly after most of Mahaut's smaller chamber works, in that they would seem to be more in line with his early
symphonies composed in the 1750s and early 1760s. Within this broad time scale, however, a variation in date throughout the concerto collection as a whole is suggested by the structure and content of the individual manuscripts themselves, as will be seen in Part II: Elements of Structure and Technique.

The concerto manuscripts form four distinct collections in accordance with their location at the present time: those of Brussels, Karlsruhe, Regensburg and Stockholm. By far the greatest number appear in the Stockholm collection, thirteen in all, including the only duplication (no. 13 in D major), identical to the Brussels D major manuscript. Thus, the entire collection of the surviving concerto manuscripts number twenty-two with one duplication. A more detailed discussion of these manuscripts and their sources appears in the following section. As was the custom of the time, all the concerti exist only in part form, without a score, as does all Mahaut’s chamber music. This is of course not peculiar to Mahaut and reflects the absence of a conductor. It does, however, as we shall see, present frequent inconsistencies between the parts in which our interpretations must carefully draw a line between intentional and unintentional discrepancies.

In addition to his compositions for the flute and reputation as a virtuoso, Mahaut was, according to Moret, also highly respected as a symphonist, particularly in France, and was a contemporary of Stamitz, Gossec and Leduc. His twelve surviving symphonies receive a detailed listing in Brook’s La Symphonie Française, underlining Mahaut’s importance as an early-classical symphonist. He was also known in the Netherlands as the editor of the series

---

7 Moret, Moret Notes.
entitled *Maendeliks Musikaels Tijverdrijf* (Monthly Musical Pastime), published in Amsterdam by A. Olofsen between 1751 and 1752. This consisted of Italianite songs in Dutch to which Mahaut contributed most of the compositions. Finally, Mahaut was perhaps best known, both during his own time and today, for his method on playing the flute, *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre en peu de temps a jouer de la flute traversière*, published in 1759 simultaneously in French and Dutch. We shall return to Mahaut’s flute tutor in a later section.

In table 1 is printed a complete catalogue of Mahaut’s work, representing all the information that has come to light regarding Mahaut’s output, publications of his work, dates, or possible dates of composition and publication, and the present location of manuscripts and eighteenth-century published editions. There are also several works included that appear in the eighteenth-century publishers’ catalogues of Le Clerc and La Chevardière for which the present location is unknown and that possibly no longer exist. Another, *VI Sonaten voor 3 fluto traversen*, published by Olofsen, was announced in the Dutch journal, the *Amsterdamsche Courant*,

9 *Amsterdamsche Courant*, 9th August 1757.

10 These sonatas match those originally published by Leopold in Augsburg and the manuscripts held in Schwerin.

In addition to the facsimile edition and English translation of Mahaut’s *Méthode*, only two of Mahaut’s works are currently available in twentieth-century editions: the two sets of *VI Sonata da camera a due* (Op.4), re-published by Heuwekemeyer in 1971 and the *VI Sonata da camera a tre*, by Kunzelmann in 1993. Two other works were published this century: *Concerto in e minor for Flute and Strings*, by the Dutch company Donemus which is no
longer available, and a single solo sonata with basso continuo in G major (Op. 1, no. 6), published by Bärenreiter in 1956. The latter, however, can no longer be traced in the publisher's archives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Publisher and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Sinfonie a piu stromenti</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>2 vlns, vla, Vc, and basso continuo</td>
<td>Amsterdam: Olofsen Amsterdam Openbare Musiek-Bibliotheque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amsterdam: sine nomine Leiden, NL-Lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Op. II</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>2 vlns, vla, bc and basso continuo, Nos.1-3 with 2 hns ad lib.</td>
<td>Paris: Le Clerc Paris, F-Pn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sinfonie a Quadro</td>
<td>c. 1751</td>
<td>2 vlns, vla, basso continuo</td>
<td>Augsburg: Leopold Zurich, CH-Zz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concertino</td>
<td>before 1756</td>
<td>2 vlns, vla, basso continuo</td>
<td>Paris, F-Pc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 symphonies [D, D, D, A]</td>
<td>c. 1765</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copenhagen, DK-Kk [mu7305.0232-6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 symphonies</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td></td>
<td>cited in Lambach catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [e minor]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso continuo</td>
<td>Brussels: B-Bc [5577] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[20th century edition: Donemus (unavailable)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [d minor]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso continuo</td>
<td>Brussels: B-Bc [5577] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [A major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso continuo</td>
<td>Brussels: B-Bc [5577] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [D major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso</td>
<td>Brussels: B-Bc [5577] (manuscript) (identical to No.13 S-Skma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto con 5 strome [G major] [Sig. Maho]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso</td>
<td>Karlsruhe: D-KA [Mus.Hs.266] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [D major, No.1]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso</td>
<td>Karlsruhe: D-KA [Mus.Hs.261] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [D major, No.2]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso</td>
<td>Karlsruhe: D-KA [Mus.Hs.262] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [E flat major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso</td>
<td>Karlsruhe: D-KA [Mus.Hs.260] (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto [G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, basso</td>
<td>Regensburg: D-Rtt [identical concerto also appears in Breitkopf cat. of 1763]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.1, A major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a6 [No.2, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc obbl., cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.3, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.4, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.5, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.6, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.7, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a5 [No.8, G major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a 5 [No.9, e minor]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a 5 [No.10, D major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a 5 [No.11, D major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a 5 [No.12, D major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto a 5 [No.13, D major]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, 2 vln, vla, Vc/ cimbalo</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma (manuscript) [identical to D major: Brussels: B-Bc]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 concerti 1759 fl, 2vln, vla, basso Selhof catalogue [lost]

3 concerti [e, G, G] 1763 fl, 2vln, vla, basso Breitkopf Catalogue [lost, although one (G major) identical to Regensburg concerto]

**Chamber**

**Solo Sonatas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI Sonata a flauto traversière solo e basso di Antonio Maho, opera prima. [C, A, e, D, G, Eflat]</th>
<th>c.1740</th>
<th>fl, bc</th>
<th>Paris: Le Clerc, Mme Boivin, [Paris, F-Ph, Brussels, B-Bc [5576]]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.1739</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amsterdam: Witvogel [London, GB-Lbm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heuwekemeyer [facs. of Witvogel edition] unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata (G), flauto traversière solo col basso continuo [Op.1, no.6]</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>fl, bc</td>
<td>Barenreiter [no.3307?] cannot be traced in archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>fl, bc</td>
<td>Paris: F-Ph [manuscript]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sonaten für 1 und 2 Flöten mit Basso continuo

9 Sonata a flauto traversiero solo con cimbalo o violoncello dell Sig. A. Mahaut

Sonate and Allegretto con variatione [G major] as Flauto traverso solo Dell Sig. Mahaut

Trio Sonatas

VI Sonata da camera a tre, due flauti traversieri, o due violini e violoncello o basso continuo [G, G, C, e, A, D]

VI Sonata da camera a tre, due flauti traversieri e basso continuo

6 sonatas before 1746

6 Kammersonaten

2 Trii a 2 flauti traverso e basso [2 volumes]

3 Trios [D, D, G]

Ex. D dur Sonata a3, duo flauto traverso com cimbalo o violoncello del Sig. Mahaut

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI Sonata da camera a tre, due flauti traversieri, o due violini e violoncello o basso continuo</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>2 fl/ vns, Vc/bc</td>
<td>Amsterdam: Olofsen [Amsterdam, NL-Atl; Leiden, NL-Lui]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sonatas</td>
<td>before 1746</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schwerin, D-SWI (Catalogus Musicalium, Signatur Mus. 306516) [manuscript]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kammersonaten</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zurich: Kunzelmann [2 volumes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Trii a 2 flauti traverso e basso [2 volumes]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>2 fl, bc</td>
<td>Schwerin, D-SWI [manuscript]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Trios [D, D, G]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>2 fl, bc</td>
<td>Karlsruhe, D-KA (Ms.Hs. 263-4/ 272) [manuscript]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. D dur Sonata a3, duo flauto traverso com cimbalo o violoncello del Sig. Mahaut</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>2 fl, cimb/Vc</td>
<td>London, GB-Lbm [manuscript]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlsruhe, D-KA (Ms.Hs. 273) [manuscript]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Sonata da camera a due flauti traversieri o due violini</td>
<td>c.1752</td>
<td>2 fl/vln</td>
<td>Amsterdam: A. Olofsen, Leiden, NL-Lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Libra I and II), Opus 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libra I</td>
<td>c.1751</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amsterdam: sine nomine, Leiden, NL-Lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Sonatas or duets for two German flutes or violins compos'd in a</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td></td>
<td>London: John Walsh, identical to Libra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasing fine taste by Antonio Mahaut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identical to Libra I above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A second set of six sonatas</td>
<td>c.1758</td>
<td></td>
<td>London: John Walsh, identical to Libra II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Sonata da camera a due flauti traversieri</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amsterdam: Heuwekemeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[libra I and II]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata [G major]</td>
<td>n.d</td>
<td>2 fls</td>
<td>Stockholm: S-Skma, manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duetto, flauto traverso primo, flauto traverso secondo, del</td>
<td>n.d</td>
<td>2 fls</td>
<td>Karlsruhe: D-KA, Ms.Hs. 265, manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign. Mahaut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ier recueil de pièces francaises et italiennes, petits airs,</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>2 fl/vln/oboes</td>
<td>Paris: Le Clerc, location unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brunettes, minuets, avec des doubles et variations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomodes pour duex flutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traversières, violons, hautbois, pardessus de viole....

| 1761 | Paris: de La Chevardière [location unknown] |
| n.d. | Karlsruhe: D-KA [manuscript] |

2ème (nouveaux) recueil de pièces françaises et italiennes...

| 1759 | Lyon: Le Goux [Paris, F-Pn] |
| 1761 | Paris: de La Chevardière [Paris, F-Pn] |

---

Unlocated chamber works with publication notices

| VI Sonaten voor 3 fluto traversen | c.1757 | 3 fls | Amsterdam: Olofsen [announced in the Amsterdamsche Courant on the 9th Aug. 1757] |
| 2nd livre: Sonates en trio pour violon et flute | c.1742 | 2fl, b | Paris: Le Clerc [appears in Le Clerc catalogue of 1742] |

---

**Vocal**

| Maendelyks musikaels tydverdryf; bestaende in nieuwe hollandsche canzonetten of zang-leideren op d’italiaensche trant [texts by K. Elzevier] | 1751-2 | 1vocal, bc | Amsterdam: Olofsen [Amsterdam, NL-At] |
| Nieuwe geöpende musicaele tydkorting bestaende in nieuwe hollandsche zangairen | n.d. | 1-3vocal, bc | Leiden, NL-Lu [under Mahaut’s privilege of 1751] Amsterdam, NL-At |
Theoretical Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwe manier om binnen korten tijd op de dwarsfluit et leeren speelen.....nieuwe druk.</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Amsterdam: J.J. Hummel [Amsterdam, NL-At The Hague, NL-DHgm Washington, US-Wc Charlottesville, US-CHua]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Concerto Manuscripts and Their Sources

We have already seen, in the previous section, the strong possibility that the Brussels concerto manuscripts are in Mahaut’s own hand and include two concerti that may have been composed in Dresden, carrying the mark of the flautist Pierre Buffardin. It is not known with any certainty, however, how the manuscripts came to be part of the collection held by the Conservatoire Royal de Musique in Brussels. Interestingly, as we have briefly mentioned, the manuscripts are also remarkably similar in their notation to the manuscript copy of one of Mahaut’s trio sonatas held by the British Library. In the light of his extended visit to London before residing in Amsterdam, this perhaps further strengthens their connection to Mahaut himself.

This uncertainty regarding how the manuscripts were obtained is a common factor in all the present-day sources of Mahaut’s concerto manuscripts. The Karlsruhe concerti are known only to be part of a collection from the Musikalien der Hofkapelle of Markgrafen Carl Friedrich of Baden-Durlach in Karlsruhe. According to the archivist of the Badische Landesbibliothek (Dr. Klaus Häfner) the manuscripts have been in the collection since 1750 and would appear to have been copied by a Karlsruhe musician, J. Reüsch, whose name appears beneath Mahaut’s on the title page of each manuscript. Significantly, one of the four concerti does not carry this name and Dr. Häfner suggests that this manuscript may be of Italian origin. In addition, here the copyist has written the composer’s name as ‘Mahu’ which, together with slight differences in the handwriting, suggests that this copyist is distinct from that of the remaining three concerti in the Karlsruhe collection. Importantly, Mahaut’s name does not appear in any records in Karlsruhe of this time and it is likely that the three Reüsch manuscripts were copied during the latter’s own travels.
In the light of the watermark, a much later date of composition, placing it around 1770, is suggested by the Regensburg concerto held by the Fürstlich Thurn und Taxis'sche Hofbibliothek. The same concerto had, however, already appeared in the Breitkopf catalogue of 1763, thus implying that the Regensburg manuscript is, yet again, a copy made sometime later and is not in Mahaut’s hand. The Hofbibliothek has no record of who such a copyist may have been, or indeed how the manuscript came to be part of their collection.

Finally, the large number of Stockholm manuscripts held by the Statens Musikbibliotek (The Music Library of Sweden) is from a rather extensive eighteenth-century manuscript collection devoted entirely to flute music in one form or another, and all written by the same hand. The watermark common to all works in the collection is, however, the Italian mark of three half moon crescents and appears not to have been used in Sweden. Whilst it has not been possible to establish who the copyist was or how the collection came to this library, it is thought to have been brought or sent back to Sweden by a young musician during his travels.\footnote{A well-known part of the education of a ‘well-descended’ young man in Sweden was to spend a couple of years travelling in Europe.} All the works in the collection are listed by Pehr Frigel (1750-1842), the secretary/librarian of the Royal Academy of Music from 1797 to 1840, in his library catalogue of 1806. The Academy’s collection was then donated to the Musikaliska Akademien (now the Statens Musikbibliotek) between 1795 and 1806-08. In addition to this collection of flute music, the Royal Academy also owns a group of manuscripts by the Swede, Johan Gustaf Psilanderhielm (1723-1782),\footnote{These manuscripts carry the stamp of the Utile Dulci Society, founded in 1766 and was the precursor of the Royal Academy of Music, founded in 1771.} which includes one of Mahaut’s trio sonatas. Significantly, if Psilanderhielm’s manuscript was copied from the above collection of flute music as it...
appears to be, the latter, including the concerto manuscript, had to exist in Sweden at least prior to his death (1782) and most likely considerably earlier.

Thus, whilst there is only one duplication throughout the entire collection of twenty-two of Mahaut’s concerto manuscripts, the varying sources begin to suggest at least four different ‘hands’, only one of which is likely to be Mahaut’s own. This is indeed corroborated by a graphological analysis, highlighting significant differences in the handwriting between collections and a general consistency within each collection. There is, however, one exception, that of the G major Karlsruhe manuscript whose notational differences confirm our earlier observations regarding its inconsistency with the remaining Karlsruhe concerti, thus implying a fifth copyist. Whilst both this concerto and the Stockholm concerti suggest an Italian origin, they remain clearly distinguished by their handwriting and cannot be by the same copyist.

In addition to the handwriting, other notational differences in the music itself are also evident between the collections including the notation of clefs, time signatures, dynamics and bar numbers etc. Such differences serve only to underline the conclusions previously drawn from the analysis of the handwriting and discussion of the sources. Significantly, our suspicion regarding the differing origin of the Karlsruhe G major concerto is confirmed by the rather unusual notation of the two Karlsruhe D major concerti in which the stems are consistently placed in the middle of the noteheads and is not reflected in the notation of the Karlsruhe G major concerto. Whilst most differences in the musical notation itself

---

13 The graphological analysis conducted by Mr. Andrew Whitehead can be found in Appendix A. At the time that this analysis was made, however, the Karlsruhe G major and Regensburg manuscripts had yet to become available and thus the paper refers only to the Brussels, Stockholm and the two D major Karlsruhe concerti.
remain unimportant with regard to interpretation, there are a number of notational elements that retain a much greater significance in their implied manner of performance. Such differences include the notation of accidentals, trills, cadenzas and articulation, and will be extensively discussed in their relevant chapters.
The Méthode

Mahaut's flute treatise, *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre en peu de temps à jouer de la flûte traversière*, was published simultaneously in French and Dutch in 1759, seven years after Quantz's *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flote traversiere zu spielen* (1752). The French edition cited above was published in Paris by La Chevardière and included a collection of small airs and minuets for two flutes, violins or treble viols. The publication announcement in the *Mercure de France* gives us some idea of the importance with which the tutor was regarded:

New Method for the Transverse Flute, by M. Mahaut, followed by a collection of small airs... This work includes an extensive discussion on the position of the fingers, on different fingerings, on confusing passages often encountered in performance and on all trills, expressions, accents, mordents, single and double tonguing.14

In Amsterdam the same year, J.J. Hummel published the Méthode as *Nieuwe Manier om binnen korten tyd op de Dwarsfluit te leeren speelen* in parallel columns of French and Dutch, including twelve plates of musical examples and fingering charts. The popularity of the tutor in Holland is implied in the demand for two reprints in 1762 and 1814, listed by Hummel in his catalogues.

In comparison to the monumental German theoretical work of Quantz, cited above, C.P.E. Bach's *Versuch über die wahre Art des Clavier zu spielen* (1753) and Leopold Mozart's *Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule* (1756), all published in the same decade, Mahaut's tutor appears as a much smaller, yet nonetheless comprehensive book, concentrating only

14 *Mercure de France*, January 1759, p.189 ['Nouvelle Méthode de Flute Traversière, par M. Mahaut, suivie d'un Recueil de petits Airs, prix 6 liv. Cet ouvrage contient une dissertation très étendue sur la position des doigts, sur les différents doigtés, sur les passages embrouillés qui se rencontrent souvent dans l'exécution, sur toutes les cadences, expressions, accents, battements, simples et doubles coups de langue.']
on technical and musical aspects of playing the flute. Its significance remains in its representation of performance practices in France and the Netherlands of the mid-eighteenth century. Mahaut specifically states that its purpose was to expand and add to Hotteterre's *Principes de la flûte traversière, de la flûte à bec et du hautbois*, published in 1707. Thus, he talks of the advance in flute playing since Hotteterre's *Principes* and the significant influence of the Italian style of music:

Various authors have given us the principles of the transverse flute, M. Hotteterre Le Romain having been the first to write on this subject. His principles, which are indeed excellent, were quite satisfactory at the time they appeared. However, now that the flute has developed to such an extent, and that Italian music has become the fashion, these principles are no longer adequate.¹⁵

To illustrate this change of style that occurred over the first half of the eighteenth century, we might look at an aspect of articulation. In 1707, Hotteterre described the use of tonguing syllables *tu* and *ru* to articulate pairs of notes that were consecutive. This was naturally associated with the French practice of *notes inégales*. Over thirty years later, Michel Corrette, in his *Méthode pour apprendre aisément à jouer de la flûte traversière* (c. 1740), claims that *tu* and *ru* were no longer widely used and indeed it was around this time that French flautists abandoned the use of tonguing syllables. In Mahaut's much shorter discussion of tonguing he explains that whilst *tu* and *ru* were "sufficient for the music of earlier times," with "modern music the player should attempt to develop the most precise articulation possible according to his natural ability and not to worry too much about various syllables".¹⁶

---


In his introduction, Mahaut goes on to describe briefly the works of writers other than Hotteterre, which of course must include that of Corrette cited above, although Mahaut refrains from naming any specific authors:

Later writers expanded their works with some musical exercises, and extended the scale of the flute by several notes which were not in use during M. Hotteterre's time. One will note that these methods were designed for beginners only; those who have reached a certain level of proficiency do not find them useful. We will attempt to guide the beginner step by step and also be of use to the more advanced player.  

Thus, we find that Mahaut's Méthode adds important information to the flute methods of Hotteterre, Corrette and indeed Quantz that precede it. Although Quantz's work is the most wide-ranging and comprehensive, Mahaut's discussion of certain aspects of flute playing is, in many places, more extensive and detailed, particularly with regard to the more advanced player. An entire chapter in Mahaut's Méthode is devoted to providing alternative fingerings for notes according to their context, the type of passage work employed and whether the work is in a sharp or flat key. Likewise, he provides up to six alternative fingerings for each trill, pointing out the differences between enharmonic intervals such as F-sharp to E and G-flat to F-flat. There are extensive explanations for each trill, considering the advantages and disadvantages of each fingering, accompanied by charts and musical

---

17 Corrette tells us that his "method embodies not only the true manner to learn the first elements of the transverse flute, but also several notes and ornaments of which earlier methods have not spoken....We hope to please the public in sharing the discoveries that the great masters have made on this fine instrument..." [Corrette, Méthode pour apprendre aisément à jouer de la flûte traversière (Paris: chez M. Boivin, c.1740), trans. Carol Reglin Farrar (New York: Institute of Medieval Music, 1970), p.17].


19 With regard to the baroque flute, the key in which a piece is written will have a significant effect on both the timbre and pitch of particular notes, as not all enharmonic notes are equivalent in this regard. For an extensive discussion of intonation differences with regard to enharmonic notes in different keys see Bruce Haynes, "Beyond Temperament: Non-Keyboard Intonation in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," Early Music (Aug., 1991), pp.357-381.
examples. In addition, where Quantz talks only of the different types of trills, Mahaut distinguishes between the French and Italian styles of their performance. Similarly, he distinguishes between French and Italian practices in playing the appoggiatura, accompanied by extensive examples.20

Although published seven years earlier, it is interesting that Mahaut makes no direct mention of Quantz’s important treatise except to credit him with the addition of the second key to the footjoint, distinguishing between D-sharp and E-flat. Here Quantz is qualified only as “M. Buffardin’s student”. Outside Germany, however, it is Holland that provides the greatest evidence of its acquaintance and familiarity with Quantz’s Versuch in the form of two editions of this work. The first is an almost complete Dutch translation and the only one published outside Germany that remained a faithful reproduction of the original. The text was translated by J.W. Lustig, a Dutch organist, and appeared in 1754.21 The second is an undated partial reprint of the earlier translation.22 In his Catalogue of Books Relating to the Flute, Dayton Miller suggests that this probably appeared around 1765.23 While this is significantly after Mahaut’s Méthode, the two editions would seem to establish that Quantz’s work had been well-known and remained popular in Holland for some time. As such, it is hard to imagine that Mahaut was not both familiar, and to some extent influenced, by Quantz’s work. In our later discussions regarding certain aspects of performance style in

20 Further discussion of Mahaut’s use of the trill and appoggiatura is to be found in chapter 8.


22 Quantz, Johann Joachim. Grondig Onderwyss van den Aardt en de regte Behandeling der Dwarsfluit (Amsterdam: A. Olofsen, c.1765).

Mahaut's concerti, including inequality, dotting and ornamentation, we shall find a number of significant parallels between the essential background of Quantz's *Versuch* and the stylistic influences evident in Mahaut's music. Thus, whilst there remains some specific differences, we shall find that in many respects Quantz's *Versuch* may be used in addition to Mahaut's own *Méthode* as a legitimate source of interpretation for Mahaut's music.
PART II

ELEMENTS OF STRUCTURE AND TECHNIQUE
CHAPTER THREE

RITORNELLO ORGANISATION

Such is the importance of the ritornello in Mahaut’s concerti that every movement, except for a small number of middle movements, is based upon its principle of alternating thematic tutti and virtuosic solo sections. This is not surprising of course in the light of Mahaut’s considerable exposure to the popular Italian violin concerto in Amsterdam, where Vivaldi’s concerti had been published by Roger and later Le Cene since 1711. Through such publication as well as travelling virtuosi, the influence of the new Venetian concerto became widespread, particularly in the Netherlands and in Germany. In his autobiography Quantz describes his first acquaintance with this genre in Pirna in 1714:

As a then completely new species of musical pieces, they made more than a slight impression on me. I did not fail to collect a considerable assortment of them. In the future, the splendid ritornellos of Vivaldi provided me with good models.\(^1\)

Whilst it was through Vivaldi that the baroque concerto reached maturity in its ritornello organisation, others had also played a part in its development and wide dissemination. Whilst still writing within the genre of the concerto grosso, it was Corelli (1653-1713) who established the fundamental pattern of alternating solo and tutti textures, to be imitated by composers throughout the later baroque and galant eras. In the last six concerti of his Concerti grossi con una pastoral . . . (Op.8), Torelli (1658-1709) took this principle a step further by reducing his concertino/ripieno contrasts to solo violin versus tutti. In addition,

he established a thematic link between the tutti sections, alternating them with the elaborate figuration of the solos. Together with Albinoni (1671-1751), he was responsible for establishing a three movement pattern of fast-slow-fast and further distinguishing it from the old-fashioned four-movement concerto grosso.  

Torelli’s significance, however, lies not only in the development of the concerto form but in his influence through his teaching on the following generation of composers, many of foreign nationalities. In particular, we note one such student, Georg Johann Pisendel (1687-1755), who studied with Torelli in Ansbach and later in Venice with Vivaldi. Pisendel was one of the foremost German violinists of his generation, evidenced not least in the number of concerti and sonatas dedicated to him by Albinoni, Vivaldi and Telemann. His importance in the history of the baroque concerto lies in his dissemination of Venetian solo concerti through his performing career. Significantly, he joined the Dresden court orchestra in 1712 and was to become Concertmeister in 1730, at which time Quantz was also highly active in the Dresden court prior to his appointment to Frederick the Great in Berlin in 1741.

Thus, in addition to the exposure to the Venetian concerto that Quantz experienced in his earlier travels, it was also a highly influential factor in the Dresden court itself under the leadership of Pisendel. We shall discuss in a later chapter the significance of the ‘mixed

---


3 Nicholas Anderson also suggests that J.S. Bach (whom Pisendel met in Weimar in 1709) intended at least some of his violin concerti for him. [Anderson, *The Baroque Concerto*]
style’ established in Dresden, preserved under Frederick the Great in Berlin, and later to become the fundamental background for the galant performance style described in Quantz’s *Versuch* of 1752.

Hence we note, not for the last time, one of the many parallel influences that existed between the popular musical style prevalent in both Amsterdam and Dresden. Returning to Amsterdam, we cannot overlook the significant influence of another Italian violinist and composer, Pietro Locatelli. After travelling as a virtuoso, causing both admiration and condemnation with his extraordinary technical feats, he was to settle in Amsterdam from 1729. Thus, all his compositions, with the exception of his first opus, were composed in Amsterdam for publication by Le Cène, to be performed in numerous concert series which he himself had established there. Through his extraordinary performance style, reflected in his virtuosic soloistic writing, he exploited the technical possibilities of the violin, establishing a new level of virtuosity in the solo concerto. Such high demands on the technique of the performer is reflected in Mahaut’s own writing for the solo flute, imitating the virtuosity of the violin and requiring a player of first rank. We shall further discuss such demands in the solo writing later in the chapter. Locatelli is also responsible for extending the boundaries of the baroque concerto form, particularly in the length of the first two movements and in the breadth of development of the ritornello motives. Such developments transform it almost into the classical form, with the exception of an absence of any clear second thematic ‘subject’ in the dominant or contrasted key presented in the ritornello. Thus, whilst the ritornello structure, made universal by Vivaldi, remains clearly recognisable, Locatelli’s concerti also exhibit many irregularities that, not surprisingly, are reflected in Mahaut’s concerti.
It is, however, highly unlikely that the sole influence upon Mahaut’s composition of flute concerti was that which he was exposed to in Amsterdam. There is to be considered in addition to this, his significant French background and musical education before settling in Amsterdam in 1739.

In contrast to the Italian preoccupation with the violin, a similar position was occupied in France by the flute being, as it was, the most popular instrument there since the early 1700s. The first book of music specifically written for the instrument was composed in 1702 by Michel de la Barre, flautist at the court of Louis XIV and at the Académie Royale de Musique. This publication initiated a vast amount of music for the flute through to the middle of the eighteenth century which was performed by an increasingly large number of professional and amateur players that emerged during this time. Significantly, in the late 1720s it was the flute that played the most important role in introducing the Venetian concerto and its ritornello organisation into France. Indeed, by the appearance of Aubert’s first violin concerti (1734), more than fifty concerti for wind instruments had already been published.

At this time, there was a significant amount of foreign music, particularly Italian, being published and performed in France that contributed to stylistic changes and the introduction of the solo concerto. Albinoni’s concerti were known in Paris by 1723 and Vivaldi’s The

---

4 de la Barre, Michel *Pièces pour la flûte traversière, avec la basse continuo* (1702).


Seasons had been premiered at the *Concert Spirituels* in February 1728. There was, in addition, much flute music from outside of France that began to be published in Paris. The first publishing privilege for Quantz's sonatas and concerti was taken out by François Boivin on July 8th 1729. Later privileges were given to publishers and music dealers in 1731, 1739, 1751, 1765 and 1773. Other flute music included that of Telemann, Locatelli, Handel, Hasse and later, Mahaut himself.

The important role of the flute in the development of the French concerto began with Boismortier's concerti for five flutes in 1727. Whilst not strictly 'solo' concerti, three of the flutes alternate as a solo instrument while the others double in unison or at the octave. More importantly though, they established a structure of three movements in a fast-slow-fast order and, in the outer movements, the use of a ritornello principle with its solo-tutti contrasts.

The next contribution was made by Michel Corrette. His Opus three and four for *Two or Three Flutes, Oboes, Violins and Basso continuo*, published in the late 1720s or early 30s, display many of the same Italian features. In addition, three of them resemble later solo concerti in the use of one instrument dominating all the solo passages (Op.3, no.4 and Op.4, no.1 and 6). Furthermore, in Opus 4, no.6, Corrette actually specifies a solo flute, and as such the work becomes the first known solo flute concerto by a French composer. Whilst it certainly predated the first violin concerto by Aubert (noted above), it is unlikely to have preceded Vivaldi's Op.10 flute concerto. The first complete set of French solo flute

8 Although Bowers suggests that publication of Quantz's flute concerti may have preceded Vivaldi's.

[Bowers, *The French Flute School*, 175]
concerti to appear followed shortly afterwards in the mid-1730s by Jacque-Christophe Naudot, *Six concertos en sept parties, pour une flûte-traversière, trois violons, un alto-viole, avec deux basses*, Op.11. These display all the characteristics of the Italian solo concerto including strong incisive themes and rhythmic drive, repeated-note and broken chord figures. They are also noted for their virtuosic solo parts, specifically their running semiquaver passage work including much sequencing, virtuosic figuration and wide leaps that show for the first time that the flute was capable of executing a technically demanding solo role on a level almost parallel to the Italian violinists.

The flute was taken further along this path by Michel Blavet, the most outstanding renowned French flautist of the first half of the eighteenth century. Through his playing he was an even greater influence on the development of the virtuosic style of flute music in France. His sole concerto for *solo flute, two violins and violoncello* was never published, existing only in manuscript. Without doubt, however, it was performed in at least one of his many concerts. Its date of composition is unknown, although judging by its virtuosic style, Bowers puts it alongside his Op.3 sonatas in suggesting a date around 1740. In all other ways resembling Vivaldi's concerto form, a large percentage of each movement is given to extensive and virtuosic solo passage-work, greatly exploiting the technical capabilities of the flute. In particular, like Mahaut, we find written-out cadenzas over long dominant pedals preceding the final cadences in the two fast movements. We also note an unpublished solo

---

9 While the publication date of Naudot's Op.11 remains uncertain, the concerti must certainly have appeared before 1737 at which time they were listed in Le Clerc's *Catalogue général de musique imprimée ou gravée en France*.


11 See the later discussion of cadenzas with regard to *Ornamentation*. 
flute concerto by Buffardin, himself also known to Mahaut and who is known to be the teacher of Quantz. If Buffardin performed this concerto in Paris it is likely to have been in 1737, at which time he performed in the *Concert Spirituels.*

Perhaps the most well-known concerti to combine both the Italian concerto form and its virtuosity with his native French performance style are those of Jean-Marie Leclair (1697-1764). In his early years he made long trips to Italy to study the violin and was later regularly acclaimed at the *Concert Spirituel* in Paris between 1728 and 1736. Invited by the Princess of Orange, Leclair made two extended trips to Amsterdam between 1738 and 1742, during which time he studied with Locatelli. As a result, the technical requirements of Leclair's solo writing is matched only by Locatelli, whilst at the same time Leclair cultivates a tenderness of expression that is characteristically French.

It is, therefore, from this background, based on the assimilation of both French and Italian characteristics, that we must view Mahaut's own solo flute concerti, strongly indebted to the Venetian solo concerto in his outer movements and ritornello organisation, whilst at the same time reflecting the irregularities and extension of the form, together with the high level of virtuosity shown in the concerti of Locatelli and Leclair. Mahaut's slow movements, however, display certain characteristic ornaments and dotted rhythms that, together with a simple and pleasing melodic line, owe more to French dance music than to an intense Vivaldian slow movement. Like Leclair, with the exception of essential graces, Mahaut leaves very little ornamentation to the performer, writing out most embellishments and thus excluding the addition of elaborate, free ornamentation required in a 'pathetic' Italian concerto.
Adagio. Many of these movements also show a variation of form away from a ritornello principle and often resemble binary or ternary structures.

Like most other solo concerti of the galant era, Mahaut’s are written for an accompanying orchestra of two violins, one viola and basso continuo. There is, however, between the different collections, a variation in the labelling of the bass part. Those in the Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti are all labelled with the term *basso*, commonly indicative of a violoncello doubling a figured bass performed by a keyboard instrument. The required presence of the latter, however, is not proven in that none of the bass parts in these five concerti are figured. This is not surprising in itself and does not exclude a keyboard in the light of the known ability of players at this time to improvise a figured bass on sight, particularly in a galant solo concerto where the harmonies remain strongly diatonic, although this may cause the performer minor problems in some of Mahaut’s chromatic passages and suspensions.

The lack of figuring, however, may be indicative of a growing trend towards the mid-eighteenth century to discard the keyboard as a redundant instrument. This is due mainly to the addition of the viola to the Italian orchestra in the late-seventeenth century, thus strengthening the harmonic structure and excluding the need for an additional supporting instrument. Kolneder is clearly of this opinion when he says that in many of Vivaldi’s solo concerto movements “the orchestra is an obbligato accompaniment rendering the harpsichord superfluous”.13 He admits, however, that this is much more frequent in the middle movements where the texture is usually much lighter and reduced to two or three

parts. This is not only a common feature in Mahaut’s middle movements, where often the bass part disappears altogether leaving the viola to function as the acting-bass, but also of Mahaut’s solo episodes in his outer movements.

Such considerations need to be addressed more importantly in the concerti of the Brussels collection. Here the bass parts are labelled simply on the title page as *cembalo*, in which three out of four concerti are heavily figured. It is highly unlikely, however, that a violoncello was not intended to double the bass line or indeed to replace the keyboard in those lighter textures described above. Significantly, the actual bass part in the Brussels d minor concerto, whilst being heavily figured, is labelled *basso* (in contrast to the title page), implying the duel-instrument basso continuo.

Whilst we noted above the possible omission of the keyboard in the solo episodes of Mahaut’s outer movements and throughout the more tender slow movements, thus requiring the presence of a violoncello, we find the precise indication of this in one of the thirteen Stockholm concerti. Whilst the bass parts of the remaining twelve concerti of this collection are each labelled *Cembalo and Violoncello*, the second concerto includes an *obbligato Violoncello* which is written as a separate part in addition to the part for cembalo.¹⁴ The significant feature here is that the harpsichord is omitted not only throughout the entire slow movement but throughout every solo episode of the outer movements, replaced by rests, and leaving the violoncello or other acting-bass to function as the continuo. Indeed, the harpsichord is included only in the tutti sections, thus freeing the obbligato violoncello to play a more ‘melodic’ role. Interestingly, the thirteenth Stockholm
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¹⁴ The use of an obbligato violoncello was a characteristic of the earlier Venetian concerto and is found in five concerti of Vivaldi’s Op.3.
concerto also has a bass part labelled *cembalo and violoncello*, conflicting with its duplicate in the Brussels collection which does not specify the violoncello, but in which its presence is clearly intended.
The Nature of Mahaut's Ritornelli

A striking feature of Mahaut's ritornelli in his outer movements is the strong and rhythmically incisive character of the opening thematic material. Owing much to a Venetian influence or heritage, they will commonly outline the tonic chord melodically in many and varied ways within the first two bars. We see, in figure 3.1, three examples in which thematic ideas of totally different character all outline the tonic arpeggio and are imbued with a strong rhythmic drive. The latter might be said of all Mahaut's Allegro material, achieved in figure 3.2a and 3.2b by the rhythmic reiteration of the tonic note. Similarly, in figure 3.2c, the tonic is established melodically by the initial octave leap. Scale patterns are also a recurring motivic feature and in figure 3.3a and 3.3b outline the ascent of degrees one to five of the tonic key.

The early-classical characteristic of Mahaut's concerti can be seen in the regular duple or quadruple phrasing of his thematic material. Such phrasing, however, does not continue as would be expected in a classical concerto, but dissolves into fragmentation and sequence, 'spinning-out' into a continuous thread of thematic motives. The breadth of phrasing and development throughout the ritornello resembles Locatelli's ritornelli, particularly in his Op.7 of 1741 in which he uses a small number of persistent motifs to build up big paragraphs and achieve a large-scale design. Two such ritornello examples from Mahaut's Brussels collection can be seen in figure 3.4a and 3.4b.

Mahaut was also fond of articulating the phrases of thematic material with rests (fig.3.5a). This is perhaps reminiscent of Vivaldi, particularly where the rests are augmented by a fermata and preceded by an imperfect cadence, allowing its 'incompleteness' to retain the
forward momentum (fig.3.5b). In addition, there are a number of more irregular structures, most commonly forming phrases of three bars in length such as that opening the first movement of the Brussels D major concerto which dissolves immediately into a sequence of descending scales (fig.3.5c). Interestingly, in the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, Mahaut makes use of a uniquely Vivaldian characteristic of grouping three such irregular phrases together to form the opening thematic material (fig.3.5d),\(^\text{15}\) at once disturbing the normal balance of a duple phrase structure.

Whilst many of Mahaut’s ritornello themes present one coherent thematic idea, he will on occasion use two motivic figures that contrast with each other both rhythmically and melodically. In particular, he clearly has a fondness for using a syncopated motive as the second figure, usually in contrast to a regular, disjunct and strongly articulated first figure, such as can be seen in figure 3.6a where the syncopated motive ‘answers’ the opening three-bar phrase. Similar contrasting figures are set against each other in figure 3.6b, although in this case, juxtaposed within the same phrase.

Having observed that the majority of Mahaut’s ritornelli are structured around an initial thematic statement based on one or two motivic ideas from which all other material is evolved, there are a significant, albeit smaller, number of examples that are clearly based on a different structural concept. The first is the use of a much greater number of motivic figures which are presented successively in a series of sectional blocks and not reappearing as fragments until later in the movement. For example, the entire ritornello opening the first movement of the second Stockholm concerto (fig.3.7a), is made up of four different motivic

\(^{15}\) See Talbot, *Vivaldi*, pp.76-77.
figures. The sections are of varying length of six, six, twelve and eight bars respectively and do not thematically relate to each other except for some figurative similarity between the first and last sections. Similarly, the opening of the Regensburg concerto presents five distinct thematic sections of lengths four, three, four, three and ten bars respectively.

The second structural deviation is of much greater interest to us as it points more towards the classical concerto and hints at the developing First Movement, or Sonata form. After an initial statement and ‘spinning-out’ of the opening thematic material, we occasionally encounter what might be called a ‘second subject’ or second thematic group in the dominant or contrasting tonality. Such an example is found in the first movement of the Brussels e minor concerto (fig.3.7b) after an opening section of eighteen bars. Here we have a significant contrast of character involving rhythm, articulation and texture, in a passage that moves towards the dominant minor (although failing to cadence properly into the new key), thus hinting clearly at a classical structure. Similarly, in the opening of the Regensburg concerto (fig.3.7c), a lyrical second subject appears after twenty-four bars contrasting with the incisive rhythms of the opening thematic material, and again moving towards a contrasting tonality. Such a ritornello structure might well suggest a later date of composition for these concerti.

They are, however, not the only movements in Mahaut’s concerti to display a section of contrasting character within the ritornello. Whilst other examples may not use significantly different material, they nevertheless create a strong contrast of character through orchestration (texture) and articulation. This contrasting section is positioned between two thematically related outer sections, creating a ternary structure (ABA) to the ritornello. In figure 3.8a an immediate contrast is achieved through a sudden reduction of texture and
dynamic, and legato articulations. Likewise, in another third movement (fig.3.8b), the change of character results from the thinner texture and the presentation of the syncopated thematic motive in the rather unusual dominant-minor tonality.\(^{16}\)

As a final example (fig.3.8c), we note that whilst the flute initially doubles the first violin in the opening of the ritornello, it presents the contrasting second subject almost as a solo, shadowed, but not doubled, by violin I and later accompanied only by the bass, thus creating maximum contrast when the ritornello returns to its original orchestration. The initial change of character in the second section is aided by the omission of the bass and the use of a pedal point in violin II and viola, creating a much sparser texture. The appearance of a quasi solo within the opening ritornello is, however, unique to this concerto, although it is more frequent amongst the inner ritornelli in a number of Mahaut’s other concerti.

A recurring feature of Mahaut’s ritornelli, particularly in fast movements and in the occasional second movement, is his use of unison passages, most commonly approaching the final cadence of the ritornello and often serving to reiterate the tonic arpeggio and scale. He does not, however, use them as frequently as many Italian composers are known to have, but rather to identify and highlight a distinct feature, such as the final cadential progression, through its contrast of texture. Such a function is also found in the unpublished flute concerto of the French composer Blavet, employing unison scale passages at the end of the ritornello.

The length of the unison passage will vary enormously from movement to movement, ranging from just two beats or two bars, through to six or eight bars. The length, however, always remains in proportion to that of the entire ritornello. Whilst not an abundant feature, Mahaut will sometimes precede a longer unison passage with a fermata over a dominant seventh chord, followed by a rest in all parts. This heightens the ‘concluding’ function of the following passage and its sudden reduction of harmonic density to a single line. Interestingly, in the third movement of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto, Mahaut uses two different unison passages in the opening ritornello. In this movement we have already noted the appearance of a second subject of contrasting character. Here the first unison passage precedes the entry of the second subject as a conclusion to the first section, and is thus suggestive of something new and different to come. The second passage occurs in the expected place, again fulfilling the usual function as a cadential approach.

With the exception of these unison passages, the ritornello will remain predominantly homophonic, characteristic of the uncluttered textures of *galant* taste in which the ear is drawn to the upper part and to the bass. The four parts of the orchestral body most commonly become divided into two distinct groups: those of the upper melodic lines (violins I and II) and the accompanying lower parts (viola and basso continuo). This clarity of texture and avoidance of earlier baroque polyphony reflects Quantz’s statements in discussing the composition of a solo concerto:

(6)There must be no more middle parts than the principal part allows; a better effect is frequently produced by doubling the principal parts than by forcing in unnecessary middle parts. (7) The progressions of the bass part and the middle parts must neither impede the liveliness of the principal part nor drown or suppress it.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Quantz, *Versuch* (Berlin, 1752), trans. Edward Reilly, chap. XVIII, par.33, pp.311-12.
There is, however, often a certain amount of dialogue between the parts, frequently between the upper and lower groups of the orchestra and following immediately on from the initial homophonic thematic statement. Such dialogue will also commonly occur between the two violins, often in the form of imitation (fig. 3.9a and 3.9b). In movement I of the Karlsruhe G major concerto (fig. 3.9b) the four-bar imitative passage (fig. 3.9b(i)) reappears in each of the three ritornelli in exactly the same position (following a two-bar statement of the theme). The imitation, however, is reversed in the second appearance (fig. 3.9b(ii)) and employs entirely new material in the third (fig. 3.9b(iii)), thus using the idea of imitation itself as a structural and thematic element.

An interesting observation, with regard to the texture of Mahaut’s ritornelli, is the inconsistent inclusion of the flute. In this matter, some distinctions can be drawn between the different collections: the Brussels concerti exclude the flute in every ritornello and tutti section, while in contrast, it appears consistently throughout those in the Stockholm collection, in all such cases doubling the first violin. Significantly, we might compare the single duplicate between these two collections (i.e. Brussels D major and Stockholm No. 13), suggesting perhaps that the inclusion of the flute throughout the ritornelli of the Stockholm copy might reflect the way in which the copyist had heard it performed either by Mahaut himself or by another flautist. We might surmise that the choice is one of preference, usually on behalf of the soloist and usually with regard to his ‘stamina’.

It is in the Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti, however, that we find a greater inconsistency in the inclusion of the flute. Whilst it does not occur throughout the second Karlsruhe D major concerto, it will otherwise commonly be included in the entire first ritornello, whilst in subsequent sections, only in the first few bars, thus involved only in the
initial part of the thematic material. In some instances, however, the inclusion of the flute does not take into account technical considerations of the instrument and will often move below the feasible range of the flute at that time. To give but one example of many, the cadence in figure 3.9c takes the flute down to a G below middle-C doubling the first violin, when Mahaut himself indicates the lowest possible note in his Méthode as a C-sharp above middle-C. We might consider two conclusions for such a notation: that the copyist was not a flute player and had no knowledge of its range, or that the notation of the flute part in the ritornello was entirely flexible, allowing it to change octave where necessary or, indeed, to stop playing if the soloist so chose.\textsuperscript{18}

That said, there are a number of movements, particularly in the first and last of the Regensburg concerto, in which the involvement or non-involvement of the flute in the ritornello seems to have been notated with much greater consideration. Following an initial ritornello in which the flute is included, subsequent appearances are restricted to the initial bars of the theme (usually two) and re-entering in the final bars of the section, most commonly a restatement of the original unison passage. In this way, it is apparent that the flute has been excluded from involvement in any development of thematic motives or in the presentation of new material within the ritornello (the latter, as we shall see, is not an uncommon occurrence). Thus, the notation suggests a much more precise indication of the intended performance and is certainly less open to alteration.

\textsuperscript{18} Such notational problems are common to many eighteenth century concerti and are not particular to Mahaut.
The Nature of Mahaut’s Solos

In examining the soloistic material in Vivaldi’s concerti, Bukofzer describes three different types: “(1) virtuosic figuration, not related to the tutti theme, (2) soloistic figuration and expansion of the tutti idea and (3) a solo idea distinct from that of the ritornello”. Such categories are equally distinct in Mahaut’s concerti. In addition, however, Mahaut reflects later stylistic developments of the solo concerto in which there is a much greater and often frequent connection of material between the solo and the ritornello, in addition to stunning virtuosic figuration. Locatelli is credited by Moser as being “perhaps the first to establish the musical principle of the solo violin repeating the first phrase of the orchestra, ornamented with fragmentation and trills, as Beethoven did in his violin concerto.”

Locatelli’s influence can clearly be seen in Mahaut’s concerti in that the majority of first solo episodes, and often the second, will open with a thematic statement by the soloist, usually of only two, three or four bars in length before moving into its own figuration. Importantly, the distinguishing feature between the ritornello and the solo thematic statement is that of texture in which the latter will be significantly reduced, usually by the number of accompanying parts. This will often take the form of a single accompanying bass part, two violins beneath the solo flute, or a three-part accompanying body of two violins and a viola-acting-bass.

Interestingly, however, the relationship between the opening solo and thematic material may not always be entirely literal, but based instead on a significant unifying element. For
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example, in the third movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig.3.10a), the initial bars of
the first solo follow the *melodic* outline of the opening phrase of the ritornello precisely
(fig.3.10a(i)), whilst at the same time, producing a more lyrical variation of the triadic theme
(fig.3.10a(ii)). In the second movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto all solo openings
allude to the theme. Whilst the first is a literal restatement (fig.3.10b(i)), the second uses the
same phrase structure, articulated by rests and repeated three times in rising sequences
(fig.3.10b(ii)). The solo is also accompanied by a single violin with a figure that closely
resembles the thematic material. Similarly in the first movement, the second solo enters with
triplet figuration (fig.3.10c(i)), but again using a phrase structure that resembles the opening
theme of the ritornello (fig.3.10c(ii)).

As we saw in figure 3.10b(ii), it is not only the solo part in which we find references to the
thematic ritornello material, but also frequently in the accompaniment beneath the opening
of the solo. For example, in the third movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto, the
complete four-bar theme appears in the unison violins as the accompaniment to the lyrical
countermelody of the flute in the opening of the first (and third) solo (fig.3.11a). In figure
3.11b (opening of first solo, mov.II, Regensburg concerto) the first two motivic crotchet
beats of the thematic opening to the movement are found in the accompanying violins and
viola beneath a solo countermelody, and similarly in the first movement of the Karlsruhe G
major concerto, in the accompanying solo bass line (fig.3.11c).

In addition to a thematic connection, the solo will also frequently present other less thematic
elements of the ritornello. In the first movement of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto,
for example, the only reference to the ritornello in the first solo is not that of the thematic
material, but of its concluding three-bar unison passage. Other elements are also apparent
such as the development and extension of new material initially presented in the inner ritornelli, thus creating an even greater unification of ideas throughout the movement. This connection, however, is not only limited to a cross-reference between ritornello and solo, but will also link solo to solo with material that is non-thematic. For example, in the opening movement of the first Stockholm concerto, we find in the second solo (fig.3.12a) a four-bar reference to new figurative material presented in the opening of the first solo, retaining the same harmonic structure and rhythm (fig.3.12b). The violin accompaniment figure then returns in the third solo (fig.3.12c), forming a question and answer dialogue with triplets in the solo flute above (doubling the harmonic rhythm), later to be taken up by the solo over a single accompanying bass line (fig.3.12d).

Just as the textural contrast of solo versus tutti forms a major structural element of the baroque solo concerto, the play of texture is also a very significant element within the solo itself. Very few solo episodes maintain a single texture throughout, but instead display a constantly changing variety of textural effects. By far the most common combination is that of the solo flute over a single bass line. In the first movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto, for example, almost half the solo bars are given to this combination (i.e. twenty-eight bars out of fifty-nine) in which the solo presents either new lyrical melodic material or the most virtuosic of figuration. Mahaut was also clearly fond of using this two-part texture to present chromatic and modulatory passages, often creating suspensions between the two parts such as the descending chromatic lines seen in figure 3.13a which, in this example, also disguise a pair of parallel fifths.

As a variation of this texture, we also frequently find the solo flute ‘shadowed’ by the first violin over the most minimal of basses (fig.3.13b(i)). In more lyrical passages the effect is
often that of a flute and violin duet in close harmony (fig.3.13b(ii)), using the traditional interchange of thirds and sixths between the two parts, displaying an interaction with individual members of the accompanying group and thus exploring different colour as well as different textural combinations.

The interaction of the violins and the solo flute is a common feature in a large number of Mahaut’s solo episodes, often reduced to their three parts only, particularly at the opening of such solo passages. Here the violins will frequently play in unison, taking the original bass part of the ritornello when the solo opens with thematic material. Subsequently, the violins will soon divide as the solo develops and modulates, moving away from thematic material. Even in slightly fuller textures, there is often a considerable amount of dialogue and imitation existing between the violins and the solo flute (fig.3.13c(i-ii)). Interestingly, in figure 3.13c(iii), we note the chromatic nature of many such passages of dialogue, most commonly towards the end of the final solo episode and often in the approach to a cadenza.

In addition, the setting of the solo flute accompanied only by two violins creates, on a number of occasions, a special textural effect that is particularly characteristic of Mahaut’s writing. That is, the combination of a sustained or rhythmically distinct solo part over a closely harmonised pair of violins (usually in thirds) in a repetitive triplet or sextuplet rhythm (fig.3.13d(i-ii)). The effect of such a texture is to create a shimmering ‘haze’, harmonically suspended before resolving into a cadential progression.

Alongside the rather transparent textural combination described above and their resultant play of instrumental colour, we also find a variety of fuller accompaniments to the solo line. The most common of these is the combination of two violins and a viola-acting-bass.
Frequently, this accompaniment is used to introduce a dominant pedal beneath increasingly virtuosic figuration approaching a strong cadence into the following ritornello (fig. 3.14a). In figure 3.14b this pedal is built up slowly until it appears in all three accompanying parts.

Significantly, in solo passages that use all four parts of the accompanying body (i.e. two violins, viola and basso continuo), the texture will always remain sparse and transparent, never resembling the solid full texture of the ritornello. Mahaut achieves this by creating different ‘levels’ in the accompaniment whilst remaining essentially homophonic. For example, in figure 3.15a, the pedals in both violin II and viola, over an almost staccato bass part and the solo melodic line shadowed by violin I, create three distinct levels in the transparent texture. Similarly, in figure 3.15b, the three lines created by the solo figuration over a more lyrical countermelody in violin I and a strong bass part are punctuated by an occasional unison rhythmic figure in violin II and viola. In other examples the orchestra is divided into two answering bodies (fig. 3.15c) or two lines of slowly descending scales moving in semibreves, a half bar out with each other, over a repeated quaver bass line (fig. 3.15d).

Whilst we have discussed individually the enormous variety of textural effects and instrumental combinations used by Mahaut in his solo episodes, they also form collectively a significant structural element within each solo, in that the constant change of texture from one combination to another will always coincide with a change of material or figuration or even a significant harmonic change in the solo line. Thus, in figure 3.16a, four changes of both solo figurations and accompanying texture are to be found. Likewise, in figure 3.16b, three figurative/textural changes occur simultaneously in the space of twelve bars. A similar structural pattern is evident in just about all solo episodes. Interestingly, in figure 3.16c, we
note that in one such change (bar 70 to 77) the flute actually merges with the accompanying body to create a two-part dialogue between flute/violin I and violin II/viola, not re-establishing its solo status until the next change of figuration and texture.

Whilst the pattern of movement from one textural combination to another will always vary within each solo, there is frequently one prominent feature that is common to many: a significant reduction in texture immediately prior to the entrance of the following tutti, creating a considerable contrast between the two sections, and therefore serving to highlight the structural function of the returning ritornello. Thus, in figure 3.17a, we note an increasing density of texture that is suddenly reduced to sustained pedals in all accompanying parts, five bars prior to the *da capo* of the original ritornello. Similarly, in figure 3.17b, the preceding fuller texture is immediately altered upon a change of figuration to a two-part flute and viola passage, two-and-a-half bars before the tutti entrance. By far the most common occurrence, however, is a reduction of texture to a two-part solo flute and basso continuo combination. Such a texture of course maximises the contrast with the following tutti and, in figure 3.17c, also highlights the chromatic movement of the melodic line in the last nine bars of the solo.

**Soloistic Flute Writing**

In his soloistic writing for the flute Mahaut has followed in the footsteps of Quantz, and more particularly in those of the French flautists Naudot and Blavet, in exploiting the technical capabilities of the flute in much the same way that Locatelli did for the violin. In range, Mahaut explored all registers of the flute, frequently taking it up to the high f-sharp$^3$ and g$^3$ in all types of figuration (fig.3.18a and b) and melodic passages (fig.3.18c). In the
latter example such an ascent makes a highly impressive opening to the first solo of the movement. In addition, however, Mahaut is clearly not afraid, on occasion, to extend this range even higher to a\textsuperscript{3}. The most striking example of this is perhaps seen in the second movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig.3.18d). Here the note appears amongst disjunct and expressive dotted figures in which its difficulty lies not least in the slow tempo, requiring breadth of tone and control of intonation.

To put such an extreme of register into historical context, it is interesting to note that whilst Hotteterre’s fingering chart includes g\textsuperscript{3}, he speaks of all notes above e\textsuperscript{3} as being forced and “cannot be used naturally in any piece” and that the “high F can almost never be played on the flute”.\textsuperscript{21} Similarly, in his flute treatise published around 1740, Corrette speaks of fingerings for notes up to a\textsuperscript{3}, but adds that notes above g\textsuperscript{3} are never used except when improvising preludes.\textsuperscript{22} The a\textsuperscript{3} does appear once in J.S. Bach’s work for the flute, which he approaches in an ascending scale at the end of the first movement to the solo Partita. Quantz has an even more restrictive opinion with regard to the range of the flute, avoiding very high passages and most frequently limiting his upper register to e\textsuperscript{3}: “The highest usable note that you can invariably produce is E”\textsuperscript{23}. Those which are higher require a particularly good embouchure”.\textsuperscript{24} Mahaut, on the other hand, includes fingerings up to d\textsuperscript{4}, although he says that the highest usable note is b\textsuperscript{3}.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{21} Hotteterre, Jacques. Principes de la flue traversière . . . (Paris, 1707), trans. Paul Marshall Douglas (New York: Dover Publications, 1968), chap.III, pp.18-19. Note that for flutes of the period, the g\textsuperscript{3} was actually easier to produce than the tone below it, hence Hotteterre’s comment regarding the f\textsuperscript{2}.


\textsuperscript{23} Quantz, Versuch, chap. IV, par.20, p.57.

\textsuperscript{24} Mahaut adds that in particular, the notes above A’’’ are intended for the flute d’amour (Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre en peu de temps à jouer de la flûte traversière (Paris,: La Chevardière, 1759), trans. Eileen Hadidian (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p.7.
In addition to this exploitation of the flute’s upper range, Mahaut was also not afraid to use the lower register of the instrument, seen in the octave leaps of figure 3.18e, despite its rather restricted ability to cut audibly through an orchestral texture at this end of its range. Inevitably, however, Mahaut always uses a lighter texture in such contexts to help the performer and it is most commonly found in the two-part flute and basso continuo passages. It is not uncommon, however, in ‘fuller’ passages where the flute simply ‘blends in’, adding an additional colour to the otherwise string texture.

The high level of virtuosity in Mahaut’s solo episodes places heavy demands on the technical capabilities of the performer, particularly with regard to the speed and intricacy of the figurations. Whilst Mahaut was certainly not the first to do so, his writing reflects the current trend to adopt patterns derived from popular violinistic figurations, successfully adapting them to the less flexible technique and narrower range of the flute. As a result the solo passages are full of rapid acrobatic leaps and broken chord figures covering the entire range of the instrument. The sequencing of broken chords for example, seen in figure 3.19a, presents difficulties for the player in both stamina and breath control. In addition to the frequent appearance of octave leaps in the figuration (fig.3.18e) we also commonly find much larger leaps, often amongst continuous semiquaver figuration, allowing little time to adjust the embouchure (fig.3.19b). Even greater demands on the embouchure can be seen in figure 3.19c where the disjunct figures constantly leap in and out of the lower octave. Equally derivative of violinistic figurations is the illusion of two-part writing within the
single line of the solo flute. In almost all cases this results in the production of a pedal in the ‘lower’ part (fig.3.20a and b). 25

The gradual increase in the level of virtuosity throughout each solo is strongly characteristic of Mahaut’s concerti, with the greatest technical demands found in the final or penultimate solos of a movement (fig.3.21a). Such an increase in the virtuosity is frequently the result of constant fragmentation and sequencing, such as that seen in figure 3.21b, until motivic figures are finally replaced by continuous passages of running figurations. These passages are often equally demanding on the articulation technique of the performer, in figure 3.21c requiring both double and triple tonguing. A large variety of articulations is in fact evident throughout the concerti, including those that are imitative of violin bowings. Such articulations are essentially reflective of Mahaut’s discussion in his Méthode, and will be discussed in greater detail in a later chapter.

25 It should be noted that these rapid changes in register are rather more easily accomplished on the flute of the time than on a modern instrument. Indeed, the figures in fig.3.20a and 20b and the triplet figures at the end of fig.3.21c, reflect the agility of the period instrument.
The Nature of Mahaut's Ritornello Structures

Having discussed the individual characteristics of Mahaut's ritornello and solo sections, we might now consider the outward structure of those movements based on a ritornello principle. The most common arrangement within the outer movements is the alternation of five ritornelli with four significantly longer solo episodes, although a pattern of four-plus-three is equally common in third movements and in the occasional first movement.

A structural feature appearing frequently throughout all collections of Mahaut's concerti, and in both first and last movements, is the use of a da capo as the final ritornello. Whilst there is an almost equal number of concerti that do not use this feature, it is not uncommon in these for many final ritornelli to be identical, or almost identical, to the first even when written out in the normal way. There are, in addition, a number of final ritornelli that are identical not to the first, but to the second ritornello of the movement, thus providing in these examples a shortened version of the original ritornello.

Whilst the length of Mahaut's fast movements varies enormously, the length of the initial ritornello, commonly the longest of all subsequent tutti sections, always remains in proportion to the rest of the movement (i.e. the longer the movement, the longer the initial ritornello). In terms of length, there is no significant difference between the concerti of different collections, although like Locatelli the extended length of a number of Mahaut's first movements points strongly towards those of the classical solo concerto.²⁶ Such

²⁶ For example: Regensburg G major, mov.1 (C) = 162 bars in length and Stockholm No.1, mov.1 (C) = 182 bars in length; significantly longer than the more common length of around 100 bars for a movement in four beats to the bar.
movements result principally from the extension of both the ritornello and solo sections by
the development of thematic motives and the introduction of new material in the ritornello
itself and by the frequent interruption of solo passages by brief tutti passages, both of which
will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

An interesting feature in some of Mahaut's third movements is the arch-like, quasi-rondo
form that results from the exact repetition of sections, together with the inclusion of the
solo in the presentation of the opening theme. For example, in the third movement of the
Karlsruhe G major concerto, not only are the first and fourth ritornello identical, but also
the first and third solo episodes are so similar as to produce a structure that can be
described as:

\[
\text{A B A'} C \text{ A'' B A}
\]

thus firmly pointing towards the Rondo structures that were to become the favourite third
movement form of the classical concerto.\(^{27}\)

Whilst most of Mahaut's ritornello structures remain straightforward, there are a number of
interesting arrangements that deviate from the normal pattern. In the first movement of the
first Karlsruhe D major concerto we note that the arrangement of the da capo is rather
unusual: the fine, marked by a fermata, does not appear as would be expected after the first
tutti section but instead after the second, sandwiching in between a solo presentation of new
material:

\[
\text{R (S) R} \parallel \text{S R S R S R (S) R} \tag{da capo}
\]

\(^{27}\) Such structures are often referred to as a Sonata-Rondo, in the light of the extensive motivic and
harmonic development occurring in the central solo episode.
Whilst this solo displays the expected characteristics of a solo episode (i.e. reduced texture and melodic line that is separate from the first violin), we have concluded previously in our discussion that in this case it does not constitute such a solo episode, but the presentation of a second thematic subject of contrasting character, resulting principally from its solo setting. Thus, Mahaut has produced an opening and closing ritornello of ternary design A B A’ that in effect reduces the overall structure to a more usual four-plus-three pattern of tutti and solo sections:

\[ R \parallel S R S R S R (da\ capo) \]

An even more interesting ritornello structure is to be found in the third movement of the second Stockholm concerto. Whilst the alternation of ritornello and solo sections is still clearly evident, here we also find a larger binary structure to the movement resulting from the use of repeat bars at a point almost half-way through and at the end of the movement:

\[
\begin{align*}
I & \rightarrow V & V & \rightarrow I \\
R S (T) & \parallel R S R S (T) & \parallel \\
& A = 55\text{ bars} & B = 57\text{ bars}
\end{align*}
\]

In the light of the modulatory and developmental nature of the second ‘proper’ ritornello, beginning section ‘B’, such a structure points clearly towards the emergence of the classical Sonata Form. The simple harmonic structure of the movement also strongly underlies the binary organisation in its move towards the dominant at the beginning of the first half, from which it returns to the tonic. We note also that the tutti sections concluding the solo episodes at the end of each half are identical, except in their tonality, thus adding to the audible impression of a larger binary structure. These are perhaps reminiscent of Mahaut’s
fast movements in his solo and trio sonatas, strongly resembling the character and binary form of French dance movements.

Harmonically, the outward structure of Mahaut’s quick movements might be described as unremarkable. In its most simplistic form the first two ritornelli will typically remain firmly in the tonic, moving to the dominant in the third and returning to the tonic for the remaining two. It is not uncommon, however, for the second ritornello to have already moved into the dominant or, in the case of a minor key, into the relative major. A greater amount of variation occurs more frequently in the third and fourth ritornello, including the sub-dominant in the third, dominant in the fourth of a major key and the use of appropriate relative major/minor keys in either the third or fourth ritornello. This basic tonal scheme is perhaps better described in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>tonic</td>
<td>tonic or dominant</td>
<td>dominant or sub.dom. or rel.minor</td>
<td>tonic or dominant or rel.minor</td>
<td>tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>tonic</td>
<td>tonic or rel.major</td>
<td>dom. minor or sub.dom. or rel.major</td>
<td>tonic or rel.major</td>
<td>tonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the rather simplistic nature of Mahaut’s tonal schemes, he does use a number of unusual patterns, principally in the use of the relative minor belonging to the dominant (or equally: the mediant-minor). Interestingly, its use is limited to those concerti of the Karlsruhe and Regensburg collections and will appear in either the central or penultimate ritornello. Whilst Mahaut clearly establishes these keys at the beginning of the ritornello
concerned, they fundamentally function as a pathway between the dominant and the relative minor or vice versa (the modulation usually being initiated and completed in the solo episode):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kr. G major</td>
<td>tonic</td>
<td>dominant</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>med.minor</td>
<td>tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr. D major</td>
<td>tonic</td>
<td>tonic</td>
<td>dominant</td>
<td>med.minor</td>
<td>tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. G major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As would generally be expected, it is principally in the solo episodes that we find the modulation from one tonal level to another, often moving through a number of related keys en-route, including the relative minor/major, sub-dominant, mediant-minor and frequently, the tonic major or minor. An unusual feature occurring occasionally in the Brussels collection is the opening of a solo episode in the dominant-minor (in a major key) and the dominant-major (in a minor key).

It is, however, not uncommon to find modulatory passages within the ritornello itself, particularly, as we shall see, in those extended ritornelli displaying development of thematic motives and the introduction of new material. We have in addition, already noted those initial ritornelli that present a second subject in a related key, including that of the dominant-minor.
Having previously discussed extensively the nature of Mahaut’s ritornello itself, we must now consider how he uses the ritornello in subsequent sections to build up his alternating solo-tutti structure. These re-appearances are principally of two kinds: those which present a shortened version of the original, and those which develop, modulate and present new material. Of the former, it is most common to find a brief statement of the original material, some only two or three bars in length, whilst others will present a complete statement lasting eight to twelve bars. Unusually, in the opening movement of the first Stockholm concerto, the penultimate ritornello presents the four-bar theme in the relative minor followed by an immediate repetition transposed up a minor third into the tonic key. An interesting thematic variation is also found in both the first and third movements of the Brussels D major concerto (Stockholm, No.13), in which the flute takes on a quasi-soloistic role. In the first movement (fig.3.22a) we find new imitative figures in the flute added over the original descending scales of the violins before moving seamlessly into the following solo episode, thus effectively blurring the line between tutti and solo. Similarly, in the third movement (fig.3.22b), the second ritornello statement is punctuated by trill figures in the solo flute, returning identically in the final ritornello.

In addition to brief statements of thematic material, we also find, although less frequently, isolated statements of those unison passages that concluded the original ritornello. In one such example (fig.3.22c) the three bar tutti unison passage immediately follows a statement of the same passage in the previous solo episode, further unifying the material of both sections and blurring the lines between them. A recurring feature of many of Mahaut’s concerti, and particularly characteristic of every inner ritornello of the Regensburg concerto, is the combination of the initial thematic material and the concluding unison passage (i.e. a presentation of the beginning and the end of the original ritornello (fig.3.22d)).
One element, however, of the original thematic material that is rarely found restated in an inner ritornello is that of a second subject. Indeed, in all Mahaut’s concerti, only one ritornello in each of two movements actually restates the second thematic idea in its original format. This is not to say, however, that it is not used at all in subsequent ritornelli, but is more commonly found fragmented and developed during modulatory ritornello passages.

Such passages are one of a number of ‘modern’ features evident in Mahaut’s use of the inner ritornelli serving, like Locatelli, to expand both the scope and length of the concerto movement. In contrast to the brief thematic statements described above these tend to be of much greater length,28 frequently introducing new material after a short thematic statement that serves to identify its ritornello function. Specifically, when introduced in the penultimate ritornello, the section will frequently conclude with the original unison cadential passage resulting in a significantly long ritornello section. The introduction of new material into the inner ritornello is such a characteristic feature of Mahaut’s concerto, that it can be found in every fast movement of every collection, with the exception of the first movement of the Karlsruhe G major and the third movement of the Regensburg concerti.

Such new material is principally of two kinds: (1) unrelated to thematic ideas and most commonly found in the form of chromatic sequences (fig.3.23a(i) and (ii)), and (2) fragmentation of thematic material and motivic development. Whilst not chromatic, such development will tend to modulate as seen in those passages of figure 3.23b(i) and (ii). In the first, the rhythmic quaver motive of the second subject is developed in the accompaniment to unison violins, and in the second, the original thematic material is

28 The third ritornello of the Brussels D major concerto, mov.III, for example, is extended to 54 bars in length by the introduction of new material.
fragmented and ‘spun-out’ in a modulatory passage from dominant to relative minor. Such development in the ritornello itself is not of course unique to Mahaut but is found in Locatelli and more particularly in the concerti of the Frenchman Leclair, for whom it is a regular practice having spent some time in Amsterdam studying with Locatelli. It is, however, a rare occurrence in any concerto before the second half of the century, thus pointing to a somewhat later date of composition.

In addition to the development of thematic motives within the ritornello, we also find the appearance of motivic figures first presented as new material in the solo episodes, thus again showing much greater unification between solo and tutti sections. For example, in the opening movement of the first Stockholm concerto, the brief second ritornello of only seven bars bears no relation to thematic material, but instead continues the running triplet figures that were introduced a few bars previously in the preceding solo. Similarly, in the third ritornello, following a four-bar thematic statement, the string accompaniment figure from the first solo episode is re-introduced and developed as new material, concluding with the running triplets seen in the previous ritornello.

Such connection between the solo and the ritornello is a significant characteristic of all Mahaut’s concerti. The relationship, however, goes beyond a motivic connection where the tutti is on occasion ‘interrupted’ by the solo or vice versa, thus upsetting the regular alternation between the two sections and blurring the outer structure of the ritornello form. We have already seen, in our discussion above, a fondness for superimposing the solo over thematic statements in the ritornello with imitative or trill figures. Similar decorative triplet figures are added over five bars of non-thematic ritornello material in figure 3.23c. In the
third movement of the first Karlsruhe D major concerto a rather extraordinary section appears constituting the fourth ritornello. Here the tutti and solo are used in a repetitive sequence of 'question and answer' (a series of five-plus-four bars repeated three times) while moving through a series of related keys (fig.3.23d). Such interruption of the tutti by solo passages is, in addition, strongly characteristic of Locatelli and Leclair, indicating the degree of structural advance that existed in the concerti of Mahaut and his contemporaries.29

In addition to the interruption of the ritornello, we also find the reverse: the frequent disruption of the solo episode by tutti passages. In its simplest, least disruptive form, brief tutti passages are used to articulate and highlight the ends of phrases in solo episodes, frequently forming a one-bar link to the next phrase (fig.3.24a(i) and (ii)), while in other examples a more substantial tutti passage will often form a non-thematic link between two distinct sections of the solo episode (fig.3.24b(i) and (ii)). Notice in figure 3.24b(ii) above, that the second solo section resumes the same material and texture of the first, making the syncopated tutti passage much more of an interruption than a 'link'. Such tutti interruptions usually occur in the longest solo episodes and are seldom based on thematic material. One exception to this observation, however, can be seen in figure 3.24c where a quasi-ritornello interrupts the third solo episode while retaining the thematic motive in the solo flute and developing its three-beat phrase structure in a descending sequence.

A rarer occurrence, but frequent enough to be found in every collection, is the interruption of a solo by more than one tutti passage. Again these principally remain non-thematic and

will often continue figures introduced in the solo (fig. 3.24d(i)). In the following example we notice a similar pattern to one that we encountered in an earlier ritornello: a series of solo and tutti passages (three-plus-five bars) forming a repetitive 'question and answer' dialogue before dissolving into solo figuration (fig. 3.24d(ii)).
CHAPTER FOUR

THE FORMAL STRUCTURE OF MAHAUT’S MIDDLE MOVEMENTS

In his slow movements Mahaut shows much greater freedom with regard to his formal structures, although many remain based on a ritornello principle using contrasting sections of solo and tutti. In those movements that retain a formal ritornello structure, the number of tutti statements is commonly limited to three or four, considerably less than in the outer movements. This of course reflects the slower tempi, with those movements containing a larger number of ritornello statements commonly in alla breve or in a triple metre.

It is notable that full ritornello presentations are, in the majority of examples, limited to the first statement (with the exception of those using a da capo structure), frequently concluding the movement with only a very brief statement of thematic material. By way of contrast, it is the solos that feature more prominently in these movements, being considerably longer than the ritornello sections. Here elaborate figuration is rare, focussing more on the lyrical song-like character of the melodic material, thus demanding skilful cantabile playing rather than a show of virtuosity. That said, however, a considerable number of ornamental figures, principally in the form of slides and trill suffixes, are written into the melodic material producing, in themselves, a significant element of virtuosity. With regard to ornamentation, Mahaut in fact leaves little to the performer and the material does

---

1 Significantly, Locatelli shows his most consistent ritornello structures in his slow movements, with few exceptions organised around three ritornelli and two solo entries. Like Mahaut, the latter is principally based on new material although there are some recurring motivic figures.
not invite the excessive elaboration common to many Italian aria-like slow movements, with the exception perhaps of additional essential graces such as the trill and mordent.\(^2\)

This significant French characteristic of clear melodic lines and essential graces, also prominent in the concerti of Leclair, is but one feature pointing strongly towards the French stylistic character of many of Mahaut's middle movements. In addition many make use of strong dotted rhythms both in the ritornello and in the solo line, highly reminiscent of the slow French Overture Style and its characteristic heightening of the majestic element. An extensive discussion regarding the performance of such rhythms will appear in the chapter regarding \textit{Rhythmic Alteration}.

Whilst most of Mahaut's slow movement structures remain straightforward, an interesting example appears in the first Stockholm concerto (fig.4.1a). Here the ritornello presents no strong motivic material in itself, based almost entirely on repeated quaver figures and, from bar four, slow descending scales in the violins, a half-bar out with each other. Its thematic value is in fact limited to its use as an accompaniment in the subsequent solo. More interesting, however, is the imitative entrance with which the movement begins, entering in one-bar intervals in descending order of pitch, but remaining essentially homophonic. Such a beginning is unique amongst Mahaut's concerti, despite the greater freedom shown in his slow movements and is indeed unusual in those of his contemporaries.

In addition to the more common structures of three or four ritornello statements, we also find a lesser number based on only two repetitions surrounding a single solo episode of

\(^2\) See the later chapter regarding \textit{Ornamentation} for a more detailed discussion.
considerable length, thus producing a ternary organisation. Such a structure strongly resembles those used by Naudot in his six French-style concerti for solo flute (Op.11). Uniform in plan, they all open and close with a short ritornello enclosing a central extensive flute solo. In Mahaut's second Karlsruhe D major concerto the second ritornello is in fact identical with the first, resulting from its use of *da capo*. A more interesting example of ternary organisation is to be found in the Brussels e minor concerto. Here a central solo episode of twelve bars is surrounded by two identical unison orchestral ritornelli, each of two bars. Within the solo episode, however, we find a secondary structure based on three four-bar sections of alternating solo and tutti passages. Each section begins with a lyrical solo countermelody (varying on each occasion) accompanied only by the two-bar dotted ritornello theme in the unison violins and concluding, in each case, with an identical tutti passage of dotted and triplet figures. Such a structure might be represented by the design below:

```
R || S1 / T || S2 / T || S3 / T || R \\
| 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
```

Whilst the majority of Mahaut’s slow movements are loosely based by varying degrees on a ritornello principle, there are a smaller but significant number of others that do not, and as a group display a wide variety of possible structures in which no two are alike. The greatest variation of form is found amongst the Brussels collection in which only one out of four concerti makes use of a ritornello organisation in its middle movement (seen above). The Brussels d minor concerto, for example, is based instead on a binary structure of eight-plus-eight bars, repeated at both the half-way point and at the end. Even with the addition of
repeats, the brevity of the movement causes it to resemble more of an interlude between the outer movements and may point perhaps to an earlier date of composition. In line with such brevity, the movement makes use of only a single motivic idea, presented as a conversation between the flute and the first violin, and thus does not begin the second section with a contrasting motif. It is, however, in the simple harmonic pattern that we find the underlying binary structure of the movement in its modulation to the dominant half-way through and its subsequent return to the tonic. Such a structure is reminiscent of French dance movements, often found in the slow movements of Mahaut’s sonatas.

Significantly, the structure makes no use of solo and tutti contrasts, which can also be said of the slow movement from the Brussels A major concerto. In this movement the solo flute is accompanied only by the basso continuo in a composition that more strongly resembles a movement from a solo sonata than that of a concerto. Whilst at first glance the movement appears to be through-composed (fig. 4.1b), there is a definite return of the opening material in bar 16, although metrically displaced by half a bar. This aside, the last ten bars make use of the same melodic pattern as the first ten bars, producing an overall ternary structure that is almost symmetrical. Finally, we consider the slow movement of the Brussels D major concerto. In contrast to other such movements of the Brussels concerti, here we note the Italian character in its prevailing siciliano rhythm. Whilst the movement is not based on any regular formal structure, we find once again, a highly organised symmetrical design: four distinct sections distinguished by fermata markings over rests in all parts forming two halves, each of five-plus-eight bars. Unity is achieved principally by the use of the same thematic phrase in the first bar of each section before developing its own new material or figuration. In addition the final section significantly resembles that of the first, giving the movement a much stronger sense of unity:
Like the outer movements, Mahaut's slow movements remain unremarkable with regard to their harmonic structure. Many retain a tonal centre that does not differ from the outer movements although they will modulate frequently within the movement itself. Typically, however, they will feature a related key as their tonic, commonly the dominant, sub-dominant or relative major/minor, although rather unusually, the Brussels d minor Larghetto uses the sub-mediant. Equally uncharacteristic of Mahaut is the Adagio of the Brussels A major concerto which, in a quasi-Italian style, finishes on a dominant cadence. Despite its Italian origin, this harmonic structure is also seen in two of the French flute concerti of Naudot's Opus 11.
CHAPTER FIVE

TEMPO AND METRE

The understanding of correct tempo for any work is, of course, a crucial element of performance. If played too fast, Allegro movements will lose their clarity, obscuring delicate figurations, and, if played too slowly, a beautiful cantabile melody may be transformed into a 'pathetic' Adagio and the latter into a dirge.

It is in instrumental music that tempi problems are particularly felt. Dance music, to a large extent, had more well-known tempo associations, and in vocal music the approximate tempo could easily be ascertained from the character of the work suggested by the text. Hence, with the development of Italian sonatas and concerti, the need for some form of tempo indication can be understood, and thus we see the simultaneous appearance of tempo terms. The number of such indications steadily increased throughout the seventeenth century until, by its conclusion, they had become a standard feature. From Corelli onwards they were particularly frequent in printed music, designed for a wider, less-knowledgeable public. Kolneder gives a brief summary of Vivaldi's tempo indications, showing a "diversity that certainly testifies to the composer's desire to make his intentions known to other performers". 1

The Germans and the English also adopted the Italian tempo terms. Quantz lists at least twenty-nine Italian indications throughout his Versuch, which can likewise be found with

---

abundance in his own compositions. Whilst the French retained their own language for French-style music, they also adopted Italian terms in their sonatas and concerti. A large number of such markings are in fact listed in Brossard’s *Dictionnaire* of 1703. We also note Mahaut’s consistent use of Italian tempo markings throughout all collections of his concerti (seen in table 2 below). Whilst not a diverse range, they include all the standard indications of the time and some with additional qualifiers such as *Allegro ma non troppo, Allegro Andante* and *Adagio cantabile*.

Today, such tempo markings present us with significant problems of interpretation, the greatest of which lies in their natural vagueness, in that, whilst some indicate a speed directly through their meaning (i.e. *presto, moderato* and *lento*), others use association by implying either a mood, such as *Allegro* (joyful), *Adagio* (at ease), *grave* (serious), a type of movement such as walking (*Andante*), or a particular character (for example: *Largo*, meaning broad). Over time, such terms took on specific tempo meanings in addition to their general character, the vagueness of which encouraged composers to use the kind of qualifiers mentioned above in Mahaut’s usage. Quantz stresses the importance of considering other factors in determining the tempo, such as the quickest type of prevailing figuration and the expressive character of the movement. With regard to the latter, the character meanings of the tempo terms remains of the utmost importance. Quantz states that they are one of the most important factors in determining the character of a movement.² Having established his four general tempo categories, he states that the various

² Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.XI, par.16, p.126.
## TABLE 2

### TEMPO TERMS AND METRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>key</th>
<th>tempo terms</th>
<th>metre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First movements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e minor</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d minor</td>
<td>Allegro ma non troppo</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major No.I</td>
<td>Moderato</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major No.II</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-flat major</td>
<td>Moderato</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>Allegro ma non troppo</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderato</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Allegro ma non Presto</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Allegro andante</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderato</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Movements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e minor</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d minor</td>
<td>Larghetto</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>12/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major(I)</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major(II)</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-flat major</td>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - continued

Stockholm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Largo</th>
<th>¾</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adagio cantabile</td>
<td>12/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Siciliano</td>
<td>12/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third Movements

Brussels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e minor</td>
<td>Presto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d minor</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karlsruhe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major(I)</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major(II)</td>
<td>Presto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-flat maj</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Allegro ma no presto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stockholm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
titles within each "have an individual meaning of its own, but it refers more to the expression of the dominant passions in each piece than to the tempo proper". 3

Quantz was also one of a handful of writers who attempted to find a more precise definition for such tempo markings by relating each to a specific pulse rate.4 This formula, in its conversion into metronome markings, has provided modern musicological research with a much clearer idea of the intended tempi.5 To what extent we can apply Quantz's indications to the works of other composers, however, is questionable, in that our second greatest problem with regard to tempo terms is their differing interpretation in different areas of Europe and their changing meaning over the course of the eighteenth century. Quantz himself says:

What in former times was considered to be quite fast would have been played almost twice as slow as in the present day. An Allegro assai, Presto, Furioso, &c., was then written and would have been played, only a little faster than Allegretto is written and performed today. The large number of quick notes in the instrumental pieces of the earlier German composers thus looked much more difficult and hazardous than they sounded. Contemporary French musicians have retained this style of moderate speed in lively pieces to a large extent.6

In 1701, Georg Muffat writes that the "Italians play adagio, grave and largo much more slowly than do our musicians. By contrast they play allegro, vivace, presto, più presto and prestissimo incomparably faster than is common in Germany".7 Later in the century,

5 Quantz, Versuch, notes by E. Reilly; p.286, n.1-9; p.287, n.1-3.
however, C.P.E. Bach writes that in Berlin: "the adagios are rendered much slower, the allegros much faster than customary in other regions," thus showing a significant regional difference and change of fashion over the space of fifty years.

Towards the end of the century, we find Quantz's schematic formula endorsed by Türk whilst Tromlitz, in his flute treatise of 1791, questions its value:

Every observation I have made has always led me to believe that a person of particular temperament does not have the same pulse beat from one day to the next, not even in fact from one hour to the next, and that each age (for temperaments do change with the years) has a different pulse rate, to say nothing of the fact that this rate can be altered very much by internal as well as external influences, such as unforeseen circumstances, weather, food and drink and suchlike, without considering other difficulties. Therefore, I doubt that this method could be used profitably. Nonetheless, anyone who wants to can give it a try, for it does at least give a tempo; but in the end one must allow feeling to decide if one is to keep the right path.

... a means of lighting upon the tempo indicated by the superscript must indeed exist. I know of none other than feeling. But if one is to find out the correct tempo by feeling, one must first of all be familiar with the content of the piece. To be governed solely by the superscription is in my opinion a mistake, or at best, a very vague expedient. Often a composer superscribes a movement Allegro, but not merely with the meaning fast; rather he has attempted thereby to convey a particular degree of joy and happiness. Now if the performer is guided by the bare meaning fast, as very often happens, then he will certainly, or at least most of the time, mistake the composer's intention; for he will not be in accordance with the content, the substance, on which his aim should be quite set, and on which everything depends.10


Thus, once again we return to the character of the music to indicate tempo, implied in both the tempo term and in the content of the movement itself. Problems connected with tempo will often centre primarily around the performer’s understanding of the character implied by the tempo terms and his ability to deduce the appropriate tempo from the nature of the work itself.

We might now examine Mahaut’s concerti themselves with regard to tempo and metre. From the table above we find a predominance in Mahaut’s opening movements of the metre C. Indeed, over half appear in that metre along with five in alla breve and three in 2/4 time. In line with Quantz’s explanation, those in alla breve display the same pulse as those in 2/4, but are written in note values twice as long. Significantly, movements in C have a much greater majestic or serious element than those in alla breve or 2/4 often displaying strong dotted thematic motives. In addition they will contain a predominance of small-note figurations such as passages built up of running semiquavers, demi-semiquavers or triplet semiquavers, requiring a strong crotchet pulse that allows such figures to maintain their clarity.

Harmonically, the bass in such movements will characteristically move in minims, although often in four during the ritornello and particularly in the approach to cadences. By contrast, alla breve movements display a lighter character with a strong minim pulse. According to Quantz it “is a metre that is more common in the galant style of the present day than it was in former times”.11 Importantly, they feature figures of larger note values which predictably form groupings of not less than a crotchet. A particular feature of such movements is the

11 Quantz, Versuch, chap. V, par. 13, p. 65.
frequent use of rhythmic/melodic motives that form half-bar units (such as those in figure 5.1a), thus metrically and visually dividing the bar in two. Even in those rarer passages involving much smaller note-values (fig.5.1b), the running sequences fall naturally into minim patterns and are supported by a slower moving minim accompaniment.

There are, however, a number of movements with regard to C and alla breve in which we find a contradiction between its metre and its content. In some this is perhaps due to a certain flexibility in which the pulse will naturally move from four to two, or vice versa, according to the nature of a particular passage. Such a flexibility is found frequently in the first movement of the Regensburg concerto. Here the imitative passage seen in figure 5.2 is most naturally felt in two, whilst the ritornello and dominant motivic groupings feature triplet, sextuplet and syncopated semiquaver figures demanding, in contrast, a fast quadruple beat.

In other movements, however, there seems to be a blatant conflict between metre and content. For example, the opening movement of the first Stockholm concerto Allegro ma non troppo, indicates a quadruple pulse by its common-time metre (C). Its content, however, featuring triplet-quaver figuration and figures that move in half-bar units, points much more strongly towards a minim pulse or, at least, a very fast four. The metre conflicts likewise with the tempo terms which would more logically warn against the rushing of the pulse in alla breve time.

It is significant that, throughout the late baroque and galant eras, there was a continuing uncertainty with regard to common and alla breve time. Whilst the proportional relationship
of the two metres (the minim in *alla breve* equal to the crotchet in common-time) is spelt out in just about every treatise of the period, Marpurg adds in 1755:

concerning notation, the error arises fairly often of confusing the simple C with the barred Č, in which case one has to examine the character of a piece with regard to its fastest notes and its phrases in order to determine whether it has two or four beats.12

A further example is found in the first movement of the Brussels D major concerto marked as *alla breve*. Whilst it is possible to perform the movement with a minim pulse, it would almost certainly need to be slower than the usual pulse of an *Allegro alla breve* due to the abundance of running semiquaver figuration and, on occasion, triplet semiquavers and demi-semiquavers even in the ritornello. Indeed, a large portion of the movement is considerably more suited to a quadruple pulse. In his discussion of tempo, Frederick Neumann suggests that “some movements in Č that contain many black notes may not have been beaten in two. As so frequently happened in French music, the symbol then indicated a fairly fast beat in four”.13 Such a suggestion would seem to offer a reasonable explanation for the conflict seen in the Brussels D major concerto. Further support for this conclusion is to be found in its duplicate amongst the Stockholm collection. Here the C sign remains unbarred and, significantly, the tempo term *Allegro* is qualified as *Allegro Moderato*, thus more appropriately reflecting the content of the movement itself.14

---


14 The first movement 'label' is not the only one to be altered in the Stockholm duplicate; the second movement, while not indicating differing speed, is re-labelled *Siciliano* (from *Largo*) and the third movement *Allegro* is again qualified by the term *Moderato*. 
In addition to Mahaut's use of the term Allegro and those qualified by Allegro ma non Presto, there are two other principal tempo terms that make an appearance in the opening movements: Andante and Moderato. The former appears in only those of the Stockholm collection, while the latter is found in the concerti of both Karlsruhe and Stockholm. Andante literally means walking, implying a deliberate but unhurried tempo. According to Neumann it had "a neutral connotation at the boundary between fast and slow but leaning originally slightly toward the fast side with an emphasis on movement." Neumann also suggests that up to the time of Haydn and Mozart Andante was loosely related to moderato, with both words indicating "the true centrist tempo". Indeed, in his Dictionnaire of 1768, J.-J. Rousseau likens the French modéré with the Italian andante. At some time during the late-eighteenth century the term andante gradually came to indicate a tempo on the slower side of moderato. Hence in 1791, Tromlitz includes moderato amongst those titles found in "less quick pieces" and andante amongst those of "moderately slow ones". Later he goes on to say that andante "signifies a tempo somewhere between Cantabile and Allegretto and consequently is rather slow".

With this apparent change of meaning, it is interesting to compare Mahaut's use of both titles, particularly where they both appear within the same collection. The opening movements of the Stockholm concerti includes two Moderatos in C alongside four Andantes in C and one in alla breve. This in itself, without even considering the musical content, is enough to suggest that the two titles imply not the same, but distinct tempos and character. An examination of the music does in fact support this expectation: the Andante

---


16 Tromlitz, Unterricht, chap.5, par.15, p.97.

17 Tromlitz, Unterricht, chap.5, par.24, p.105.
movements in C all display large passages of demi-semiquaver and sextuplet-semiquaver figuration, requiring a stately quadruple pulse if such figuration is not to lose its clarity. By contrast, whilst the two *Moderato* movements are also best beaten in four, they contain considerably fewer demi-semiquavers and intricate figurations, allowing a faster pulse. The same conclusions can be drawn in a comparison between collections of the Stockholm *Andante alla breve* and the Karlsruhe *Moderato alla breve* movements. In these the *Andante* remains significantly more serious in nature, dominated by majestic dotted figures.

Finally in our discussion of Mahaut's tempi in his opening movements, we must consider the three titles amongst the Stockholm collection that combines *Allegro* with either *Moderato* or *Andante* (i.e. *Allegro* *Moderato* / *Allegro* *Andante*), thus presenting a further interpretative problem. Since *Allegro* is the universally favoured tempo term found in opening movements it is perhaps reasonable to consider the two additional words as qualifiers, therefore guarding against taking the movement too fast. How significant, however, would be the difference between an *Allegro* qualified by *moderato* or one by *andante*? Surely a difference of considerable subtlety. We have also noted Mahaut's use of more common qualifiers with regard to the *Allegro*, even within the same collection (i.e. *Allegro ma non troppo*). It would be well, therefore, to approach these titles from another angle. Previously we established the continuing importance of the literal character meaning of many titles in addition to their implied tempo. Whilst *Allegro* had come to mean simply *fast*, its literal meaning of *joyful* also remained significant. Thus, where many composers wrote *Vivace e Allegro*, they clearly meant *fast and joyful*. Hence it is possible that what Mahaut meant by his combined titles was simply a *joyful moderato* and a *joyful andante*, using the term *Allegro* as a character rather than a tempo term. In this manner, the
difference in tempo that clearly exists between Mahaut's *Moderato* and *Andante* is
maintained, again supported by the content of the movements themselves.

Mahaut's middle movements display a much greater variety of both tempo terms and metre,
perhaps a reflection of the many variable characters and structures that we have seen in
these movements. The most common are the *Adagios* in C. Such movements, dominated by
dotted and triplet semiquavers, are all consistently beaten in eight, thus preventing a hurried
tempo resulting from a continuous quadrupple pulse that would no longer be an *Adagio*. In
many, the subdivided pulse heightens the *majestic* element of the dotted figures by allowing
them to be exaggerated rather than encouraging the performer to 'under-dot' them as a
result of the faster tempo of a quadruple pulse, thus assimilating them to a triplet rhythm.18

In addition to the seven *Adagios* in C, we also find one *Adagio* and one *Grave* in alla breve,
both within the Karlsruhe collection. Whilst this combination is less frequent, it is not a rare
occurrence in the eighteenth century:

> although the alla breve proper is more common in the *Allegro* than in the *adagio*, the
> latter does occur. In an *adagio* †... the tempo must be taken a little faster.19

Thus we must equate the *adagio* nature of the movements with a faster tempo and in so
doing, it is best to count these movements in four, rather than in eight. Such a pulse is in
fact suggested by the content of the movements themselves in which the figurations are
commonly grouped into crotchet units in contrast to the quaver units that dominate the
*Adagios* in C. In addition, both movements feature slow syncopated figures

---

18 See the later discussion on dotting and assimilation with regard to *Rhythmic Alteration*.

19 Türk, *Klavierschule*, chap.1, par.70n**.
that would lose both cohesion and momentum if taken with a quaver pulse. Significantly, the *Grave* contains a much greater proportion of intricate figurations requiring a slower quadruple pulse than does the *Adagio*, whilst the latter features, in addition to its demi-semiquaver figurations, many long and expansive melodic lines that require the momentum of a slightly faster tempo.

In the Karlsruhe and Stockholm concerti, we also find a significant number of middle movements in 3/4, all requiring a definite crotchet beat. Both collections feature two combinations, that of *Largo* 3/4 and *Adagio* 3/4, thus signalling some discernible distinction of tempo between them. Such a distinction, however, is somewhat of an interpretative problem for us today, lying principally in the ambiguity of the term *Largo*. Whilst it has come to imply to us today a tempo at the slowest end of the scale, it is clear that during the baroque it was taken as slow, in its literal meaning of broad or sustained, but not as slow as *Adagio*. Such an approach is seen in the use of *Largo ma non adagio* and *Largo andante*. Indeed, the term *Largo* did not move towards the slowest end of the scale, alongside *grave*, until later in the eighteenth century, approaching the classical period. Significantly, this distinction in which the *Largo* represents a slightly faster tempo than does *Adagio* is reflected in Mahaut's music. The *adagios*, displaying a more majestic and stately element, contain a multitude of small rhythmic figures including repeated semiquavers in the string accompaniment. By contrast, a more *cantabile* element is evident in the two *Largos* with considerably greater momentum towards the first beat in every bar.

It is perhaps significant, therefore, that those middle movements in a compound time signature such as 3/8, 6/8 or 12/8, which, by nature of their lilting rhythm, exhibit forward
movement and song-like qualities, are almost all entitled *Largo* or its diminutive *Larghetto*.\(^{20}\) The sole exception, found in the eleventh Stockholm concerto, is labelled *Adagio cantabile* (12/8), but this nevertheless still requires a slightly slower pulse than the *Largo* 12/8, thus confirming our conclusions with regard to their relative tempi.

In line with Quantz's directive, Mahaut's third movements are never in C or *alla breve*, both associated with a character too serious for a final movement. Instead they feature two metres, predominately that of 3/8 and the remainder in 2/4. Both are used in combination with the tempo terms *Allegro*, *Presto* and *Allegro moderato*. A variety of tempi are evident in the *Allegro* movements, which form the majority, principally depending on the presence or absence of note values less than a semiquaver. In many there is a strong tendency to count only one pulse per bar in a playful lively manner, although this pulse is subject to some variation particularly within the solo episodes. Significantly, however, in those movements labelled *Presto* we do not see such variation, but rather they remain consistently beaten in one-per-bar. Such movements commonly feature semiquavers as their smallest note values and in one particular example (Stockholm No.4, mov.III), the smallest value used in the ritornello is a quaver, pointing to a considerably faster tempo than those in *Allegro*. Such a distinction between *Allegro* and *Presto* may be seen in the Regensburg movement labelled *Allegro ma non presto*. Whilst here the fastest notes in the ritornello remain semiquavers, the qualifier perhaps warns against a fast singular pulse which would inevitably obscure delicate figurations appearing later in the movement.

---

\(^{20}\) The *Siciliano* (12/8) of Stockholm No.13, is in fact termed *Largo* in its Brussels duplicate.
Finally in this discussion we note that those fewer movements entitled *Allegro Moderato* contain a much larger portion of intricate demi-semiquaver and triplet semiquaver figurations. The final movement of the thirteenth Stockholm concerto, for example, contains passages of continuous repeated demi-semiquavers throughout all accompanying strings. The effect of such passages is to limit the tempo somewhat. In particular, this tends to exclude a single-bar pulse in favour of a fast two (2/4) or three (3/8), which is in itself implied by the tempo terms.
CHAPTER SIX
NOTATIONAL OBSERVATIONS

Having discovered four different sources for Mahaut's concerti strongly indicating a variety of copyists' hands, we would expect to find significant differences in the notation, some of which we have already identified in a preceding chapter.¹ There are, however, a number of notational elements that have a considerable effect on interpretation, specifically the notation of accidentals, abbreviated notations and dynamics. There are also differences in the notation of trill symbols and cadenzas which will be extensively dealt with in subsequent chapters along with articulation and the interpretation of irregular rhythmical notations.

Accidentals

The notation of accidentals throughout all collections of Mahaut’s concerti clearly shows a familiarity with the rule regarding barline cancellation in the same way that we would approach it today. There are, at the same time, many occasions in which a 'reminder' of the corrected accidental has been put in following the barline, often notated in brackets. In line with this 'rule', we also note the apparent application of an accidental throughout the bar without the need for subsequent markings. That said, however, when a bar contains much figuration, usually in the solo part, the accidental is commonly re-written in the second half of the bar. Whilst it will not appear alongside every occurrence of the note in question, those left unmarked are also clearly affected by the accidental, often being repetitions of the

¹ See chapter 2: The Concerto Manuscripts and Their Sources.
same figures. Similarly, an accidental will often be re-written if the note appears in a different octave. That such accidentals are clearly ‘reminders’, and are not in fact necessary for their application, can be seen in the numerous examples in which they are left unmarked.

Of most interest in the notation of accidentals is the inconsistent use of the older notational practice of using a sharp or flat to cancel a preceding accidental. In these concerti we note the occasional and extremely inconsistent cancellation of a sharp with the notation of a flat, rather than that of a ‘natural’ (as seen in fig.6.1a-e). That the latter was not unfamiliar to the copyists is apparent by their use of both symbols with equivalent meaning: the lowering of a semitone from a sharp to a natural. This use of both symbols can occasionally be seen within the same movement and indeed within the same passage. In figure 6.2a(i) the D-sharp and C-sharp appearing in the bass are cancelled in the following bar by flats. The same thematic material is, however, used in the opening of the first solo (fig.6.2a(ii)) in which the same sharps are this time cancelled with natural signs. Similarly, the passage in figure 6.2b, taken from the Brussels D major concerto, uses flats to cancel both the C-sharp and D-sharp while its duplicate in the Stockholm collection maintains the use of natural signs.

Interestingly, in figure 6.2c, the passage uses both symbols to cancel a preceding sharp but remains at least consistent within each individual part. The same cannot be said of the passage in figure 6.2d(i) in which both natural and flat signs appear in the second violin with equivalent meaning. This is confirmed in the repetition of the passage four bars later which is, this time, consistent in its use of natural symbols (fig.6.2d(ii)).

The frequency of examples appearing amongst the Brussels collection make this a particular characteristic of the notation in these concerti. By way of contrast, those in the remaining
collections make much more consistent use of the natural sign. There are, however, a number of isolated and inexplicable examples occurring in the Regensburg and Stockholm concerti. In the former, whilst all three movements consistently make use of the natural symbol, we find late in the first movement (fig.6.3a) a single C-sharp cancelled with a flat sign which cannot be read with any other meaning. Similarly, in the first movement from the second Stockholm concerto (fig.6.3b(i)), the F-sharp of the key signature is cancelled by a flat in both flute and violin I, and likewise appears in an isolated occurrence in the third movement (fig.6.3b(ii)). Later in the first movement we find the same cancellation in the viola, whilst a natural is used in the flute (fig.6.3c).

The inconsistency of these latter examples, set alongside the remaining concerti of these collections, suggests, particularly with regard to the second Stockholm concerto, that they were perhaps copied from a manuscript displaying a much greater use of the flat sign with the intended meaning of a natural. Interestingly, whilst we have seen a flat symbol used to cancel a sharp, there is not one example of a sharp being used to cancel a flat. In such contexts all Mahaut’s concerti are consistent in their use of a natural sign.

Abbreviations

Abbreviated notations in Mahaut’s concerti are somewhat rare. The majority of those that do occur, however, are associated with the notation of solo figuration, thus saving both time and space. In the third movement of the Brussels e minor concerto, for example, the oscillating octaves in the solo flute are replaced by an abbreviated semiquaver notation \((\text{\textfrac{3}{8}} \text{\textfrac{3}{16}})\) (fig.6.4a). With the emergence of the highly virtuosic solo violin concerto in the eighteenth century, a much wider use was being made of abbreviated figurations to
aid the quick notation of long and repetitive sequences. Such a tendency is occasionally reflected in the solo flute notations in Mahaut’s concerti, most significantly in the second Karlsruhe D major concerto. Here the abbreviations are used for both semiquaver and triplet-quaver figurative passages. In each case the required pattern of the figure is written-out in the first bar of the sequence and is subsequently reduced to show only the three notes involved in each sequential pattern (fig.6.4b(i)-(iii) and fig.6.4c).

The only other abbreviated notation to appear in the concerti is that representing repeated quavers in the time of a minim. Two notations are used to indicate this execution, the first in the Regensburg concerto and the second in the third Stockholm concerto. In the former, (fig.6.5a) we note the common use of a single slash through the stem of the minim. The latter, however, (fig.6.5b) might perhaps be confused with a similar notation indicative of a ‘fingered vibrato’ or *flattement*, although in this context the faster tempo would exclude such an interpretation, more appropriate for long notes in a slower tempo during which one can also swell and diminish the tone.² In addition, it has been established that the symbol used for such an ‘ornament’ in the vocal, wind and string music of French and Italian writers, is that of a continuous wavy line. The symbol seen in figure 6.5b, utilising a series of dots above a longer note to which is added a slur (* 'r ' * ), appears to represent a vibrato principally in German *galant* keyboard music, specifically that of C.P.E. Bach and Marpurg, and is performed on a long expressive note by rocking the key with the finger.³

² Such a description is given by Mahaut in his *Méthode*, although he gives no symbol for its intended use. [Méthode, chap.V, p.19]. Tromlitz says that it is used “on long notes, fermatas and on the note before a cadenza . . .A very fast flattement is in my opinion a bad ornament.” [Tromlitz, *Unterricht*, chap.10, par.4, p.214].

Thus it is unlikely that such an execution was in fact intended by the symbol seen in figure 6.5b, but rather, it represented an abbreviated notation for four repeated quavers.4

Dynamics

Dynamic indications in Mahaut’s concerti, like most baroque/galant instrumental works, leave much to the judgement of the performer. The principal function it would seem, of those that do appear, is to identify the alternation of solo and tutti (with the notations piano and forte respectively) within the individual written string parts and are indicative of their thematic or accompanying role at each point. Such notations are either indicated symbolically (f: or for. and p: or po.) or written out fully. Throughout all collections, however, we seldom find such dynamic markings in the solo flute part, which are replaced instead with the terms solo and tutti.

The use of these dynamic markings to indicate solo and tutti passages reflects not only the larger structural contrasts but also quicker alternations, often including imitation between the accompanying and solo parts. Such an example can be seen in figure 6.6a where the alternating forte/piano dynamics in the strings highlights the ‘question and answer’ dialogue between solo and tutti.

---

4 In addition to the subdivision into four quavers, the symbol is also indicative of the slurred-tremolo, seen frequently in the accompanying strings in Mahaut’s concerti, in which the quavers are to be taken in one bow-stroke, indicated by the slur. This slur, however, is frequently omitted in Mahaut’s notation in both flute and string parts, leaving only the four dots or dashes, but as we shall see later, remain indicative of the slurred-tremolo (or tongued-legato) rather than of a detached execution. For further discussion, see Chapter 9: Articulation, and specifically, the section regarding The String Articulation of Repeated-Note Accompaniment Figures.
Whilst *forte* and *piano* are noticeably the predominant markings throughout all collections of Mahaut’s concerti, there is marginally a greater variety to be found in those of the Stockholm collection, principally with regard to the softer dynamics. Thus we note frequent use of the term *pianissimo*, particularly beneath the opening of a solo episode and in others, the abbreviated notation: *pianiss.*. In one concerto (Stockholm No.8, mov.1) we find the term *più piano* marked in the violins beneath a repetition of the preceding two bars marked *piano* (*p*). Whilst the notations do not appear in the solo flute part, they identify an intended ‘echo’ effect which clearly the soloist was to understand simply by the literal repetition. Such echo effects are also found notated in other collections although notably never marked in the solo part. For example, in figure 6.6b, the echo indicated in bar 139 and the subsequent *forte* in the following tutti bar are notated by dynamics only in the strings in both sequential repetitions. Similarly, in the twelfth Stockholm concerto, the two-bar echo in the opening of the third movement ritornello (fig. 6.6c) is notated by dynamics only in the first violin. Echo effects are also used in the ritornello to contrast question and answer phrases (fig. 6.6d) or to identify and contrast a second thematic idea (fig. 6.6e).

A significant feature of Mahaut’s dynamic notations are those *forte* and *piano* contrasts marked in quick succession, frequently at half-bar intervals. Examples can be seen in figure 6.7a to 6.7d, found in both solo and ritornello passages. Interestingly, whilst such markings are only found in the Stockholm collection it is not necessarily indicative of their absence in other concerti. Having established that the Stockholm collection is not in Mahaut’s own hand, it is possible that they were notated upon hearing a performance of these respective concerti, an idea that we will later return to in the light of other performance matters. Clearly the notations were not made in rehearsal by the individual players as the handwriting is consistent throughout all parts in each example.
Thus, like most concerti of the baroque era, the evidence of Mahaut's notations suggests, on the surface, a 'terraced' view of dynamics based on strong forte/piano contrasts. Indeed the Allegro of the baroque concerto has an implied dynamic structure in which a forte thematic opening is assumed, then to be followed by a marked piano after the first major cadence or entrance of a second thematic idea. Whilst these dynamic contrasts are entirely appropriate, it is, however, apparent from the writings of Mahaut's contemporaries that such markings are no more than the bare bones of what was in fact expected, involving an infinite variety and subtlety of dynamic shadings. Whilst extended passages of crescendo and diminuendo were not common until made fashionable by the Mannheim school, all the intermediary degrees between fortissimo and pianissimo were indeed well-known to baroque composers, appearing in Brossard's early-eighteenth century Dictionnaire and are explained in Quantz's Versuch, including the modifications mezzo, poco, più, meno and assai.\(^5\) In addition, Quantz refers frequently to crescendo and decrescendo, particularly in the more subtle execution of individual or small groups of notes, and likewise even Mahaut talks of them in his Méthode in reference to the long appoggiatura.\(^6\) In his notes on Quantz's use of dynamics, Edward Reilly suggests that:

\(...\) failure to consider the intermediate positions between bold contrasts and sweeping crescendos or diminuendos results in a false representation that ignores the sensitivity of early musicians to this side of performance. Although detailed information on dynamics may be lacking in the periods before Quantz, the sources that have survived hardly suggest either lack of awareness or indifference to this aspect of performance.\(^7\)

\(^5\) Quantz, Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.VII, par.19, n*, p.274.


Whilst Quantz's discussion of dynamics is not presented in a compact, easily accessible form, but is rather scattered throughout the *Versuch*, it nevertheless collectively represents an extensive and revealing exploration of the subject that most certainly requires some discussion. With regard to the solo part, Quantz emphasises that "light and shadow must be constantly maintained. No listener will be particularly moved by someone who always produces the notes with the same force or weakness and, so to speak, plays always in the same colour, or by someone who does not know how to raise or moderate the tone at the proper time". In the use of dynamics he later goes on to say that they must be used "with great discernment lest you go from one to the other with too much vehemence rather than swell and diminish the tone imperceptibly".

Just as Mahaut mentions it in passing, Quantz discusses crescendo and diminuendo in the performance of the *messa di voce*, itself strongly associated with the long appoggiatura. This includes the swelling and diminishing of long notes in faster movements:

> Each note, whether it is a crotchet, quaver, or semiquaver, must have its own *Piano* and *Forte*, to the extent that the time permits. If, however, several long notes are found in succession where, in strengthening the tone, the time does not permit you to swell each note individually, you can still swell and diminish the tone during notes like this so that some sound louder and others softer.

---


9 Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.XIV, par.9, p.165.

10 Further explanation and discussion can be found in the chapter regarding *Ornamentation*.

11 Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.XIV, par.11, p.166.
The use of *diminuendo* is also discussed in the expressive performance of a fermata\(^\text{12}\) and in the lengthening of the last note of a phrase before a rest.\(^\text{13}\)

The most significant discussion with regard to the solo flute appears in Quantz’s note-by-note instructions for the performance of a multitude of figures, principally in an *Adagio* tempo.\(^\text{14}\) Here he uses abbreviated words for *crescendo, decrescendo*, strong, stronger and weak and draws an analogy with painting in which *mezze tinte* or *half tints*, by which the dark is imperceptibly joined to the light, are employed to express light and shadow.\(^\text{15}\) Thus, contrary to the terraced levels of dynamics suggested by his own concerti, Quantz’s examples illustrate a remarkable subtlety of shading on individual notes and small figurations.

Quantz’s remaining discussion of dynamics appears in the second half of his *Versuch* and refers principally to the instruments that would accompany the solo. Clearly he did not expect quite the same degree of subtle shading that he reserved for the concertante part, but goes into some detail with regard to balance and the dynamic emphasis of dissonances and harmonic movement in general. Violinists in particular should consider what type of role that they play (i.e. middle parts must be performed quite softly, whilst those alternating with the solo may be brought out a little more strongly and high bass parts are to be played even more strongly still).\(^\text{16}\) Likewise the violist must regulate his volume according to that of the


\(^{13}\) Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.XIV, par.12, p.166.


\(^{15}\) Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.XIV, par.25, pp.172-3.

others and in most cases must remain soft so that he does not obscure the upper and lower parts. When playing a melodic or bass part, however, he may do so more strongly.\(^\text{17}\) In discussing the role of the violoncellist, Quantz stresses the dynamic emphasis needed for flattened and sharpened notes that form dissonances and for those notes with a second, diminished fifth, augmented sixth or seventh above them. A crescendo (i.e. "to swell by strengthening the tone") is also described in the performance of a suspension. In final cadences, particularly in the Adagio, the cellist should play the preceding two, three or four notes "a little more forcefully" in order to "direct the attention of the listeners to the cadence" (see fig.6.8).\(^\text{18}\)

Finally, in discussing the harpsichord, Quantz maintains that dynamic variation is indeed possible by regulating the touch in piano and strengthening it for forte by adjusting the number of parts above the bass.\(^\text{19}\) A large amount of this discussion is given to varying degrees of dissonance, and hence, the varied dynamic emphasis that these should receive. Thus he demonstrates with an entire Adagio movement using the abbreviated symbols for piano, pianissimo, mezzo forte, forte and fortissimo.\(^\text{20}\) In its refined style and subtlety it is similar to his previous discussion of small figures for the solo flute.

\(^{17}\) Quantz, Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.III, par.11-14, pp.239-40.

\(^{18}\) Quantz, Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.IV par.7-8, pp.244-45.

\(^{19}\) It is apparent that by "regulating the touch", Quantz does not refer to the force by which you strike the keys of the harpsichord, but by the varying force (i.e. dynamic), created by altering the number of notes (including dissonances) in the chord.

\(^{20}\) Quantz, Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.VI, par.9-16, pp.253-259.
With regard to the accompanying body in general, Quantz consistently emphasises the need
to be regulated by the concertante part in order to maintain the correct balance. Thus they
must consider not only the character of the accompaniment, its register and density, but also
the character of the solo part, “whether it has a flattering air to play or passage work” and,
importantly, whether it is in a high or low register. Speaking of the flute, Quantz points out
that the low register will not penetrate as easily as in the high, especially in minor keys,21
“for in general, the flute, like all soft voices, must be accompanied by considerable
moderation”.22 Each accompanying instrument must adjust its own loudness and softness to
reflect the “swelling and softening of the tone” in the concertante part:

    the most beautiful effect is achieved if the accompanists aid him in the same manner,
swelling and moderating their tone jointly with him.23

Significantly, Quantz mentions a few dynamic ‘formulas’ that we have already seen in
Mahaut’s concerti:

    In the repetition of the same or of similar ideas consisting of half or whole bars,
whether at the same level or in transposition, the repetition of the idea may be played
somewhat more softly than the first statement.24

Mahaut’s *forte* markings in his unison passages are reflected in Quantz’s comments that
they “must be played in an elevated and majestic manner with fire, with a vigorous bow, and


with a more forceful tone than another kind of melody".  

Thus, what we find in Quantz’s Versuch is not an innovation or peculiarity of his own writing, but an extensive description of the type of dynamic execution demanded by the music itself. Significantly, Quantz did not use these abundant dynamic indications in his own numerous sonatas and concerti but rather, like Mahaut, commonly wrote only the plain forte and piano whilst clearly expecting the performer to utilise all the intermediate levels and nuances described in his Versuch. Such a refined style, typical of the galant period, was certainly not limited to behind German borders. Edward Reilly suggests that Quantz’s “extensive use of the messa di voce and repeated emphasis on the importance of studying singers and singing in numerous places in the Versuch and Lebenslauf, suggests that this type of dynamic shading was copied from the expressive style of singing employed by Italian artists of the day”. Such nuances are likewise to be found in Italian instrumental music which itself had a profound significance in the development of the ‘universal’ solo concerto. Hence, with regard to dynamics, Quantz’s discussion was not new but was perhaps one of the first attempts to describe in detail the fine nuances that are likely to have been common practice throughout the eighteenth century, and in many respects even before this. Most certainly they are required in a performance of Mahaut’s own concerti.

---

27 Vivaldi’s manuscripts in fact contain a rich variety of dynamic shadings, often clearly suggestive of crescendo and diminuendo with his notated sequences of forte, piu forte, fortissimo; piano, piu piano, pianissimo; or piano, un poco forte, forte. The frequency of the term cantabile undoubtedly alludes to the molto expressivo style of the Italian singer and with this, the refined play of dynamics or 'light and shade'. For a fuller description of Vivaldi’s dynamics, see Walter Kolneder, Performance Practices in Vivaldi, pp.16-28.
28 The messa di voce for example, was familiar to Italian singers as early as the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and according to Reilly, was first transferred from voice to instrument in G. Fantini’s Modo per imparare a sonare di tromba (1638) [see Reilly, Three Studies, pp.131-2]
PART III

INTERPRETATIVE AND STYLISTIC CONSIDERATIONS
CHAPTER SEVEN
RHYTHMIC ALTERATION

In this chapter we will consider the degree and contexts within Mahaut’s concerti to which we might apply certain conventions with regard to the alternation of notated rhythms that had its roots in the tradition of French baroque music. Such a tradition became increasingly fashionable and stylised in the galant era, its influence reaching beyond the borders of France and French music.

Whilst Mahaut fails to mention the essentially expressive alteration of rhythm prevalent in galant music of this time in his Méthode of 1759, we must ask to what extent can we apply the more well-known discussions of Quantz and his contemporaries to Mahaut’s music. To this end, we shall examine four primary areas of rhythmic alteration evident in the concerti: inconsistent notation, inequality, dotting and assimilation.

Before we embark on such a discussion, however, we might note the enormous rhythmic variety and complexity already evident within the concerti before such types of alteration are even considered. Not only is the variety staggering, but the rate at which rhythmic figures change and ‘evolve’ demands a high degree of virtuosity on the part of both the soloist and the accompanying string players. Such variety can be seen in figure 7.1a(i) where triplet, quadruple and dotted semiquaver figures are repeatedly contained within the space of a half-bar sequence. Figure 7.1a(ii) illustrates the frequent irregularity of the rhythmic figures, requiring great control in the placement of the notes. In the opening ritornello of the same movement (fig.7.1a(iii)) we also see the way in which Mahaut uses ever-changing
rhythmic figures as a method of thematic variation around the same melodic outline. In all such contexts as those above, the complex and changing rhythms are carefully and correctly notated, which, as we shall see later, cannot always be said of the notation of certain standard rhythmical ‘formulas’.

A particular rhythmic characteristic of the concerti that in itself requires careful execution is Mahaut’s use of a syncopated quaver figure in rising and descending lines, such as that seen in figure 7.1b(i) and (ii). So common is the appearance of these figures, particularly in Mahaut’s middle movements (such as the latter example and in figure 7.1c(i) and (ii)), that when coupled with the slower tempi they create a characteristic lilt, forming a significant unifying element throughout all collections of the concerti.

**Inconsistent Notation**

Whilst we have seen the complexity and variety of rhythmic patterns employed by Mahaut, which have for the most part been carefully and correctly notated to distinguish their differences, we also find in equal quantity an abundance of figures that are notated with incorrect dots and rhythmical values.

The simplest and most easily corrected context can be seen in figure 7.2a, an example chosen from many, in which the numerically incorrect dotted figures of the first three bars are found correctly notated three bars later in their sequential repetition. Despite the incorrect notation the intention and essence of the figure remains clearly apparent from its first appearance, providing little in the way of an interpretative problem.
Of greater concern, however, are the problems caused by an abundance of missing ties and dots creating seemingly illogical rhythmical clashes between parts, and subsequent appearances of motives often found notated without their characteristic dotting. In figure 7.2b we might compare the first and second tutti from the *Adagio* of the Regensburg concerto. On the first beat of the second bar (fig. 7.2b(i)) we note the absence of a dot in both the flute and violin I, but find it dotted in violin II. Compare this then to the second tutti (fig. 7.2b(ii)) and we find the figure consistently dotted in all three parts. We are, however, now missing the dot in the first two beats of violin II, when all other parts are dotted in unison.

Note also the new, although inconsistent, appearance of ties in flute and violin I of the second tutti. Initially, we might consider that the notated addition is an error. If, however, we look at figure 7.2b(iii), appearing in the first tutti immediately after the opening, we find a passage which fragments the theme and uses it in imitation between the two violins. Here we find the same ties notated consistently in both parts (in effect, the tie creates a double-dotted quaver which we will take up later as a separate issue). As the two segments seen in figure 7.2b(ii) and 2b(iii) are so closely related to the opening, it may then be reasonable to argue that these ties and dots are also the intended execution in figure 7.2b(i).

Further notational discrepancies can be seen within the same movement. In figure 7.2c(i), approaching the final cadence of the ritornello, we have flute and violin I playing in unison with violin II a third below. Clearly the reversed dotted figures in violin I, and later in the flute on the fourth beat, are simply errors rather than a deliberate and messy rhythmic contrast. Confirmation of this appears in the concluding passage of the movement (fig. 7.2c(ii)) in which the same passage is consistently dotted in the usual manner.
The opening motive appears again beneath the beginning of the first solo episode (fig. 7.3a). But for the upbeat dotted figure, however, we might be excused for not recognising it, lacking as it does its characteristic dotting and retaining only the melodic outline as a clue to its identity. A similar occurrence can be seen in another Adagio taken from the Karlsruhe collection (fig. 7.3b). We have, in violin 1, beneath the opening of the second solo (fig. 7.3b(ii)) what appears to be a reference to the opening motive (fig. 7.3b(i)). This would suggest the need for it to be dotted. Although it is not melodically identical, it follows a similar outline and an identical phrase structure. It is also apparent, from examining many of the concerti, that Mahaut was fond of alluding to the ritornello motive at the beginning of every solo episode, either in the solo itself or beneath it in the accompaniment. We must consider that Mahaut, the performer, might have thought it unnecessary to notate what he felt to be obvious.

Likewise, in figure 7.3c, the dotted character of the ritornello motif appearing in the opening of the first solo episode should be reflected in the similar motivic figures of the third, fourth and fifth bars. Here, however, only the second repetition in the sequence is dotted completely, contrasting with those on either side. As the figures are part of a sequence, they should at least remain consistent within themselves. The more complete notation of the second repetition points to the motivic nature of the figures, and thus their intended performance throughout the passage.

---

1 It is likely that the repeated quavers in the viola part of the opening bar are also intended to be dotted in line with those of the flute and violins, thus creating a much more striking effect in comparison with a certain clouding of the rhythm produced by a straight accompaniment against the dotted thematic figures.
A more obvious example showing mistaken notation of a dotted motivic figure is to be seen in figure 7.3d. Here the ritornello motive (seen in the first bar of the violins), having previously been notated correctly in every appearance, suddenly appears beneath the final solo episode with the dots reversed in the second and third occurrences of the first violin (marked *). Surely the resultant lombardic rhythm, conflicting with the standard dotting a third below in violin II, was not intended and can be explained only as a careless 'slip-of-the-pen'.

A rather unusual notation of a lombardic figure also appears in the opening ritornello of the twelfth Stockholm concerto (fig.7.3e(i)). Here the rhythm contrasts strongly with the standard dotted figures that precede and follow it. It is, however, so consistently notated in both the flute and violins that we cannot see it as an error, but rather as an intended distinction, and a further example of Mahaut's complex and constantly changing rhythms. We do note, however, that the standard dotted figure appearing in the first violin on the first beat of both the two opening bars of the ritornello remains consistently undotted in both the flute and violin II throughout every appearance, as does the initial upbeat figure in the flute.

That such rhythmical conflict was unintentional can be seen in the omission of other 'understood' dotted figures on subsequent appearances that can clearly be read as errors. For example, on the return of the tutti (fig.7.3e(ii)), none of the required standard dotted figures are notated in violin II throughout the ritornello motive, and in the opening of the following solo (fig.7.3e(iii)) no dots are notated in the rising semiquaver figures that clearly refer to the ritornello motive. In addition, surely the dots in the flute part of figure 7.3e(iv), appearing at the end of the ritornello, have been omitted in error, albeit consistently
throughout every appearance. In the final ritornello this omission includes the second violin and is undoubtedly not intended.

The incredible abundance of these notational inaccuracies must lead one to the conclusion that they are not the result of deliberate rhythmical contrast, but of careless notation requiring correction upon performance. A possible explanation for their occurrence might lie in our previous conclusion that Mahaut, like his contemporary Locatelli, also living and working in Amsterdam, wrote these concerti in parts as was the custom of the time. Hence, he did not first compose a score in which the parts would be vertically aligned, thus making it easier for such inconsistencies to occur.

It is often the case throughout Mahaut's concerti that the intended dotting of a ritornello motive does not become conclusive and more or less consistent until later appearances of the material. In the opening of the fourth Stockholm concerto (fig.7.4a(i)), for example, we see that the rhythmic dots appear only in violin II. Upon repetition, however, the lombard rhythm is added in violin I. In the second tutti (fig.7.4a(ii)), as in the next, violin I again remains undotted, and whilst they appear in the second violin, the lombardic second figure is reversed to standard dotting. It is not until the final tutti (fig.7.4a(iii)) that we find a consistent and correct rhythmical notation in the violins.

It is, however, not only in the tutti itself that the ritornello motif is incompletely notated, but also in clear references to it within the solo episodes. In the opening to the second solo of the same movement (fig.7.4b(i)), whilst both figures are correctly notated in the solo flute, it is not 'answered' consistently in imitation by the supporting violins. Likewise, a similar passage in the next solo (fig.7.4b(ii)) omits the dots in all parts including the flute.
In contrast to this rather careless approach to the notation of the ritornello motives we find a number of occurrences amongst the violin accompaniment beneath the solo passage work in which certain non-motivic figures are carefully and consistently dotted, leaving no question as to their intended performance (fig. 7.4c). One bar later, however, with the return of the tutti, the ritornello motives are again left undotted in the first violin.

A similar approach to motives of the ritornello, can be seen in the first movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig. 7.4d). In figure 7.4d(i), appearing in the middle of the opening ritornello, we find no dotting except for the upbeat in the violin II. When it reappears, however, in a later tutti (fig. 7.4d(ii)) at the same pitch, we now have every upbeat figure dotted in violin I and omitted in violin II, but for the first one. Are we to follow its lead and dot all the upbeat figures in violin II to match, and thus produce a passage that seems more correctly notated on its second appearance than on its first? By implication, are we to apply the same dotting to the equivalent passage in the first ritornello? Opinions will of course differ, but I am inclined to suggest that the dots were intended in both passages having been established by the dotted upbeat at the very opening of the movement (fig. 7.4d(iii)), although again, inconsistently. Later we will discuss the implication of the sextuplet figures in this opening passage with regard to the possible softening of these dotted figures, which may likewise suggest a similar execution of the dots in the two passages above.²

Thus, throughout Mahaut's concerti it is apparent that having indicated the intended dotting of a motivic figure, even if only in a single part, all subsequent appearances of such motives

² Although here, the passages are not associated with sextuplet or triplet figures.
are notated in a somewhat more casual and inconsistent manner, clearly suggesting the assumption of an 'understood' execution.
The Use of Inequality

The revival of baroque practices and the quest for an authentic performance has created enormous controversy over the application and use of notes inégales. Although there is extensive evidence that it was well established in France in the late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there is little to document the extent to which it applied beyond French borders. This is particularly relevant when we are considering here a composer who was working in Amsterdam under the significant influence of the strongly popular Italian style and discussing works whose structure and content are of Italian origin. We must also remember that in Mahaut’s case, however, his fundamentally French musical education and environment before residing in Amsterdam which would have undoubtedly remained a significant factor on his taste and style, even in the face of new influences. Aside from Mahaut’s personal acquaintance with the French performance style, it is certain that this style was, at least, well-known in Amsterdam through travelling musicians and the publication of numerous French works.

The convention that we speak of refers to the unequal rendering of notes that are notated equal. It applied predominantly to conjunct motion and was nearly always trochaic (long-short).

In my view there are defects in our way of writing music, which correspond to the manner of writing our language. It is that we write differently than we play: which causes foreigners to play our music less well than we play theirs. By contrast the Italians write their music in the true values in which they conceived it. For example, we point several eighths that proceed by conjunct degrees; however, we mark them equal; our custom has enslaved us; and we continue.3

By the end of the seventeenth century the evidence from over 30 French writers including Jean Rousseau (1687), Loulié (1696), L’Affilard (1697/1705), Montéclair (1709/1736), Corrette (1741/1770), L’abbé Duval (1764) and Lacassagne (1766), describes a convention that had become systematically organised according to meter, as we see in the following table:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} \text{ beat in triple time: } & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{ in } \frac{3}{4} \text{ and } \\
\text{ in } \frac{3}{2}
\end{array} \\
\frac{1}{4} \text{ beat in duple time: } & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{ in } 4 \text{ or } 2/4 \text{ and } \\
\text{ in } 2
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

Principally, the alteration applies to the smallest rhythmical value within the movement and usually corresponds to the table above. There are, however, discrepancies within French sources of the eighteenth century where smaller values appear within a movement than those usually prescribed for a particular time-signature. In one of his many discussions on the matter of inequality, Frederick Neumann groups such differences into two camps: those that proclaim that inequality descends (i.e. applied to the smaller value rather than the customary larger one) and those that advocate a cumulative approach. The latter is expressed by Borin in 1722:

\[
\text{ in whatever measure when one species of a note is unequal, it follows that the smaller species are also.}^5
\]

---

4 A full exposition of the metre-inequality relationships of these thirty authors is given by Frederick Neumann and reproduced with some corrections by Stephen Hefling in his *Rhythmic Alteration*, Table 1.1, pp.8-11.

5 Borin, *La musique théorique et pratique, dans son ordre naturel* . . . (Paris, 1722), p.27. Other authors who agree with this approach include de la Chapelle (1736), L’Abbé Duval (1764) and Dard (1769). Those on the other hand that prefer descending inequality include Corrette (1741), Bordet (1755) and Lacassagne (1766).
No satisfactory solution can be found for this discrepancy between authors and it is likely that a solution can be sought only from the style and qualities of the individual movement. Such an approach is suggested by Montéclair:

it is very difficult to give general principles concerning the equality or inequality of notes, because it is the taste of the pieces one sings that decides this.\footnote{Montéclair, Michel. \textit{Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre la musique} . . . (Paris, 1709), p.15. [trans. given by Helling, \textit{Rhythmic Alteration}, p.28]}

The question of descending or cumulative inequality will become significant shortly when we examine a number of Mahaut’s triple-metre middle movements in which it is the semiquaver figures that welcome inequality rather than the customary quavers.

An important performance issue associated with inequality is the degree of alteration. Whilst the sources describe anything from an imperceptible lilt to the marked 3:1 ratio usually notated by a dot, it would seem that, in general, inequality remains mild and is ordinarily executed as Bacilly stated with regard to singing: “so delicately that it is not apparent”.\footnote{Bacilly, Bénigne de. \textit{Remarques curieuses sur l’art de bien chanter} . . . (Paris, 1668), trans and ed. Austin B. Caswell as \textit{A Commentary upon the Art Of Proper Singing} (Brooklyn, New York: Institute of Medieval Music, 1968), pp.235-6.} Towards the beginning of the eighteenth century Jean Rousseau commented “it is necessary to take care not to mark them too roughly”.\footnote{Rousseau, Jean. \textit{Tratté de la viole} . . . (Paris, 1687), facs.cd. (Amsterdam: Antigua, 1965), p.114.}

To distinguish mild inequality from a stronger species which he calls \textit{piquer} or \textit{pointer}, Loulié uses the term \textit{lourer} in which the first note of each pair is made “a little bit longer”
Other authors to use this term include Brossard, J-J. Rousseau and Pierre Duval, although its use is not always synonymous with inequality. It would appear that the appropriate degree of inequality to be used is again principally dependent on the nature of the movement at hand and is surmised in the later part of the eighteenth century by Engramelle in his work regarding the setting of mechanical organs:

>This inequality ought to vary according to the nature of the piece; in gay airs it should be more marked than those that are gracious and of tender expression, more in marches than in minuets.

We have said that the practice of inequality was, in all probability, well-known in an international music centre such as Amsterdam. We find, however, that before 1790 only three tutors existed outside France that unmistakably describe the custom: those of the German authors Muffat (1698) and Quantz (1752) and an Englishman, Peter Prelleur (1731). By far the most detailed coverage is that of J.J. Quantz, in both his Versuch and Solfeggi. The latter is a work that existed principally for the instruction of his famous pupil,


Frederick the Great. The topic first appears in his *Versuch* in chapter six with regard to tonguing:

... in quick passage work the single tongue does not have a good effect, since it makes all the notes alike, and to conform with good taste they must be a little unequal (see chapter XI, par.12). 14

Quantz's own cross reference to chapter eleven provides us with a full exposition of the subject, describing the long-short alteration in the traditional French metre relationships (see fig.7.6):

Here I must make a necessary observation concerning the length of time each note should have... Where possible, the principal notes must always stand out more than the passing ones. In consequence of this rule, the quickest notes in every piece of moderate tempo or even in the *Adagio*, although they appear to have the same value, must nevertheless be played a little unequally, so that the stressed notes of each figure, namely the first, third, fifth and seventh, are held somewhat longer than the passing, namely the second, fourth, sixth and eighth, although the lengthening must not be as much as if the notes were dotted. Among these quickest notes I mean the quarters in three-two time, the eighths in three-quarter and the sixteenths in three-eight time, the eighths in alla breve, the sixteenths or thirty-seconds in two-four or in common time[C]: but only so long as no figures of still more rapid notes, or doubly quick ones, are mixed in, whatever the metre - for in that case these latter would have to be executed in the manner described above. For example, in table IX, fig.1 [see fig.7.6], if one were to play the eight sixteenths at letters k, m and n slowly with the same value, they would not sound so pleasing as if one let the first and third of four be heard somewhat longer and stronger in tone, than the second and fourth. Excepted from this rule, however, are, first of all, the fast passages in a very fast tempo, where time does not allow them to be executed unequally, and in which one therefore need only apply length and strength to the first of four notes... Also excepted are notes above which dots or strokes are found, or several successive notes on the same pitch. Further exceptions are: when a slur occurs over more than two notes (namely over four, six, or

14 Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.6, sec.1, par.9, p.74.
eight; and finally, the eighth notes in gigues. All of these must be executed equally, that is, one as long as the other.\(^{15}\)

Here we note that he is in favour of *descending* inequality, applying it to the smallest values present and he confirms that it is generally of a mild degree: “this lengthening must not be as much as if the notes were dotted”.\(^{16}\) We also notice that he has included ascending thirds in one example (see fig. 7.6) which is usually considered outside of the French tradition. This, however, may not have been so as we shall soon see in an example from Michel Corrette. In the *Solfeggi* we find annotations indicating varying degrees of inequality such as “very unequal” or “certainly not equal but also not too unequal”. Neither source identifies the practice as French yet there can be no mistake as to its origin.\(^{17}\)

Although the *Versuch* was written in Berlin in 1752, Quantz’s compositions show that his style was already well formed before he left Dresden to serve Frederick the Great. The latter’s wish to maintain and emulate the musical style of Dresden meant that this became the essential background for Quantz’s *Versuch*. It is not surprising that French inequality was a prominent practice in the Dresden *Hofkapelle*, for French violinists and wind players were active there since the late-seventeenth century and regularly formed over half the ensemble, lead by the French concertmaster Volumier until 1728. Quantz himself studied

\(^{15}\) Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.11, par.12, p.123.

\(^{16}\) Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.11, par.12, p.123.

\(^{17}\) In the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the use of tonguing syllables was, naturally, associated with *inequality*, effectively producing the required rhythmic lift. Such articulations are extensively described by French writers at this time and later, by Quantz. It is significant, however, that towards the mid-eighteenth century, the French themselves moved away from the use of tonguing syllables as reflected by Corrette’s comment that they are no longer widely used [see Michel Corrette, *Méthode pour apprendre aisément à jouer de la flûte traversière* (Paris, c.1742), facs.ed. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1975)]. Later Mahaut himself writes that whilst they were “sufficient for the music of earlier times,” with “modern music the player should attempt to develop the most precise articulation possible according to his natural ability and not to worry too much about various syllables.” [Mahaut, *Méthode*, chap.VIII, p.21].
flute in Dresden under the French flautist Buffardin, and leading Dresden musicians learnt
the style first hand during visits to Paris. It will be remembered that Mahaut himself was
also acquainted with Buffardin and is likely to have written two concerti dedicated to him in
Dresden.

Dresden, however, was not only influenced by French performance practice. Italian music
was also cultivated, particularly under Pisendel, successor to Volumier and student of
Vivaldi. Telemann is known to have commented on the mixture of French and Italian styles
in the Dresden Hofkapelle.18 In addition, Quantz's knowledge of both French and Italian
styles was strengthened by his own travels to Paris, Italy and to England. Edward Reilly,
translator of Quantz's Versuch, believes that Quantz's dependence on Vivaldi in his
concerto structures may make him one of the surest guides to the performance of Vivaldi's
compositions, except in the handling of certain French graces and some matters of
bowing.19

Thus Dresden and Amsterdam had a significant element in common, in their absorption of
both Italian and French performance styles. The same can be said of the concerto, by 1730
an international form. This is to say that the concerto structure, Italian in origin, became a
foundation overlaid by the national style of the composer. Thus French concerti will remain
undeniably French, particularly in their middle movements, and surely subject to French
practices. Hence, when Corrette says in 1741: "although semi-quavers are normally unequal

18 Telemann, Lebens-Lauff (1718), in Johann Mattheson, Grosse General-Bass-Schule, 2nd ed. (Hamburg,

19 Reilly, E. Quantz and his Versuch; Three Studies (New York: American Musicological Society, 1969),
chap.1, p.38.
in 4/4, they are played equal in Allegros and Prestos of sonatas and concertos”\(^{20}\). I would argue that this is not necessarily because they are Italian movements, as is generally assumed, but because the fast speed negates inequality, more suitable for the expression of flattery.

The same considerations are evident in Mahaut’s concerti. Tempo is naturally a limiting factor on inequality, not only making it difficult to perform at a fast speed, but also making it difficult to distinguish as a listener unless a much less subtle ratio is used such as that of a triplet (2:1). This would perhaps explain Quantz’s comments above with regard to faster tempo: “one therefore need only apply length and strength to the first of every four tones”.\(^{21}\) This approach, however, is not confirmed in French sources and may have been a galant development of the German school, lying outside the French convention. As such, a certain amount of consideration should be taken if wishing to apply it to Mahaut’s music, although to some extent such alteration may occur naturally.

Although many French authors explicitly excluded inequality from foreign music (principally Italian) including Loulié (1698), Brossard (1705), Couperin (1717), Montéclair (1736) and David (1737),\(^{22}\) the later development of international forms such as the sonata and the concerto meant that the two styles could be found within the same work and it becomes important “above all to distinguish the phrases in French style and those that call


\(^{21}\) Quantz, *Versuch*, chap.11, par.12, p.123.

for Italian taste". Thus, whilst the outer movements of Mahaut’s concerti show the driving rhythm and virtuosic display popularised by the Italians, the middle movements, in particular, have an undeniable French quality due to their rhythm and ornamentation. In such movements it is difficult to deny the relevance of Quantz’s discussion of inequality.

Rather like accent in a language, passer les croches fits readily with pieces in appropriate style and less well with others.

Although part of the German Karlsruhe collection, this decidedly French quality can be strongly felt in the second movement of the G major concerto, whose opening of the first solo is given in figure 7.7. Here the descending and ascending lines of quavers in the solo and accompaniment, such as bar eleven and twelve, undoubtedly welcome an unequal performance, thus removing the rigidity of the written notation. A certain unevenness would also be somewhat welcomed in the solo quavers of bars fourteen to nineteen, with particular emphasis on the first quaver of each bar. Such an execution would of course need to be reflected in the repeated quavers of the accompanying strings.

In line with the generally accepted French metre-relationships, the second movement of the fifth Stockholm concerto, in triple metre, welcomes an unequal performance of its frequent descending lines of quavers (fig.7.8a). Here, however, we also note that in addition the movement consists of many smaller rhythmic figures including semiquavers and demisemiquavers of which the latter do not welcome inequality to the same degree (fig.7.8b). Whilst we would normally expect inequality to apply to the smaller rhythmical values or descend to such figures, we might also note their strong ornamental nature, remembering

Mahaut’s fondness for writing out decorative figures, and as such would not ordinarily be made unequal, being an ornamentation of the essential melodic line.

Likewise, we see the same relationship in the second movement of the first Stockholm concerto (fig. 7.9a-d) where the customary conjunct quavers welcome an unequal execution. Note that the degree of inequality employed by the soloist in figure 7.9b can be quite subtle and perhaps variable, whilst similar figures in the ritornello (fig. 7.9a), and those later ‘shadowed’ by the first violin (fig. 7.9c), require a more consistent and perceivable degree of inequality for the sake of synchronisation. Whilst we have considered the customary unequal rendering of quavers in this movement, there is in addition a strong suggestion, with the exception of some disjunct semiquaver figures and demi-semiquaver slide figures, that inequality ‘descends’ in the solo material to include descending semiquaver and sextuplet figures, such as those seen in figures 7.9d and 7.9e. An unequal performance of such figures would be almost automatic by the soloist.

In contrast to the metre-relationships seen previously, we note in the following two examples (figures 7.10 and 7.11), taken from the Stockholm collection, that in the absence of any stepwise-moving quaver lines, it is the conjunct semiquaver figures appearing in the solo material that welcome inequality. Interesting, however, in the second example, an unequal performance of a descending quaver line is in fact ‘written-out’ using a dotted notation (fig. 7.11b). Whether this rhythm is intended to be exaggerated in a ‘majestic’ character or softened slightly is unclear, although the paired slurring and the ‘tender’

character of the movement would, perhaps, suggest the latter. If so, this notation in this context might be seen as indicative of inequality rather than a literal ‘dotted’ execution.

Significantly it is the paired slurring of the semiquaver figures in figure 7.11a that is so strongly indicative of inequality and likewise, in figure 7.12 where the rising pairs form a line of imitation between solo and cembalo. Whilst here the slurring is far from consistent, it is enough to indicate a paired legato character that welcomes a subtly unequal performance.

This indicative slurred notation, however, appears not only in a conjunct context, for which inequality is generally accepted, but also over disjunct passages. Whilst the appropriate use of inequality in the latter is not acknowledged to quite the same extent either today or in eighteenth century French sources, it nevertheless has its place in certain contexts. Whilst some authors specifically state that disjunct intervals are made equal,25 others suggest that it was open to interpretation. In contrast to his written comments, Montéclair’s examples include two rising fourths which he explicitly instructs to be performed unequal.26 Likewise, in 1738, Corrette gives an example intended for unequal execution which consists of a sequence of semiquavers rising in thirds.27 Heffling suggests the “disjunct motion (especially arpeggiation) is generally more characteristic of Italian music than French, which may be a factor in the theorists’ excluding it from inequality”.28 This is perhaps so, but the unequal execution of disjunct passages as suggested above was not unknown within the French tradition.

The practice of slurring equally notated but unequally performed passages in pairs was known in French sources as *lourer* and was originally an attempt to imitate the long-short legato execution of certain eighteenth-century drone instruments (loure, cornemuse, musette and hurdy-gurdy) whose articulations were unavoidably blurred, and who therefore had to lengthen the first of every pair in order to define the beat. The practice was equally applicable to stepwise and leaping figures and is described by Demoz in 1728:

> Lourer is to express the notes slurred in pairs by slurring, caressing and rolling them in such a way that the notes are continuous, joined and connected (as in those playful airs for musettes, cornemuses and veilles), while perceptibly marking the first of each pair.  

Returning to Mahaut's concerti, it is easy to see such an execution implied in the paired slurrings of the viola part of figure 7.13a. If performed in this way the execution would need to be matched in the semiquavers of the solo flute which, again, fall naturally into pairs. Similarly, in figure 7.13b, the use of *lourer* in the bass part of bars 47 and 48 follows naturally from the descending quaver line preceding it in the solo flute that undoubtedly would be performed unequally. The unequal performance of quavers in the bass is also suggested in the dotted notations of bar 45, which, as we have discussed previously with regard to this movement (fig. 7.7), might suggest *in this context* a softening of the rhythm to the triplet lilt of inequality. Whilst the notation throughout this section is not consistent, the performance must be made to be so.

---

In the following examples we will consider two additional observations with regard to Mahaut’s use of inequality. In figure 7.14a we note the simultaneous notation of a descending line of conjunct semiquavers in the solo flute against dotted quaver/semiquaver figures in the bass. If the semiquaver line is made unequal, as is ordinarily the case in C, the semiquavers in the accompanying dotted figures will no longer be rhythmically synchronised with the solo line. Thus it becomes not only musically desirable, but necessary to exaggerate the dotted figures by overdotting, thereby shortening the semiquavers and bringing them back ‘in-line’ with those in the solo above. This is, of course, the fundamental reason for the introduction of overdotting (i.e. overdotting concomitant with note inégales, in which the dot was lengthened in proportion to the prevailing degree of inequality).

Finally in this discussion we note two slow movements in the Stockholm collection that utilise the metre and rhythmical characteristics of the Italian Siciliano (fig. 7.14b and 7.14c).30 Despite, however, the Italian heritage of such movements they also display a strong French element in their ornamentation and, most particularly, in their frequent semiquaver figures that appear to demand an unequal execution in their lilting and ‘flattering’ expression. Thus once again we acknowledge the mixture of styles present in Mahaut’s concerti, not only from movement to movement, but within the movements themselves.

---

30 The Brussels duplicate of figure 7.14c, is not in fact labelled Siciliano, but Largo.
Dotting

Two issues arise from Mahaut’s notation of dotted rhythms: that of the apparent variable value of the dot and the related question regarding the over- or under-dotting of specific figures. Whilst the consideration of such issues is highly significant in our interpretation of Mahaut’s notation, it must be remembered that the standard value of the rhythmic dot throughout Mahaut’s life, and indeed the entire seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was the same as it is today: half the value of the note or rest that precedes it. In his examination, Hefling claims that over fifty French sources testify to this in addition to a lesser, but significant, number of non-French sources.31

Contrary to our initial comment, however, it was not terribly uncommon for the value of the dot to be somewhat less or greater than the standard value. Such a notation is found in a number of French and German sources spanning both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and can be seen amongst Mahaut’s dotted rhythms in figure 7.15a and 7.15b. In this example clearly the dot replaces a tie and represents not its usual value of half the crotchet but that of a semiquaver, thus shortening its value. With regard to his organ works in 1623, Titelouze states that “there are some notes elongated by a dot which I have used to indicate only a quarter of their value: it is done to save the note-plus-tie that would be necessary to indicate the value”.32 Later in the century it is described, among others, by Etienne Loulié in 1696 (fig.7.16):

... ordinarily the dot after a note augments its value by half. Sometimes, however, it augments the note by one-eighth, one-quarter, three-eighths, one-half, five-eighths,

31 Hefling, Rhythmic Alteration, chap.4, pp.65-66.
three-quarters, or seven-eighths... In any given place the time-value of the dot is regulated by the notes which follow.\textsuperscript{33}

The notation was also discussed extensively by German theorists including Sperling (1705) and Schmelz (1752).\textsuperscript{34}

Mahaut’s use of this variable value is strikingly frequent throughout all of his concerto manuscripts, representing perhaps another significant unifying element of the various collections. Figure 7.17 illustrates further examples from the Stockholm manuscripts, closely resembling those given by Loulié above. Remembering, of course, Mahaut’s tendency to be neglectful in many of his notations, it is also conceivable that here the groups of three following the dotted notes may have been intended as triplets (although not marked as such), as this is not an uncommon feature of Mahaut’s notation. A triplet would, however, require a shift in the metrical accent which, in figure 7.17a(i), is less favourable as it would disrupt the descending line of semiquavers that continues into the next beat. In figure 7.17a(ii) and likewise in figure 7.17d, triplets are neither notated or implied throughout the remainder of the movements and are, therefore, unlikely to be intended in this context.

A slightly different rhythmical example is seen in figure 7.18a where, again, the dot represents only a quarter of the principal’s value (i.e. a quaver). It is clear from the manuscript notation that the two following notes are not intended as a grace (and therefore forming part of the dotted minim), but as regular semiquavers in real-time. Similarly, in the

\textsuperscript{33} Loulié, E. \textit{Eléments ou principes de musique} . . . , manuscript additions.

\textsuperscript{34} See discussion in Heffling, \textit{Rhythmic Alteration}, chap.4, p.67.
rather unusual rhythmical figure of the following example (fig.7.18b), the dot must again lengthen the principal by only a quarter of its value (i.e. a semiquaver) if the metrical notation is to make sense. Here the variable value of the dot replaces what would otherwise be a visually complicated and messy notation involving a tie (\[ \text{\includegraphics[scale=0.5]{example}} \]).

In the previous section we discussed the probable unequal performance of ascending and descending quaver melodic lines and of the pulsating repeated-note accompaniment with regard to the second movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto. Such an interpretation would have an effect on the opening dotted motive (fig.7.18c), softening it to something resembling the lilt of a triplet rhythm (\[ \text{\includegraphics[scale=0.5]{tripllet}} \]) in order to synchronise with the unequal quavers beneath it. Thus here the dot represents even less than one-quarter of the value of the note preceding it. That the triplet notation above was extremely rare and was often represented instead by a dotted figure (\[ \text{\includegraphics[scale=0.5]{dotted}} \]) is well documented during Mahaut’s time and will be discussed shortly along with many other examples with regard to the assimilation of dotted and triplet rhythms.

The second and more controversial issue of this chapter concerns the over- and under-dotting of certain figures. With regard to the former, having become known rightly or wrongly as the French Overture Style, it is claimed by Donington to be “one of our best-attested conventions of baroque interpretation”.\(^\text{35}\) Like notes inégales, however, the sources do not support a sweeping avocation of overdotting outside France and must be considered very carefully before using it to interpret the music of any non-French composer.

Fundamentally, it is clear from French authors that overdotting was a direct result of notes inégales. The degree of inequality demanded and determined the length of the over-dot so that simultaneous inequality and dotted figures might be synchronised, and is described by Hotteterre in his 1737 treatise:

in movements where the quavers are unequal, the dot which is after the crotchet is the equivalent of a pointed quaver, such that the quaver which follows a dotted crotchet is always short.\(^\text{36}\)

Hotteterre goes on to state that this overdotting is necessary even in a one-part piece that clearly requires no synchronisation.\(^\text{37}\) Thus it will apply in a multi-part work even where the two figures are not simultaneous, allowing the interpretation of such figures to remain constant throughout a movement. Further confirmation comes later in the century from Morel de Lescer:

NB. I point out that the dot after a crotchet note (when the quavers are unequal) is worth more than a quaver for the reason that it takes the place of a 'first' quaver, which is long according to its nature; it follows from this that the latter part of the beat which comes after the dot, being short and weakened by the length of the 'first' quaver, is worth no more than a semiquaver. And so too for the dot placed after a quaver, which has to have the same relationship.\(^\text{38}\)

---


\(^\text{37}\) In his discussion, Heffling suggests that if even students practising alone were expected to over-dot in proportion to the inequality, then "overdotting must have been commonplace in French music despite the relatively small number of writers who discuss it" [ Heffling, Rhythmic Alteration, chap.4, p.70].

\(^\text{38}\) Morel de Lescer Science de la musique vocale (Paris, c.1760), p.8. [trans. given by Heffling, Rhythmic Alteration, chap.4, p.69].
Thus, this fundamental necessity for lengthening the dot finds support in French sources throughout the late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and is crystallised in Fuller’s statement of 1977: “wherever inequality goes there also goes overdotting”.39

Such a requirement can easily be seen in two examples taken from Mahaut’s concerti (fig. 7.19). In the first (fig. 7.19a), an undesirable rhythmical conflict would be created if the semiquavers in the bassi were not delayed to coincide with the second of each pair of unequal semiquavers in the solo line. In such a movement it would be natural for the player to ‘adjust’ to the interpretation of the soloist. In figure 7.19b the two figures are not simultaneous, but have instead a linear relationship in which the delayed semiquavers in (i), produced by overdotting, would reflect the probable unequal performance of descending semiquaver pairs appearing throughout the movement and illustrated in (ii). In addition, the slurs linking short to long, in figure 7.19b(i), also suggest the grace-note quality of the semiquavers, implying a delayed execution.

In concluding his extensive discussion, Hefling comments that “geographically, the practice [of overdotting] would have been as widespread as notes inégales themselves”,40 thus suggesting that where the latter may be appropriate, so too might be the former.

By the second quarter of the eighteenth century (from about 1730 onwards), however, the notion of overdotting began to appear outside France as an independent custom unrelated to French inequality. With regard specifically to double-dotting (a particular ratio of 7:1), it


40 Hefling, Rhythmic Alteration, chap.4, p.70.
was not unknown for composers to notate such rhythms using appropriate rests and ties (i.e. \( \text{\texttt{\text{	extbackslash y 	extbackslash y \textbackslash y \text{\textbackslash y}}}} \) or \( \text{\texttt{\text{	extbackslash y 	extbackslash y \textbackslash y \text{\textbackslash y}}}} \)).\textsuperscript{41} Mahaut himself has occasionally used such notations, particularly as upbeat figures in his slow movements (fig.7.20), thus ensuring the desired effect. The notational use of the double-dot did not become familiar until the mid-eighteenth century,\textsuperscript{42} propagated in particular by the 'modern-thinking' composers of the Berlin school including C.P.E. Bach and Marpurg, and also Leopold Mozart who objected to the irrational notation of intended overdotting.

Whilst Mahaut's concerti were undoubtedly written around the mid-century, there is not a single occurrence of this notated double-dot (\( \text{\texttt{\text{	extbackslash y \textbackslash y \textbackslash y \textbackslash y}} \)) throughout the manuscripts. It is, however, a frequent notation in many of his solo and trio sonatas, believed to have been written even earlier than his concerti. Bearing in mind that the notation is rarely found in Italian sources (and those that are, make use of rests and ties) and whilst Mahaut's sonatas remain essentially French, the concerti, however, were significantly influenced by the Italian violin virtuosi in Amsterdam and the increasingly popular solo concerto of Italian origin. Thus it is conceivable that, in the absence of the notational double-dot, Mahaut was simply adjusting to the prevailing notational custom of such works.

The essential element in the use of overdotting outside France is found in its effect upon the character of the music as a means to enliven or energise otherwise sluggish rhythmic figures. As we shall see, Quantz associates it with the \textit{majestic} and its essential

\textsuperscript{41} Graham Pont provides a list of 147 composers throughout the baroque period who used such notations [Pont, "Rhythmic Alteration and the Majestic", \textit{Studies in Music} (Australia), 1978, vol.12, pp.87-89] For further discussion see Hefting, \textit{Rhythmic Alteration}, chap.4, pp.70-74.

\textsuperscript{42} Although Hefting suggests that it was already well-known to French keyboardists between 1650-1700. [Hefting, \textit{Rhythmic Alteration}, chap.4, p.70].
Lebhaftigkeit (animation) and boldness. It involves strong attacks on the longer notes followed by short and sharp little notes. C.P.E. Bach implies as much in his statement that a flattering effect will not tolerate the fundamental defiance of these dotted notes and Leopold Mozart explains that slow pieces become too sleepy without it. Even in England Roger North associates it with the "rage of an angry person".

Thus it is entirely probable that similar figures in Mahaut's concerti were likewise 'enlivened' by the use of overdotting, unassociated with the presence of inequality. This would seem particularly applicable to contexts such as those in figure 7.21. Here we note Mahaut's fondness for using longer dotted figures (\(\text{\textbullet} \quad \text{\textbullet}\)) in the accompaniment beneath semiquaver passage-work in the solo part. In this context, not only would overdotting energise this fairly static accompaniment, preventing it from dragging the tempo and therefore the solo line, but it would also delay the short note to coincide with the last of each group of four semiquavers in the solo passage-work. The latter sits better harmonically than if it were performed with its literal value.

Note in figure 7.21c, the dot is effectively not sustained but replaced by rests. The similarity of this example with the two contexts preceding it (fig.7.21a and b) would suggest that a 'like' execution would also have been understood, particularly noting the faster tempo. In the light of Mahaut's considerable French musical background which, as we have previously commented, remains a significant element despite the outwardly Italian nature of the concerti, a strong similarity might be drawn here to a description given by Quantz of French bowing which he relates to French dance music:

---

... is usually played seriously, with a heavy yet short and sharp bow-stroke, more
detached than slurred. . . Dotted notes are played heavily, but the notes following them
briefly and sharply. 44

In this metre [C], as well as in three-four time, the quavers that follow the dotted
crotchets . . . must not be played with their literal value, but must be executed in a very
short and sharp manner. The dotted note is played with emphasis, and the bow is
detached during the dot. All dotted notes are treated in the same manner if time
allows. 45

We shall discover shortly, in our further examination of Quantz’s rhythmic descriptions, that
his use of the words short and sharply repeatedly imply an essential lengthening of the dot
and a delayed sharp attack of the following short note. In addition, here we note that “the
bow is detached during the dot”, producing an execution not unlike that implied in figure
7.21c. It will also be remembered that Quantz’s comments specifically reflect the ‘mixed’
style that existed in Dresden prior to his appointment in Berlin (1741), a style in which this
type of overdotting had become commonplace. We have also noted that Mahaut may have
visited Dresden, resulting in the composition of two concerti dedicated to Pierre Buffardin.

In the context of Mahaut’s concerti, we are, however, even more concerned with a type of
overdotting relating to the interpretation of small-scaled dotted figures, such as \( \text{\textdagger} \)
and \( \text{\textdaggerdbl} \), which appeared with the emergence of the elegant galant style in the 1730s
and 40s. Much of the thematic material in Mahaut’s manuscripts, particularly in the slow
middle movements, is dominated by such small-scale dotted figures, as can be seen in both
examples in figure 7.23.

---

44 Quantz, J.J. Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.vii, par.56, p.290.
45 Quantz, J.J. Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.vii, par.58, p.290.
First discussed by Quantz amongst his rudiments of pitch and rhythm (by implication, a fundamental concept), we find it endorsed by other writers including C.P.E. Bach, Marpurg and Leopold Mozart. Labelled by Frederick Neumann as the *galant* type of overdotting, it is not derived from *note inégales* and as such remains an independent custom not specifically associated with French music. It does, however, as we shall see, maintain a relationship with the expression of the *Majestic*, itself associated with the French Overture.

Figure 7.22 illustrates Quantz’s examples where he first introduces the concept in chapter V of his *Versuch* (*Of Notes, their Values, Metre, Rests and Other Musical Signs*):

In dotted quaver, semiquaver, and demisemiquaver notes one departs from the general rule because of the liveliness these notes must express. It is particularly important to observe that the notes after the dots in (c) and (d) [see fig. 7.22] must be played just as short as those [after the dots] in (e), whether the tempo is slow or fast. 46

Importantly, we note that the short note in (c) is to be just as short as those in (e). The later examples clearly show that the short note is played as late as possible and the dot held.

In Quantz’s seventeenth chapter we find the following quote with reference to performing the *Adagio*:

In slow pieces dotted quavers and semiquavers must be played with a weighty stroke and in a sustained manner . . . The semiquavers following the dots must always be played very short and sharply, in both quick and slow tempos, since dotted notes must generally express something of the majestic. 47


Earlier, in his discussion of the *Allegro*, we find the cross-reference to his description of the *majestic* element:

*Majesty* is represented both with long notes during which the other parts have quick motion, and with dotted notes. The dotted notes must be attacked sharply by the performer, and must be executed with liveliness. The dots are held long and the following notes made very short, see chapter V, #21 and 22.48

Taken in isolation, these two later quotes remain ambiguous and have been subject to much debate as to their meaning.49 Viewed, however, in the light of his rudimentary comments given in chapter V (in which he establishes the fundamental interpretation of these dotted rhythms) to which, after all, Quantz refers us at the end of the last quote, it is apparent that a movement dominated by dotted notes is interpreted here by lengthening the dot to heighten the *majestic* element. Mahaut's *Adagio* from the Regensburg concerto, whose opening is seen in figure 7.23b, provides us with perhaps further grounds for this interpretation with his notation of overdotting produced by ties across the beat (fig. 7.23c).

With regard to the performance of such an *Adagio*, and to ripieno violinists in particular, Quantz adds:

The strokes must not be detached as is done when there are rests after the notes rather than dots. The dots must be held for their full value, so that they do not appear to be bored, and so that the *Adagio* is not transformed into an *Andante*.50

48 Quantz, J.J. *Versuch*, chap.XII, par.24, p.133.

49 For a fuller account of such controversy including Neumann's argument, see Hefling, *Rhythmic Alteration*, p.191-2, n.16.

Thus Quantz indicates that the dots in such *Adagios* as those in figure 7.23 are not only subject to *majestic* overdotting, but are to be sustained throughout and not shortened by the insertion of rests.

In his essay entitled *The Overdotting Syndrome*, Neumann suggests that Quantz's instruction above to hold the dots to their outer most limit of their value "cautions against shortening the dot, but excludes its lengthening". Admittedly Quantz's comments would remain ambiguous if not viewed in the light of his previous discussions such as that of chapter V. His meaning, however, was later clarified by Quantz's student Agricola, in 1757:

The short notes that come after a dot - particularly semiquavers and demi-semiquavers, and also quavers in alla breve - are always performed, be it slow or quick tempo, and be there one or several of them, very short, and at the outermost limit of their value: the notes that stand before the dot are, on the contrary, held proportionately longer.

Like any set of rules it would be foolish to apply them blindly without further evidence from other sources. But Quantz and Agricola are not alone. At the height of the galant period we find supporting comments by C.P.E. Bach, Leopold Mozart and Marpurg, all describing the galant alteration of small-scaled dotted rhythms, either specifically or by example. C.P.E. Bach objects only to the rigidity of having an inflexible rule, pointing to the necessity of looking at the disposition of the parts before altering the rhythm. Importantly, he also agrees with Quantz regarding the sustained execution of the dot in the *Adagio*.

---


whilst implying that in a livelier piece, such as an *Allegro*, one might 'articulate' more between the dotted and the short note while still delaying the latter as much as possible.

This interpretation might easily have been intended in a number of Mahaut’s first movements, thematically dominated by small-scaled dotted rhythms (fig.7.24a-c). Thus their *majestic* character is heightened by overdotting whilst ensuring rhythmic clarity by 'lifting the bow' between the dotted and short notes and, in effect, adding a certain amount of 'silence'.

In figure 7.24b(iii) we note the motivic entrance of the bass four bars after the return of the ritornello. Here the first note of the figure has been written as a standard quaver rather than the expected semiquaver upbeat to the following dotted passage. It is, however, highly probable that our ‘expected’ execution was intended by Mahaut, thus adding a dot to the rest and, therefore, shortening the first note to a semiquaver. To this would then be added a certain degree of overdotting in imitation of the dotted ritornello motive which precedes it. One finds confirmation of this interpretation in Quantz’s observations that are essentially an extension of his rudimentary interpretation of dotted figures:

If a semiquaver rest appears on the downbeat, and dotted notes follow [see fig.7.24d], the rests must be regarded as if it were dotted, or as if it were followed by another rest of half the value, and the following note as if it were of half the value.\(^54\)

With regard to the *majestic* quality of these motivic dotted figures, it would follow that a like-execution, heightened by overdotting, would apply in equal measure to those contexts

\(^{54}\) Quantz, J.J. *Versuch*, chap.XVII, par.16, p.226.
in which the motivic figures appear in the accompaniment *beneath* the solo passage-work, such as those in figure 7.25a and b.

Likewise, such figures also appear at major cadences, such as at the end of the ritornello (fig.7.26a) or in the approach to the cadence (fig.7.26b). In the latter, the *majestic* character and required overdotting heightens the contrast to the previous material consisting of many slurred triplets.

An interesting context involving dotted figures is found in the first movement of the eighth Stockholm concerto (fig.7.27). Here Mahaut has effectively created an imitative pattern of dotted quaver/semiquaver figures by using ties in the flute and violins. If, however, as one might expect, the bass player was to heighten his figures by overdotting, the imitation would be distorted and therefore lost. In order to avoid this, it would be necessary to lengthen the tied notes in the upper parts to match the length of the elongated dotted note in the bass, producing a rhythm something like: \[ \text{\textbullet-\textbullet-\textbullet} \text{\textbullet-\textbullet-\textbullet} \]. Whilst such a notation might look messy and complicated, it is, in performance, an easy pattern to ‘slip into’, particularly in imitation with the bass.

In our discussion of overdotting, a special mention must be made of the dotted figure involving two short notes such as that of a slide (\[ \text{\textbullet-\textbullet-\textbullet} \]). Quantz observes that the longer you sustain the dots, “the more flattering and pleasing notes of this kind sound”.\[55\] Later Agricola includes the figure in his fundamental description of overdotting:

The short notes that come after a dot - particularly semiquavers and demi-semiquavers, and also quavers in alla breve - are always performed, be it slow or quick tempo, and be there one or several of them [italics mine], very short, and at the outermost limit of their value: the notes that stand before the dot are, on the contrary, held proportionately longer.\footnote{Agricola, J. F. Anleitung zur Singkunst, pp.133-134 [trans. given by Hefling, Rhythmic Alteration, chap.5, p.108].} [see fig.7.28a]

Thus it would appear that such figures were intended to be executed in a like-manner to those with a single short note. That Mahaut had a fondness for such figures is clear from their abundance throughout the concerti. We have already seen an example, in figure 7.6b(ii), where they follow immediately on the heels of the standard-dotted motivic figures opening the first solo episode. Consistency demands that they be executed in a like-manner to the motivic figures, and are thus heightened by overdotting. In figure 7.28b the 'slide' nature of the ascending figure points to an ornamental function of the pairs of 'little-notes', which would suggest in turn that they are played as fast as possible. In addition, the incorrect and inconsistent metrical notation implies that the performers understanding of the required execution was assumed by the copyist. Finally, in figure 7.28c, the figure is consistently juxtaposed with a triplet rhythm. At a fast tempo the perceived difference between the two would become minimal. The idea that such similarity or even assimilation was intended is not logical in the light of the consistency of the alternating notation. On the contrary, however, a lengthening of the dot would highlight the contrast between the two figures and maintain the juxtaposition.

As with inequality, however, tempo remains a significant regulating factor on overdotting small-scaled dotted figures and it must be taken into consideration that a quick tempo may
eliminate any perceivable effect of overdotting these figures. This is, in all likelihood, the reason behind C.P.E. Bach’s observation:

But if many [dotted figures] follow each other, especially in quick tempo, they are often not held, even though the notation calls for it. 57

We turn now to another of Mahaut’s slow movements (fig.7.29a). Here we find a sequence of illogical rhythmic groupings involving descending demi-semiquavers preceded by a dotted quaver. We might consider two possibilities as an explanation. Firstly, in line with our earlier discussion regarding the variable value of the dot, it perhaps represents a tie, thus shortening the dot to a demi-semiquaver: \[ \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\textdegree} \textsuperscript{\textdegree}}} \]. This, however, does not satisfy the problem of the initial bar. If, on the other hand, we consider the lengthening of the dot associated with the\textit{majestic} and the expected overdotting of\textit{\textdegree} \textsuperscript{\textdegree} figures, we find a solution in Quantz’s following statement:

\[ \ldots \text{if 3 or more demi-semiquaver notes follow a dot or a rest, they are not always played with their literal value, especially in slow pieces, but are executed at the extreme end of the time allotted to them and with the greatest possible speed.} \]

The same is implied in figure 7.29b where the figures grow from the two-note slide described above to include numerically illogical notations in which clearly there is an understanding that they are to be performed as fast as possible.


The controversy that has developed this century over the contraction of such figures has principally to do with its application to semiquavers, where Quantz refers only to demi-semiquavers. Other composers, however, such as J.S. Bach, have been known to revise their notation by contracting semiquavers to demi-semiquavers (BWV 831). For a full account of the argument see Hefting, \textit{Rhythmic Alteration}, chap.7, pp.152-157. Here Hefting observes that the significant element is the gesture of an upbeat flourish. Contrary to this, Mahaut’s semiquaver pickups are part of larger semiquaver passages which would exclude the contraction of the upbeat figure.
In addition to such figures preceded by a dotted note, we also find numerous examples of those following a rest (fig.7.30) whose identical execution is also included in Quantz’s instructions above. Note, in figure 7.30a(i-iii), the variation of the scale figure appearing in exactly the same place of each ritornello. In each, however, the notation remains numerically incorrect, once again suggesting an understanding of the required execution. In figures 7.30b and 7.30c the slides form a cadential passage in octave unison. Whilst here they are notationally correct, the unison upbeat flourish or ‘gesture’, similar to the previous examples, would suggest that they are delayed and performed as fast as possible.

Finally in our discussion of overdotting, we find passages in Mahaut’s manuscripts which are dominated by the lombardic snap, or a reversed dotted rhythm (fig.7.31a and b). This forms a strong rhythmic characteristic of Mahaut’s concerti and likewise of the emerging galant style, particularly in the pre-classical concerto and sonata. Its roots lie in the export of Italian instrumental music and is documented by Quantz following his visit to Rome in 1724: “What came most to my ears was the Lombard style”.59 Having introduced overdotting in chapter V of the Versuch, Quantz also advocates its use for the Lombard rhythm:

With regard to the length of the dot and the shortness of the first note, the notes in fig.8 [see fig.7.32], where the dot stands after every second note, are similar to the dotted notes mentioned above. Their order is simply reversed. The two quick notes in (b) and (d) are treated in the same manner, two quick notes here receiving no more time than one in the examples above. The shorter you make the first notes, the livelier and bolder is the expression.60


Quantz’s comments are also corroborated by Agricola five years later (see fig.7.33):

When the short note comes first, and the dot is after the second note, then the first note is as short as possible, and the left over is assigned to the note that has the dot after it. In such figures, however, the first note is strong, and that before the dot, which is always slurred to it, is rendered weaker, although well sustained; and when there is time, it is strengthened again.\(^{61}\)

Note, that both Quantz and Agricola include in their discussions the ‘lombardic’ slide or the reverse of the figure (\(\text{\textlangle,\rangle}\)), seen with equal abundance in Mahaut’s concerti as the single figure (fig.7.34). In figure 7.34c notice the inconsistency in the notation of the two rhythmic figures \(\text{\textlangle,\rangle}\) and \(\text{\textlangle,\rangle}\). In bar nineteen, whilst the two violins are clearly intended to be in rhythmic unison a third apart, the two figures are set against each other on the third beat. Later, in bars twenty-three and twenty-four, the dotted rhythm on the third beat is replaced by the plain dotted figure. This begins to suggest that what is actually intended by \(\text{\textlangle,\rangle}\) is in fact \(\text{\textlangle,\rangle}\). Likewise, in figure 7.34d, three different notations are found simultaneously: a dotted lombardic figure in the flute, an undotted, notationally incorrect figure in violin I and a slower rhythmic figure in violin II. Clearly what is intended by all these notations is a slide performed as fast as possible. Such required assimilation will be discussed in the next section.

An interesting question regarding the overdotting of lombardic figures arises when we find such figures slurred, particularly in slow movements, where the exaggerated fast despatch of the first note or notes does not seem particularly appropriate (fig.7.35). Whilst C.P.E. Bach gives us the same instruction as Quantz and Agricola, stating that the quick dispatch
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of these notes is correct most of the time, he adds that where the figures are slurred the short note is not taken too quickly, marked by gentle pressure rather than a short shove or jolt. This applies likewise to short notes when the idea is sad or expressive and occurs in a slow tempo. Such remarks would explain the appearance of slurs in figure 7.35a and 7.35b where a more gentle and flattering expression is required.

Finally, in concluding our discussion of this issue, it is apparent that, having become an independent custom outside France unrelated to French inequality per se, overdotting had an enormous influence on composers in Germany and the Netherlands and perhaps to a lesser extent on the Italians. Such influence has even been noted in the works of J.S. Bach who revised a keyboard overture (BWV 831) in line with Quantz’s rhythmic alterations (for publication in 1735) after a period of time spent in Dresden. Indeed Bach’s compositions at this time reflect the emerging galant style that he found there. With regard to Mahaut, we have already noted the parallel influences that existed between Dresden and Amsterdam.
Assimilation

The last point of discussion with regard to rhythmic alteration is that of assimilation or synchronisation, involving the interpretation of frequent passages mixing duple and triplet figures either simultaneously or in juxtaposition. Eighteenth-century sources regarding assimilation are rare, concerning themselves largely with the contraction and dotting of upbeat figures that were discussed above. The decision, therefore, whether to assimilate conflicting duple and triple rhythms, such as we find in abundance in Mahaut’s concerti, is one left largely to the performer, judging each context individually.

Of the many examples in the concerti, we shall consider first the simplest of conflicting rhythms, that of duple against triplet semiquavers (fig. 7.36a). Here, amongst the solo passage-work, closely shadowed in imitation by the first violin, two triplet patterns rise sequentially to a duple pattern that leaps downwards to begin the sequence again. Thus we have both linear alternation and vertical conflict between the two figures. In order to resolve the latter, it is probable that the duple rhythm is altered to a triplet (i.e. \( \begin{array}{c} \text{3} \\ \end{array} \)) so that the second note coincides with the last of the triplet against it. Importantly, this would also satisfy musical and melodic considerations. Following an upward sequence towards the first note of the duple pattern it would be natural, and perhaps automatic, to sustain the latter a little longer than is indicated, while giving less significance to the second note. Similarly, in figure 7.36b, the duple semiquavers are likely to be assimilated to the triplet movement which precedes and follows it.

Approaching the mid-eighteenth century, it became increasingly fashionable to set triple and dotted duple rhythms deliberately against each other, to be performed exactly as notated.
Hence Quantz insists that you must not under-dot the duple rhythm, but over-dot it, so that the short note sounds after the third note of the triplet.\textsuperscript{62}

Throughout Mahaut's manuscripts, however, many messy and meaningless conflicts occur that would be eliminated simply by softening the dot. In figure 7.37a we find dotted figures in violin II set beneath triplets in the thematic material (*). Yet what we have in violin II is not independent material worthy of rhythmic contrast, but a simplified version of the thematic material providing harmonic support. By softening the dot and assimilating it to a triplet rhythm we reduce the part back to its harmonic role. By implication, we might consider the same interpretation of the dotted pick-up figures. This would perhaps also suggest a similar 'softening' of the dot in later solo passage-work, such as the slurred lombardic rhythms in figure 7.37b(i) followed immediately by sextuplet figures. In figure 7.37b(ii) a similar passage is seen again, although here the lombardic dots are missing.

A more complicated problem is seen in the \textit{Adagio} from the Brussels e minor concerto (fig. 7.38). Here we find the consistent alternation of triplet and dotted duple semiquavers. Two possible interpretations suggest themselves. We might lengthen the dot in the duple figures and effectively highlight the contrast with the following triplets. Something has already been said, however, about the French quality of Mahaut's slow movements, and one would be strongly tempted to render the semiquavers of the solo, entering in bar three, slightly unequal by inequality, following suit later in bar seven and eight. For the sake of notation, this would look something like that seen in figure 7.38b. In contrast to our first interpretative possibility, we could then soften the dotted figures of the strings to a triplet

\textsuperscript{62} Quantz, J.J. \textit{Versuch}, chap. V, par. 22, p. 68.
and thus create a similar lilt in all the parts. It has been commented to me that, although the latter may be the less interesting interpretation, it is probably the most in keeping with the style. It would also work better in those places where the dotted and triplet figures appear simultaneously, such as in bar six (fig.7.38a).

Significantly, the suggestion of assimilation occurs not only where duple and triplet rhythms exist in close proximity, but also where the character of the movement is influenced by one or the other. For example, we have seen the opening bar of the Brussels A major concerto in figure 7.36b, establishing a strong triplet lilt to its character. Later in the movement, we also find slurred dotted figures of both the lombardic and standard type (fig.7.39a-b). Only the second example exists beside triplet figures, but in both one feels a strong need to soften the dots and assimilate them to the character of the movement.

In all the examples thus far, we have discovered the need to assimilate the two conflicting rhythms. This is, however, not the case in all contexts throughout the concerti. On the contrary, there are many in which the two are deliberately set against each other, usually in a linear alternation rather than a vertical one. In figure 7.28c we have already seen the notation of a dotted rhythm ( ) alternating with triplet quavers in consistent repetition. The contrast between the two figures was further highlighted by the implied overdotting of the first rhythm. In figure 7.40 we find a similar context, although this time, the triplets consistently alternate with a lombardic dotted figure. Note that the figure POT3 is not notationally correct and we have concluded previously that a lombardic slide ( ) was intended by such notation in addition to a strong implication of overdotting.
is hard to imagine that assimilation was intended when the alternation is so consistently notated and when it would otherwise have been easier to notate them all as triplets.

In addition to the conflict between triplets and simple or dotted duple rhythms, we also find a large number of contexts involving the figure \( \text{\texttt{\( \text{\texttt{J\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{}}\)}}} \) set against triplet quavers, either intentionally or in error. Two simple examples requiring assimilation can be found in the first movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto (fig.7.41). In figure 7.41a we see that the rising quaver/semiquaver scale figures in the first violin are harmonically shadowed below in violin II, whilst using a conflicting triplet rhythm. As violin II clearly fulfils a supportive harmonic rather than contrapuntal role, surely the triplet notation is an error intended instead as a quaver and two semiquavers. Similarly, on the first beat of bar fifty-nine (fig.7.41b), we find that the orchestra is playing in melodic unison. Yet violin I and II play these three notes as a triplet, while the viola and bass are notated as a quaver plus two semiquavers. Logic tells us that this is not intended. Considering that they constitute the last notes of a descending triplet run beginning in the previous bar, consistency demands that they too are performed as a triplet. In contrast, clearly the triplet notated in the flute and first violin on the following beat should in fact be two quavers followed by a crotchet, in unison with the other parts.

The Larghetto of the Brussels d minor concerto is dominated by the motivic figure seen in the first bar of figure 7.42a. This figure, answered in imitation by the first violin, is consistently notated throughout the movement, with the exception of bar three where it appears as a triplet and is clearly an error. Triplets do, however, appear legitimately at two points in the movement, in the flute part at the cadential passages concluding each half
(fig. 7.42b). Here the triplet does not allude to the motivic figure and serves only to broaden and decorate the cadential approach.

In the third movement of this concerto (fig. 7.43) we encounter a greater problem in reconciling the notation of these two figures. Here the semiquaver triplet is a significant thematic element of the ritornello and of the passage-work in the first solo episode. At the beginning of the second solo, however (fig. 7.43a), the triplet is replaced by a new duple figure (\[\text{\textcircled{W}}\]). Almost identical passage-work opens the third solo episode (fig. 7.43b) with the exception that, here, the figure at the beginning of each bar is now notated as a triplet, only to return to a duple rhythm in bars eighty-six and eighty-seven. That the latter is sandwiched between two identical bars notated with a triplet points to the unintentional use of the duple notation. Indeed, the inconsistency throughout the passage-work, together with the dominance of the motivic triplet in the ritornello, would suggest that the duple rhythm should be consistently assimilated to a triplet.

Such a solution, however, is not so clear cut in the following example. In this concerto, a significant motivic element of the ritornello, in both the first and second movements, is the rhythmic/melodic figure seen in figure 7.44a. In figure 7.44b(i), the opening of the first solo episode, the flute introduces new material involving triplet semiquavers. This would not be unusual in itself except that beneath it, in both violins, we find the conflicting duple rhythm of the motivic figure used in imitation with the flute. Such imitation would normally demand consistency in the rhythmic figure. Note also figure 7.44b(ii), a later passage of solo figuration made up entirely of triplet semiquavers. Beneath this, in direct vertical conflict, we find the duple motivic figure in the violins. The question to be considered, therefore, is
are we to attempt to resolve the rhythmical conflict by assimilation or let it stand as it is, creating a rather muddy rhythmical effect?

Similarly, the same conflict is to be found in the second movement with the triplet figure in the flute and the duple motivic figures in the violins below (fig. 7.44c). Significantly, the duple rhythm is also found in the flute part of both movements wherever it is followed by two semiquavers, thus completing the motivic figure (see fig. 7.44a). Bearing in mind the general inconsistencies and short-cuts taken in much of Mahaut’s notation, it is possible that no difference is in fact intended between the duple and triple figures, the difference in notation resulting only from the fact that it is easier and quicker to write a duple rhythm followed by two semiquavers (\(\frac{2}{3}\)), than it is to write a triplet (\(\frac{3}{3}\)).

Realistically, of course, the perceivable difference between the two would be negligible in the faster tempo of the first movement, becoming a significant problem only in the second.

Finally, figure 7.45 presents us with another case of questionable assimilation. Here, in both violin I and II, we have a linear alternation between the two figures. We also have imitation between the parts so that the figures conflict with each other vertically. If we were to assimilate everything to a triplet rhythm it would, as a result, remove the rhythmic element of the imitation. It should also mean suddenly producing a triplet rhythm out of the repeated quavers in the accompaniment (although the conflict of two-against-three in such a context is not unusual). Judging, however, by the consistency with which the two figures alternate, I would argue here that the distinction is deliberate and the conflict intended.

To conclude, I will return to Mahaut’s own flute *Méthode*, published in 1759 simultaneously in French and Dutch. In it, we find not one reference to the expressive
alteration of rhythm, although this might be explained by its technical rather than stylistic nature. It was written, however, at least a decade after his concerti and eight years after Quantz’s *Versuch* at a time that was witnessing the emergence of the classical symphony, to which Mahaut contributed. We also note that although the treatises of C.P.E. Bach, Leopold Mozart and Marpurg (also written during the 1750s) all describe the *galant* overdotting of small-scaled rhythms, they are silent on inequality. Marpurg’s silence is particularly striking as he had spent much time in France, wrote many French keyboard pieces, was familiar with French musical literature and generally favoured the French style. Indeed, outside the restraints of Frederick the Great the 1750s saw a move away from French performance causing some, like Marpurg, to abandon French customs. The change can also be seen in the abandonment of woodwind tonguing syllables traditionally associated with inequality. Whilst Quantz devotes a comprehensive chapter to their use, Mahaut writes in 1759: “while they were sufficient for the music of earlier times, they are no longer widely used”.

As we have previously concluded, therefore, that Quantz’s *Versuch* represents not the changes of the 1750s but the *mixed* style established in the 1730s and 40s and preserved under Frederick the Great in Berlin. Thus it represents a style that may be closer to that of Mahaut’s concerti than his own *Méthode* written perhaps a decade later.

---

CHAPTER EIGHT
ORNAMENTATION

In the following discussion regarding ornamentation we will focus primarily on how we might interpret and perform those symbolic ornamental notations, such as the appoggiatura, slide, trill and mordent, found within the concerti themselves. In addition we will consider Mahaut's discussion and use of those essential graces described in his *Méthode* and their appropriate use in the concerti. As we are dealing here principally with the interpretation of Mahaut's symbolic notations, our discussion of 'free ornamentation' is essentially limited to the cadenza. This is not to suggest that such ornamentation was not perhaps intended, particularly in some of Mahaut's 'pathetic' Italian *Adagios*. On the whole, however, Mahaut, like J.S. Bach, tended to write out his more elaborate ornamentation, leaving only the essential graces to the interpretation and 'understanding' of the performer.

One-Note Graces

In his *Méthode* Mahaut describes briefly both the appoggiatura (*port de voix*) and the French *Accent*.\(^1\) The appoggiatura, he says, is indicated by a small note and is articulated with the same tongue stroke as the note which follows it. In a statement clearly distinguishing between French and Italian performance, Mahaut notes that the Italians use it both ascending and descending, giving the small note half the value of the principal note which it precedes. He goes on to describe the *overlong* appoggiatura, receiving two-thirds
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\(^1\) Mahaut, *A. Méthode* (1759), p.20.
of the principal note whenever the latter is of triple value. The discussion is accompanied by the musical example seen in figure 8.1.

Clearly Mahaut’s description is that of the long onbeat (i.e. accented) appoggiatura that became prominent with the emergence of German galant practices in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. Whilst, as we have seen, both Mahaut’s music and his Méthode strongly reflect the characteristics of the galant style, not least in its move away from complex polyphonic textures, it is significant that he never specifically refers to the German source of its features, but rather speaks of them in terms of their French or Italian origin. Thus inherent in Mahaut’s statement that the Italians use both the ascending and descending long appoggiatura is a comparison with French practice in which the long appoggiatura is used principally as an ascending port de voix, while the descending grace or coulé remains predominantly anticipated and hence unaccented.²

We cannot assume, however, that Mahaut’s concentration in his discussion on the long appoggiatura necessarily suggests that an anticipated grace was not part of his musical language. On the contrary, we see in his examples (fig.8.1) the inclusion of single descending semiquaver graces which, unlike the others, are not ‘realised’ in their true value in the line below, thus clearly suggesting a pre-beat execution. Whilst the important Italian

² In his violin method of 1761 (the first substantial French violin method to be published), L’Abbé le Fils describes, however, both an onbeat and prebeat coulé. The onbeat grace (coulé soutenus) to be used when preceding a weak note, accompanied by a dynamic accent (>) on the appoggiatura. The anticipated grace was used when approaching an accented principal note. It is plausible of course, that the inclusion of a sustained onbeat descending appoggiatura is simply a reflection of the strong Italian influence that had reached France by the mid-eighteenth century seen, not least, in the appearance of a French violin method. [Principes du violon, (Paris, 1761); facs. cd. (Paris; Aristide Wirsta, 1961)].
violin treatises of Geminiani (1687-1762) and Tartini (1692-1770) extensively explain the ascending and descending long appoggiatura, they also include in their discussions certain contexts in which an anticipated grace would be more suitable. These contexts are discussed in the following paragraphs.

We note in figure 8.1 that the distinction between an intended long onbeat appoggiatura and a short prebeat execution is made remarkably clear through the manner of notation: a small note written with a crotchet value preceding a dotted minum or semibreve clearly indicates a long accented appoggiatura, whose proper execution is seen in the line below. In contrast, we have already noted the semiquaver notation of the intended anticipated graces which, significantly, precede principal notes of much shorter value. Thus there is no confusion as to the intended execution of Mahaut’s graces notated in this way.

In comparison, however, the notation of abundant one-note graces found throughout Mahaut’s concerti is much less helpful with regard to indicating their intended execution. With just three exceptions, all such graces have been written in a uniform quaver value. In addition, their musical contexts reveal without a doubt that such notation might represent any intended performance, be it onbeat or prebeat, long or short. Thus we can conclude already that, at the time of writing his concerti, Mahaut remained uninfluenced by those composers at the forefront of the German galant style, known as the Berlin school. I refer
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4 Tartini, Giuseppe. *Regole per arrivare a saper ben suonar il violino* (c. 1750); facs. as supplement to German; French and English publication: *Traité des agréments*, ed. Erwin R. Jacobi (Celle and New York, 1961).
principally to the effort by C.P.E. Bach and his followers to establish, around 1750, a more exact metrical notation of the *long* appoggiatura symbol.

Mahaut's usage was more likely to have been influenced both by his early French musical education and his later exposure in Amsterdam to the popular violin concerti of the Italians. Whilst we see the single quaver grace as the most common notation in French music in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, it remained fundamentally adequate in that the variable length of the onbeat appoggiatura was not yet a prominent issue. Frederick Neumann suggests that this in itself points to the essential shortness of the older style.⁵ These unmetrical quaver-notes, assumed to have been adopted by Italian composers around 1710 (none are to be found amongst works of major composers before 1710), appeared in Vivaldi's vocal works after 1720 and in his concerti from Opus 8. Like Tartini, Vivaldi's notation was limited mostly to the use of the little quaver and, like those found in Mahaut's music, might represent anything from the prebeat to the *long* onbeat appoggiatura. The notation, however, varied amongst composers and from work to work. Significantly we note an effort by some to use a notation that is more or less proportional to the principal note it precedes. Two examples are seen in the following similar relationships, suggested by Frederick Neumann to have been used by Caldara and G.B. Sammartini: ⁶

![Musical notation examples](image)


Unlike the Berlin school, the proportional values of these graces were not intended to be literal. This can be concluded from the frequent simultaneous use of unequal value notations, clearly intended to represent a synchronised execution (fig.8.2). Although admittedly less sophisticated, we might draw a parallel to the relationships used by Mahaut in his *Méthode* where a crotchet notation preceded the larger dotted minum and semibreve principals, while a semiquaver grace preceded a descending semiquaver scale. We also note the occasional use by other Italians of a semiquaver or demi-semiquaver notation to suggest a brief or prebeat execution in the same way that it is suggested by Mahaut’s example.

In this light we might view the three isolated occurrences of a semiquaver grace in Mahaut’s concerti. In the tenth concerto of the Stockholm collection we find such a notation preceding two syncopated figures (fig.8.3a and 8.3b). Again we note the short value of the principals, particularly in figure 8.3a, which reflects the relationships discussed above. In addition, musical logic demands that the grace be executed before the beat to avoid the disturbance of the following syncopated line that would surely result from an onbeat execution of the grace.

In figure 8.3c, from the first D major concerto of the Karlsruhe collection, we find an ascending and disjunct example where the semiquaver grace precedes a much larger principal. Here the grace is consonant with the bass and if placed on the beat would produce a rhythm not unlike and, as such fall in line with the ‘onbeat’ doctrine of the Berlin school (advocated principally by C.P.E. Bach) which will be discussed in greater detail later in this section. As we have seen previously, however, Mahaut frequently used an almost identical rhythm ( ) in numerous melodic designs throughout the concerti and indeed throughout all his compositions. In this light we might conclude an intended
difference between a semiquaver grace and a written out lombard-style rhythm. This, together with the large leap between grace and principal and the semiquaver notation itself, strongly implies, contrary to the Berlin school, a prebeat execution in which the grace fulfils only a melodic/rhythmic function.

This is supported by theoretical and musical evidence found amongst the popular Italian works, undoubtedly a much greater influence upon Mahaut than that of the Berlin school. Significantly, the major instrumental Italian theoretical works, that of Geminiani and Tartini, present only two contrasting types of one-note grace: the short prebeat execution and the long onbeat one of variable length. Importantly, they do not mention an invariably short onbeat interpretation. Francesco Geminiani, student of Corelli, who later resided in England as a well-known violinist-composer, stated that the short appoggiatura can be used on any note, thus excluding any onbeat harmonic function. In his music he frequently used a semiquaver or demi-semiquaver notation to indicate the short grace. That these were intended to be anticipated, before the beat, can be seen in an example from his violin treatise (fig. 8.4a). Here the grace appears in the same movement with accented lombard-style rhythms written in regular notation. Just as we saw in Mahaut’s notation, this must surely imply an intended difference between the two figures. Likewise, we find in Handel, whose ornamentation is strongly influenced by the Italians, the use of semiquaver notation to indicate a very short grace and, at the same time, an intended difference between and , pointing again to an anticipated interpretation.

With regard to the short appoggiatura (appoggiatura brève) and in a context similar to Mahaut’s grace in figure 8.3c, Tartini writes, in his treatise dealing exclusively with ornamentation, that the longer the principal note, the faster the grace will be. For example,
before minims, he says, the grace “must be done so fast that it is almost unnoticeable”. That Tartini’s short appoggiatura is an anticipated grace can be concluded from his following description, given much greater clarity than that by Geminiani. He talks first of its ‘fleeting’ nature and then states:

... these Vorschlage must be done quickly in such a manner that the [principal] note is always stronger than the Vorschlag and therefore the emphasis of the bowing or of the voice must always fall directly on the parent note, not at all on the Vorschlag.

Thus the accent falls on the principal note rather than on the grace.

That these Italian practices were amongst those adopted by the ‘modern’ Germans at the beginning of the galant style is evident from the music of a number of such composers. Whilst the ornamental tables of Theophil Muffat (1690-1770), son of Georg Muffat, reflects the rigidly applied onbeat patterns later taken up by C.P.E. Bach in Berlin, his examples suggest that this onbeat interpretation was not without exception, occasionally introducing a semiquaver notation in contexts that clearly imply anticipation. Likewise, musical examples in the 1738 treatise of the Italian-trained Freiburg organist, Franz Anton Maichelbeck (1702-1750), suggest anticipation of the semiquaver graces. Further examples preceding a principal of semiquaver value are found in the work of Johann Stamitz (1717-1757) (fig.8.4b) which are unmistakably prebeat.

7 Tartini, G. Regole (c.1750), facs.ed., p.7 [‘que appena si senta’].
9 Muffat, Gottlieb Theophil. Componimenti musicali per il cembalo (Augsburg, c.1736); modern ed. DTÖ, vol.III, No.3 (1896).
As a court composer to Frederick the Great, the Italian-learnt practices of Carl Heinrich Graun (1703-1759) would have had a significant influence on the emerging ornamental practices of the Berlin school, including his use of proportional notation between grace and principal:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\ding{120}} \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{\ding{121}} \\
\text{\ding{121}} \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{\ding{120}} \\
\text{\ding{120}} \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{\ding{121}} \\
\text{\ding{121}} \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{\ding{120}} \\
\text{\ding{120}} \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{\ding{121}}
\end{align*}
\]

We also note his use of a semiquaver notation strongly implying anticipation. Just as we have seen the fondness for written out lombard rhythms in Mahaut's concerti, and likewise in Handel and Geminiani, we note the necessity in Graun's music to distinguish between \( \text{\ding{120}} \) and \( \text{\ding{121}} \). Many contexts also suggest a prebeat execution when the grace precedes an already written out appoggiatura.

Finally here, we look briefly at one of the three great German treatises, that of Leopold Mozart (1717-1787), published in 1756 shortly after those of Quantz and C.P.E. Bach. Whilst in many aspects Mozart's work reflects the ideas laid out by C.P.E. Bach, this is not the case with regard to ornamentation. In this, he is closer to Quantz but, more significantly, to the Italian practices of Tartini, on whose work he bases much of his ornamental instruction, which includes reproducing many of Tartini's musical examples. Important to our discussion here is Mozart's use of a semiquaver notation to indicate a clearly anticipated grace. These he uses to illustrate a prebeat execution preceding descending thirds and in a series of minims (fig.8.4c). He talks too, of other contexts which will be discussed shortly. Once again the prebeat nature of his short or 'passing' appoggiatura is inherent in his description:
Now there be also short appoggiature with which the stress falls not on the appoggiatura but on the principal note. The short appoggiatura is made as rapidly as possible and is not attacked strongly, but quite softly.\textsuperscript{11}

We must note, however, that Mozart also states (in his discussion of the \textit{long} appoggiatura which he describes as having one-half the value of the principal note) that it is possible to interpret a semiquaver grace as a \textit{long} onbeat appoggiatura. This pre-supposes that the principal note is of quaver value and that the context allows an onbeat execution (fig. 8.4d).

The well-known theoretical work of Johann Joachim Quantz, emerging also from the Berlin court of Frederick the Great, likewise stands apart from that of C.P.E. Bach in a number of factors, not least in the treatment of the short appoggiatura. Like the Italians, Quantz speaks only of the \textit{long} onbeat and a short anticipated execution, and likewise essentially limits his notation to the use of a quaver-grace, whilst specifying a semiquaver notation only for a very short grace. With the exception of one specific context,\textsuperscript{12} he does not speak of the short onbeat interpretation of C.P.E. Bach. Quantz’s discussion, however, is not at all systematic. Scattered as it is across a number of chapters, his comments are better discussed in greater depth with regard to their relevance in interpreting Mahaut’s numerous quaver-note graces in the following chapters.

It now remains to look at Mahaut’s usage of the quaver-note grace in the concerti, essentially to establish a probable intended placement and length within certain musical

\textsuperscript{11} Mozart, L. \textit{Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule} (Augsburg, 1756); Eng. trans. E. Knocker (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), chap. 9, par.9, p.171.

\textsuperscript{12} Between two or more long repeated notes, Quantz states that appoggiatura should be performed: “very briefly, tipped in place of the principal notes on the beat.” [\textit{Versuch} (1752), chap.VIII, par.2, p.92] See table VI in fig.8.4e.
contexts. The discussion is divided into descending and ascending graces for, as we shall see, these may have been treated in a slightly different manner.

The Onbeat, Descending Grace

The large majority of written quaver-note graces in Mahaut’s concerti are undoubtedly associated with trills, cadences and places in which the introduction of dissonance enhances the musical expression. In this context, therefore, the intention is unmistakably of an onbeat, accented and long appoggiatura whose execution was laid out by Mahaut in his Méthode. A product of the emerging galant style, the frequent long and overlong appoggiatura relieved the monotony of consonance and enriched the simplistic melodic lines resulting from the rejection of complex baroque polyphonic textures in favour of more homophonic melodic ideals. This function is spelt out by Quantz in his Versuch:

Without appoggiaturas a melody would often sound very meagre and plain. If it is to have a galant air, it must contain more consonances than dissonances; but if many of the former occur in succession, and several rapid notes are followed by a long one that is also a consonance, the ear may easily be wearied of them. Hence dissonances must be used from time to time to rouse the ear and in this connection, appoggiaturas can be of considerable assistance...  

Although the length and notation of the long appoggiatura reached its height of standardisation in the Berlin court of Frederick the Great, the indication of its Italian origin can be found in the Italian treatises of Geminiani and Tartini. The works of both masters outline the well understood principles regarding the variable length of this onbeat ornament.

13 Quantz, Versuch, chap.VIII, par.1, p.91.
In Tartini, we find the explanation for their necessary ornamental rather than regular notation:

as a regular note the first eighth would carry the normal metrical accent and be in need of a short trill to further underline it; as an appoggiatura it should start softly, then swell and diminish before it falls onto the main note.\(^\text{14}\)

Thus it was fundamentally a method of indicating the appropriate and expressive manner of execution for a dissonance and its resolution, and was echoed by Geminiani: “[the superior appoggiatura] is supposed to express love, affection, pleasure etc. It should be made pretty long, giving it more than half the length of the note it belongs to, observing to swell the Sound by Degrees and toward the End to force the Bow a little”.\(^\text{15}\) The same principle is found in the German works of Leopold Mozart who, as we have seen, reflects much of Tartini’s Italian ornamental practices, and that of Quantz. The latter acknowledges the Italian origin of this execution and explains:

Appoggiaturas must be tipped gently with the tongue, allowing them to swell in volume if time permits; the following notes are slurred a little more softly. This type of embellishment is called the Abzug; it originated with the Italians.\(^\text{16}\)

We have already noted that, like the Italians and indeed Mahaut, Quantz uses principally a quaver-note notation for the appoggiatura and did not adopt the Berlin fashion of indicating its exact length. It is interesting, too, that the Mahaut concerti belonging to the German Karlsruhe and Regensburg collections, known to have been copied by the respective court musicians, also maintain the flexible quaver-note notation. We might surmise that their

\(^{14}\)Tartini, G. Regole, (c.1750); translation of excerpt by Frederick Neumann, Ornamentation, p.174.

\(^{15}\)Geminiani, F. Prefaces to The Art (1751) and Treatise of Good Taste (1749).

\(^{16}\)Quantz, J. Versuch (1752), chap.VIII, par.4, p.93.
geographical distance from Berlin left them unaffected by the current fashion (not inconceivable since Quantz, after all, maintained his own Italian-influenced practice despite living and working within the Berlin court itself), or perhaps this notation resulted simply from the precise copying of that already written by Mahaut. After some consideration, however, the latter would seem to be the least plausible possibility. After examining the two manuscripts of the only concerto to be duplicated between collections (Brussels D major), it is apparent from the number of additional graces added to the copied manuscript (Stockholm No.13) that such copying was not always literal with regard to ornamentation, and may have been approached with considerable freedom.

Thus we need to consider graces notated in those concerti known not to be in Mahaut’s hand, not only with Mahaut himself in mind but also with the ‘style’ of and influences upon the copyist. With regard to the German collections, we can safely assume a strong galant influence but one which clearly did not embrace some of the more ‘modern’ practices of C.P.E. Bach and his followers.

We might now look more closely at Mahaut’s usage within the concerti. Throughout all the collections it is apparent that a long onbeat appoggiatura is undoubtedly demanded whenever the grace precedes a principal value of more than one beat: preceding $\downarrow$ in a fast four, $\downarrow$ in a fast triple quaver signature (i.e. 3/8) and $\downarrow$ in an Adagio counted in eight. There are a number of exceptions, including some with a principal value of only one beat although these are rare in comparison. In addition, we have already seen the semiquaver grace notated before a triple principal value, clearly indicating its difference in performance by nature of its notation.
The fundamentally long appoggiatura appears typically within three musical contexts: (i) the cadential trill, (2) as an expressive phrase ending, and (3) as part of a melodic line.

(i) the cadential trill, examples of which are seen in figure 8.5. Note, in figure 8.5a(i), that the dissonance is not felt unless the appoggiatura is performed long, as a crotchet value. Similarly in figure 8.5b, the appoggiatura must be made overlong in order to avoid a semitone clash with the first violin. The solo flute grace in figure 8.5c(v) creates an expressive approach to the cadence if made overlong, where it is strongly dissonant with the basso continuo in this sparse texture. Undoubtedly an additional appoggiatura is expected, but left unnotated, preceding the trilled note itself.

In contrast, the descending grace in figure 8.5c(vi) suggests the addition of a trill which may have been assumed, and as such the appoggiatura must be performed long. A striking feature to be highlighted by these examples is the relatively small number of major cadences throughout the concerti to be notated with its customary appoggiatura. As we saw in figure 8.5c(v), we might assume that they were omitted as an unnecessary notation, automatically expected in the execution of the trill. An example can be seen in figure 8.5c(vii). Here the trill is notated with its preceding appoggiatura, but in the duplicate of this concerto (Brussels D major), the same trill remains without such a marking, but which can be ‘understood’ by the trill itself.

Having pointed out the rather small number of major cadences to be notated ‘completely’, with respect to the appoggiatura, there are in contrast, a greater number of shorter cadence trills which are more consistently notated with their preceding grace. In these, several factors suggest that the length of the appoggiatura is perhaps more variable than the black
and white ‘formula’ applied to the longer cadences discussed above. Here, in the light of the shorter principal, a long or overlong execution of the appoggiatura would severely limit the time allowed for the trill itself. This is seen in figure 8.6a(i), where the ornament is more naturally performed with a shorter appoggiatura than the ‘rule’ would suggest, allowing the trill sufficient space to pause before anticipating the following chord and thus, maintaining the clarity of the ornamentation. This is particularly important when we note that the trill is doubled a third below by the first violin. Likewise, for an almost identical figure (fig.8.6a(ii)), the slightly shorter performance of the appoggiatura becomes even more crucial due to the faster Allegro tempo, allowing sufficient ‘pause’ before the tutti entrance. This is a reflection of Tartini’s restriction of the long appoggiatura to slower movements in order to avoid a loss of brilliance (here caused by a shortened trill).

In figure 8.6b(i), we find, rather unusually, that the trilled principal is actually the dissonant note (i.e. a seventh). The appoggiatura itself is consonant with the bass and it therefore serves no purpose to give it a long execution. On the contrary, the more time we allow the principal, the more the dissonance and its resolution is felt. We must choose, therefore, between a prebeat or a shorter-than-usual onbeat execution of the grace. In this context I would suggest a preference for the latter interpretation as the descending leap preceding the cadence would make an anticipated performance rather uncomfortable. Whilst the appoggiature in the following three rhythmically similar examples (fig.8.6b(ii-iv)) remain dissonant against the bass, their placement on the weakest part of the bar again makes a shorter execution work better in these contexts. Significantly, Tartini, among others, restricts the long appoggiature to the heavy beat.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, the long execution in a

\textsuperscript{17} Tartini, G. \textit{Regole} (c.1750), facs.ed., p.5.
repeated sequential motive such as figure 8.6b(iv), would soon become monotonous, tiring the ear and thus, hindering its ‘effect’.

Figures 8.6c(i and ii) show us two examples where the appoggiatura precedes a longer principal, which one might otherwise interpret with an overlong execution (\[\text{\texttt{\textbackslash greeksmallthe}}\text{\textbackslash i\textbackslash greeklettertheta}}\espace\text{\textbackslash tr}\]) according to the ‘rule’. With such an interpretation, however, the trill itself becomes very short and rushed, sacrificing much of its brilliance to the dissonance of the appoggiatura. This dissonance, struck on the beat, is of course a necessary element, but sits more naturally if shortened to a quaver value (\[\text{\texttt{\textbackslash greeksmallthe}}\text{\textbackslash i\textbackslash greeklettertheta}}\espace\text{\textbackslash tr}\]), allowing the trill itself more ‘space’.

What we have seen, with regard to a more variable length of onbeat appoggiature than ‘the rules’ might suggest, is principally, if not solely, found in a context preceding a trill (or where a trill might be implied), thus allowing a certain ‘breathing space’ for the trill itself. It is not, however, the onbeat appoggiatura that remains invariably short and described by C.P.E. Bach in preference to the anticipated grace.

(ii) As an expressive phrase ending, shaped by the accent and decrescendo essential to the performance of the long appoggiatura. The examples seen in figure 8.7a illustrate the expected long and overlong execution preceding a principal of more than one beat, whilst we note, that those in figure 8.7b precede shorter values. That these are still intended as long appoggiaturas can be seen by their musical context. The phrase ending in figure 8.7b(i) appears frequently throughout the movement following, in each case, a cadential trill, thus delaying the latter’s resolution. In an Adagio this appoggiatura is better placed long, on the beat, thus reaping its expressive potential rather than functioning simply as a ‘rhythmic’ suffix to the trill (i.e. \[\text{\texttt{\textbackslash greeksmallthe}}\text{\textbackslash i\textbackslash greeklettertheta}}\espace\text{\textbackslash tr}\}). Whilst no trill is present in figure 8.7b(ii), the
appoggiatura, if made long, serves to delay the resolution of the preceding suspension. Again, if it were to be anticipated the expressive potential is lost. The long onbeat interpretation is, in fact, written out later in the movement (fig.8.7b(iii)) where the appoggiatura is tied to the preceding minim. In a similar context, a probable overlong execution can be seen in figure 8.7b(iv).

(iii) As part of a melodic line, where the dissonance and resolution of the appoggiatura considerably enhances the expressive quality of the melody. These graces appear frequently as 'probable' overlong appoggiatura, resulting from dotted-value principal notes as seen in figure 8.8a. Such an execution in figure 8.8a(ii) is clearly required in order for its dissonance to have an effect against the harmony. Similarly, the potential expressive dissonance of the overlong appoggiatura against the basso continuo is favourable in the sparser two-part texture of figures 8.8a(iii-v).\(^{18}\)

A longer dotted principal value can be seen in figure 8.8a(vi). Here the appoggiatura effectively highlights the dissonant note in this descending line (a function also served by the tied suspension across the bar-line which could not be written as an appoggiatura), thus "describing" the intended expressive manner of execution through the notation. This visual identification of the dissonant element (thus implying its long execution) is an essential element of many solo melodic lines, particularly those forming descending lines or sequences, illustrated by examples in figure 8.8b. In the second bar of figure 8.8b(i), the consonance of the principal notes welcomes the onbeat dissonance created by the long execution of the appoggiatura, greatly increasing its expressiveness in this Adagio

---

\(^{18}\) Similar examples of the context seen in fig.8.8a (iv) and (v) are also frequently found in the third movement (Allegro) of the fifth Stockholm concerto.
movement. This interpretation also serves to maintain the smoothness and continuity of the descending line which would be disturbed by a shorter execution either before or on the beat. We will see in the following paragraphs that there is a strong argument in these concerti for the anticipation of graces between equal principals that descend in thirds. In the light of the discussion above, however, such an execution is unlikely to be intended here, particularly when we note that the first appoggiatura does not fall between descending thirds and it would be illogical to perform each in a different manner.

Likewise, the harmonic accents created in figure 8.8b(ii) by a long interpretation of the appoggiature, heightens the expressive potential of the smooth melodic line which would again be disturbed by a prebeat execution. Note that the last appoggiatura completing the phrase in bar 72 precedes not a crotchet but a minim. In the previous phrase (bar 67-8), the same appoggiatura was written out in crotchets, clearly illustrating the intended long execution.

A particularly frequent sequential figure appearing in all collections of Mahaut's concerti is that illustrated in figure 8.8c(i and ii), together with a slight variation seen in figure 8.8c(iii). Here again, the grace identifies the dissonant element in the figure and works well as an onbeat long appoggiatura. With regard to the first two in particular, the speed of the preceding figure makes a prebeat execution of the appoggiatura uncomfortable and does not work well in a sequential repetition.
The Prebeat, Descending Grace

Thus we have seen, in a number of contexts, the probable implied long and overlong interpretation of appoggiature preceding principal values usually in excess of one beat. It becomes clear in contrast that an intended short execution can generally be concluded when the principal is of smaller value, most commonly that of a quaver or less. The significant question, however, is one of placement: onbeat or prebeat? We noted previously that the Italian and French models of the galant era demonstrated only the use of an anticipated short grace (such a grace having originated in France). In Germany (by which we mean principally the Berlin court of Frederick the Great), which became the forefront of the galant style, it was possible to draw a line separating Quantz and Leopold Mozart (who both tended to reflect Italian/French models with regard to the appoggiatura) from C.P.E. Bach, Agricola and Marpurg, advocates of the inflexible onbeat doctrine (whose music nevertheless often demonstrates otherwise, with the possible exception of C.P.E. Bach). We shall observe, however, in the following discussion that within Mahaut's concerti the many and varied contexts in which a short appoggiatura is implied reveals a strong bias towards anticipation in line with French and Italian models, thus strengthening the relevance of Quantz's writing with regard to ornamentation.

In many contexts the strong implication of an anticipated appoggiatura results from the incompatibility of an onbeat execution. The simplest example, already briefly mentioned, is the short value of the principal (a demi-semiquaver is not uncommon) which would be incongruous with either a long or short onbeat appoggiatura. Such examples can be seen in figure 8.9a. Those in the second figure of this example also invite a short trill on the principals, even demanded perhaps by the written out suffixes. At this tempo clearly the
value of the principal could not support both an onbeat appoggiatura and a trill, forcing the grace to be anticipated. The third example, which we have already met with before regarding the semiquaver notation of the grace, implies anticipation not only by such notation, but by the obvious and unfavourable disturbance that an onbeat placement would cause in the syncopation.

In previous chapters we have discovered that Mahaut, like innumerable Italians, was extremely fond of lombardic rhythms. A great variety of these patterns, from the simplest \( \text{\textit{OFý}} \) to \( \text{\textit{107}} \) and \( \text{\textit{? Tý}} \), are found meticulously notated throughout the concerti. In addition they are often, but not always, preceded by a grace as we see in figure 8.9b(i-iv). That these figures negate an onbeat execution of the grace is obvious whilst, on the contrary, anticipation preserves the rhythmic identity of the carefully written lombardic rhythms. We notice in figure 8.9b(iv) that the first such figure forms what could be described as a mordent. This is perhaps the most common lombardic rhythm to be preceded by an appoggiatura, and is true not only of Mahaut’s work but of the Italians in general. The latter in fact had no symbol for the mordent until much later in the century,\(^{19}\) and thus the melodic/rhythmic formula: \( \text{\textit{P.}} \) appears so frequently in their work that it takes on the characteristics of a standard ornamental figure whose execution is immediately understood. Further examples are seen in figure 8.9c. That this understood execution includes the characteristic anticipation of the appoggiatura, concluded in the context of other lombardic rhythms (fig.8.9b), can be likewise surmised from the abundant examples to be found in Vivaldi, Tartini and Locatelli, to name just a few.\(^{20}\) It is also inherent in Tartini’s

---

\(^{19}\) Frederick Neumann suggests that the French keyboard symbol \( \text{\textit{A[V}} \) did not appear in Italian music until c.1775 [Neumann, F. *Ornamentation*, p.166].

\(^{20}\) For further comments and examples see Neumann, F. *Ornamentation*, p.167.
instructions with regard to this figure: whenever tempo and time permit, the accent on the principal is enhanced by the addition of a trill:

Again this is understood from the ‘formula’, whether or not it is marked with a trill.\(^{21}\) Note that only figures 8.9c(iv and v) are notated in this way, significantly where the mordent is less crushed.\(^{22}\)

A further commonly found grace preceding a short principal is an interbeat placement where the principal is, by nature, ‘weak’, thus excluding the accented, dissonant effect of delaying the consonance with an onbeat appoggiatura. The most frequent context is that seen in figure 8.10a and 8.10b, where an onbeat execution of the grace would unfavourably interrupt the sextuplet rhythm. Likewise, the essential weakness of the principal quaver in figure 8.10c makes an accented appoggiatura absurd.\(^{23}\)

As a contributing factor in excluding an onbeat appoggiatura from a particular context, we have already seen in a number of previous examples the need to avoid disturbing a prominent rhythmic feature. I speak of the syncopated line in figure 8.9a(iii), the lombardic examples of figures 8.9b and 8.9c and the sextuplets seen above in figures 8.10a and 8.10b.

---

\(^{21}\) Only a brief mention of this ornamental figure appears in Quantz’s Versuch (found amongst his discussion regarding ripieno violinists). Whilst the semiquaver notation of the appoggiatura implies a very short grace, his comments, however, remain ambiguous as to its actual prebeat or onbeat placement, stating only that the figure must be played “very quickly and precipitately to the last note in a single bow stroke” [Versuch, chap.XVII, sect.III, par.24, p.230)]. See fig.8.9c(vi).

\(^{22}\) The implied trill associated with these figures is discussed in greater detail in the later section regarding The Interpretation and Execution of the Trill.

\(^{23}\) The triplet context is specifically illustrated in Quantz’s Versuch, along with numerous other possibilities in his discussion of Extempore Variations on Simple Intervals. The realisations given for suggested interbeat appoggiaturas similar to figure 8.10c above, likewise show unmistakably, a prebeat intention.[Versuch, chap.XIII, par.30, pp.153-4)].
In all these, their distinctive rhythmic character would be distorted by an onbeat execution of the grace. Likewise, in figure 8.11a, whilst a long appoggiatura is clearly not at all applicable, an accented short grace would alter the prominent and repetitive dotted rhythm. Although this passage is sequential the grace appears only once, significantly adding emphasis to the highest point in the solo figuration. Other identically placed dotted figures remain unornamented, strongly negating an intended rhythmic distortion in bar 37. With regard to rhythmic alteration we have previously discussed the ‘softening’ effect that the lilting sextuplet accompaniment would have on the solo dotted figures preceding the grace. In doing so, they effectively allow room for a more natural prebeat execution of the appoggiatura.

In line with this discussion of ‘non-interference’, we might also consider the distorting effect of an onbeat execution upon notes of equal length in which the ‘evenness’ of the passage might be an important consideration. This principle is given plainly by Tartini, which he applies to any note values in any tempo."

Thus the smooth and even lines of the passages in figure 8.11b would be unfavourably disrupted by an onbeat grace. In the second example, an accented dissonance on the first beat of the bar is, on the other hand, rather pleasing, and in some minds may excuse a disturbance of the smooth line. In figure 8.11b(iii), clearly an onbeat execution would again hinder the smoothness of the descending quaver sequence. Here, in addition, two other

---

24 Tartini, G. Regole (c.1750), facs.ed., p.5. Quantz, however, adds a slight variant to this principle in the context of long repeated notes. Here he says, they should be performed “very briefly, tipped in place of the principal notes on the beat.” Thus making this his only acknowledgement of a short onbeat appoggiatura. This is, however, hardly a significant contradiction of Tartini’s principle in that, Quantz is clearly referring principally to a context of repeated notes; not necessarily of equal length; his own example including both crotchets and minims. [Versuch, chap.VIII, par.2, p.92].
factors strongly suggest anticipation. The Brussels manuscript (probably the original) of this Stockholm duplicate remains unadorned with such graces. Thus, in the light of the significant harmonic and melodic differences that an onbeat execution would make, it is unlikely that such was intended. In addition, the frequency and repetitiveness of the graces would tend to negate an onbeat interpretation which would only become monotonous and heavy and in complete contradiction to the gigue-like character of the movement.

The reverse to this, of course, can be seen in figure 8.11b(iv), where the flow of the descending thematic line would be greatly upset by a consistent short (onbeat or prebeat) interpretation of the graces, and likewise their frequency would tire the ear. A consistent long execution, however, lacks the brilliance required for this lively movement, rendering the line too smooth. Perhaps a happy compromise is to execute those appoggiatura preceding a crotchet as long, whilst anticipating the grace preceding the shorter quaver value, thereby 'lifting' the rhythmic energy of the phrase. This interpretation also supports our thoughts regarding the anticipation of graces preceding principals of smaller values.

Finally in this discussion, we must recognise the need to maintain distinctions between different rhythmic patterns which may become blurred with an ill-considered ornamental execution. In figure 8.11c, for example, only an anticipated grace will leave intact the rhythmic contrast between the two figures at the beginning of the second and third bar. In addition, since Mahaut frequently and meticulously wrote out such onbeat lombardic rhythms as in the second figure, logic demands that a different interpretation was intended by the first.
This ideal of non-interference is equally applicable to contexts in which the grace precedes an already written out appoggiatura. Clearly an onbeat execution of the grace would destroy the function and ‘effect’ of the written appoggiatura, possibly even replacing it with a consonance. Once again, the correct, undoubtedly prebeat, interpretation of the grace in examples such as figures 8.12a(i) and (ii) is described by Quantz (see fig.8.12b(i-ii):

Often two appoggiaturas are also found before a note, the first marked with a small note, but the second by a note reckoned as part of the beat; they occur at ceasuras [see fig.8.12b(i)]. Here the little note is again tipped briefly, and reckoned in the time of the previous note in the upbeat. Thus the notes in fig.9 [see fig.8.12b(i)] are played as illustrated in fig.10 [see fig.8.12b(ii)].

Likewise, Leopold Mozart implies that the understanding of this essential execution is fundamental. This is apparent in his reasoning against notating appoggiaturas in real-time:

It is true that all the descending appoggiature could be set down in large print and divided up within the bar. But if a violinist who knows not that the appoggiatura is written out, or who is already accustomed to befrill every note, happens on such, how will it fare with melody as well as with harmony? I will wager that such a violinist will add yet another long appoggiatura . . . which can surely never sound natural but only exaggerated and confused. It is a great pity that beginners acquire this fault so readily.

Whilst the principal in figure 8.12c is not an appoggiatura created by a suspension as in the first two examples, it is, however dissonant with the bass, resolving by descent to the consonance that follows. If the grace that precedes the written appoggiatura was to be
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25 Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap. VIII, par.6, p.94. The same ‘rule’ can be found later in the well-known flute treatise of Johann George Tromlitz [Ausführlicher und gründlicher Unterricht, die Flöte zu spielen (Leipzig, 1791), chap.10, par.15, Eng. trans., Ardal Powell as The Virtuoso Flute Player (Cambridge University Press, 1991), p.222]. Although appearing towards the end of the century, Tromlitz relies greatly on the German galant treatises for his discussions, particularly on Quantz and Leopold Mozart.

26 Mozart, L. Versuch (1756), chap.9, par.3, pp.167-8.
placed on the beat, not only would it alter the 'written' dissonance, but replace it with another (i.e. 'A' against 'A-sharp' in the bass) that would fail to resolve. Thus an anticipated grace can be the only possible intention.

In addition, we might also add the obvious need to avoid parallel fourths, fifths and octaves which may be created by the long onbeat execution of an appoggiatura, such as that seen in figure 8.12d. Here a long onbeat placement produces undesirable parallel fourths with the bass. The grace must, therefore, be anticipated or given a very short onbeat value such as . In the light of the conspicuous absence of any implication so far of an intended invariably-short onbeat interpretation, it was most likely a prebeat performance that was expected here.

We shall see, in the following discussion, that this was also true with regard to two other musical contexts which were hotly debated throughout the second half of the eighteenth century. We find in Mahaut's concerti an abundance of appoggiature falling between descending thirds of equal value, and those preceding the rhythmic/melodic figure . It is in these two figures that the controversy between an onbeat and prebeat execution of the grace, that not only confuses us today but raged within the Berlin galant school itself, is most clearly seen. We have mentioned previously that the descending appoggiatura in French music of the first part of the eighteenth century was predominantly an anticipated one. This goes back to the earlier French gambists, flautists and theorists of the seventeenth century, including Marin Marais, Loulié (1696), L'Affilard (1696/97), Montéclair (1709/36) and the flautists de La Barre and Hotteterre. Confirmation of this can
be seen in de La Barre’s and L’Affilard’s pre-bar notation and in Hotteterre’s flute treatise, whose examples clearly show anticipation and in which he comments that such are rarely used except in descending thirds. Later Michel Corrette (1709-1795) refers to the coulé (descending appoggiatura) in his vocal treatise as a “small inflection of the voice,” again appearing between descending thirds. His ‘small-note’ notation underlies their passing, unstressed nature and are thus clearly anticipated.

That the fundamental anticipation of graces between descending thirds in French music continued past the mid-eighteenth century can be seen in an almost plagiarised version of L’Affilard’s instructions by the well known musician/composer, Villeneuve, in his treatise of 1733, later republished in 1756 shortly after a second edition of L’Affilard’s treatise itself in 1747. Likewise, the prebeat execution of the coulé is given in Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s musical dictionary of 1768. Thus it is apparent that whilst a number of French musical works and treatises reflected the growing galant fashion for the onbeat, sustained and

---


Loulid describes the coulé as “an inflection of the voice from a small or weak or short tone, to a longer or stronger one” and again his illustrations are consistent in their anticipation of the appoggiatura [Éléments ou principes de musique, (Paris, 1696); Eng.trans. Albert Cohen (New York, 1965), p.66]. Likewise, the same principle is seen in Montéclair’s description as “an ornament that sweetens the melody and smoothens it through the linking of sounds” [Principes de musique (Paris, 1709 and 1736), p.78]. For further discussion of the seventeenth and eighteenth century French sources with respect to the descending appoggiatura, see Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation*, pp.58-91.


The anticipation of graces between descending thirds is clearly seen in his description: “the coulé is done by descending three notes and passing through the one in the middle gracefully and lightly” [trans. given by Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation*, p.85].

strongly expressive appoggiatura, the short grace falling frequently between descending thirds remained largely anticipated.

We have likewise noted previously the French origin of the Italian adoption of the one-note grace and, more significantly, their acknowledgement and apparent practice of only two types of execution, the long onbeat and the short anticipated grace, omitting entirely any mention of a short onbeat interpretation. The fundamental French nature of these anticipated graces is given strong testimony by Quantz. Whilst it is true that much of his treatment of the short appoggiatura in his Versuch is unsystematic and at times ambiguous, on this point his discussion is clear and unconfused. His first comments appear, not surprisingly, in his discussion "Of the Appoggiatura and the Little Essential Graces Related to Them", and concern solely the passing appoggiatura between descending thirds (see fig. 8.12e(i-iv)):

Passing appoggiaturas occur when several notes of the same value descend in leaps of thirds (see fig. 5). When performed they are expressed as illustrated in fig. 6. The dots are lengthened, and the notes on which the slurs begin, that is, the second, fourth and sixth, are tipped. Notes of this kind must not be confused with those in which a dot appears after the second and which express almost the same melody (see fig. 7). In this figure, the second, fourth and following short notes fall on the downbeat, as dissonances against the bass; when performed they are executed boldly and briskly, while the appoggiaturas discussed here require on the contrary, a flattering expression. Were the little notes in fig. 5 lengthened, and tipped in the time of the principal notes, the melody would be completely altered and would sound as illustrated in fig. 8. But this would be opposed to the French style of playing, to which these appoggiaturas owe their origin, hence to the intention of their inventors who have met with almost universal approbation in this regard. 32

32 Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap. VIII, par. 6, pp. 93-4.
Thus Quantz specifically excludes both a short onbeat and a long onbeat execution. A second, although similar discussion, appears later with regard to the duties of the ripieno violinists. Here he includes our second musical figure as a typically French model and again talks of their French origin (see fig. 8.12f(i-iv)):

Short appoggiaturas, among which those between descending thirds are reckoned, must be touched very briefly and softly, as though, so to speak, only in passing. For example, those in fig. 36 and 37, must not be held, especially in a slow tempo, otherwise they will sound as if they are expressed with regular notes as to be seen in figs. 38 and 39. This however, would be contrary not only to the intention of the composer, but to the French style of playing, to which these appoggiaturas owe their origin. The little notes belong in the time of the notes preceding them, and hence must not, as in the second example, fall in the time of those that follow them. 33

Whilst Leopold Mozart does not specifically acknowledge the French origin of his anticipated graces, his discussion largely agrees with Quantz and includes descending thirds in his list of appropriate contexts. We have noted before that Mozart excludes entirely any mention of a short onbeat execution, in itself showing the Italian/French influence on his ornamentation.

The controversy and confusion regarding the interpretation of these short graces lies in the contradictory instructions given by other members of the Berlin school, of whom the most significant is, of course, C.P.E. Bach. In the first part of his 1753 Versuch, Bach refers to both the long and short appoggiatura when he states:

All embellishments notated in small notes pertain to the following tone. Therefore,

33 Quantz, Versuch, chap XVIII, sect. II, par.20, pp.227-8.
while the preceding tone is never shortened, the following tone loses as much of its length as the small notes take from it.  

Thus all appoggiature are struck on the beat against the bass. Later, with respect only to the invariable short appoggiatura, Bach states: "... is played so rapidly that the following note loses scarcely any of its length."  

With these statements Bach establishes an onbeat doctrine that encompasses the short appoggiatura and excludes an anticipated interpretation. Among his examples we find our previously anticipated French models, whilst he admits a more moderate speed of execution appropriate for a more tender expression in an Adagio tempo between descending thirds.

Those who followed C.P.E. Bach’s onbeat doctrine included Johann Frederick Agricola (1720-74) and Frederick Wilhelm Marpurg (1718-95). The former includes in his musical examples the onbeat interpretation of our frequent pattern in which the grace must not be sounded as a semiquaver but as a demi-semiquaver. In the context of descending thirds, Agricola does, however, recognise that "several famous performers" will anticipate such graces "in the manner of the French", thus acknowledging their French origin. It is significant too, that Marpurg's two works regarding ornamentation, the first published in 1749 and the second, first published in 1755, reflect the change from the French influenced interpretations to the onbeat executions contained in the


German *galant* style. In the later works, Marpurg, however, supports his onbeat instructions by citing the French writer Boivin (1653?–1706), who states in his organ book “that these little notes must fall exactly on the harmony notes in the bass”.39

Thus the onbeat short appoggiatura, like the anticipated grace, appears to claim a French precedent. Edward Reilly, translator of Quantz’s *Versuch*, suggests that the difference may lie in the distinction between the interpretation of keyboard and non-keyboard French music.40 Indeed, many French works dealing with ornamentation in keyboard music, including Boivin and later Couperin, place appoggiaturas between descending thirds on the beat, in agreement with C.P.E. Bach, whilst the majority of non-keyboard authors, many of whom we have previously mentioned, retain an anticipated interpretation. The division is also seen in the Berlin school where the onbeat interpretation is given by the keyboard players and an anticipated one by Quantz and Leopold Mozart, who were not. The division is not quite complete, however, in that advocates of the German onbeat doctrine regarded it as a ‘universal’ ideal, applicable not only to keyboard music.

It is likely that Quantz’s categorical statement regarding the French nature of both figures under discussion, and thus their essential anticipation, reflects the way in which he heard them performed by French flute players during his visit to France in the 1720s and does not necessarily take into account a keyboard interpretation that existed at the same time. Thus it would not be correct to suggest that a short onbeat interpretation was solely a product of

---

38 Compare the 1749 treatise *Der Critische Musicus* with *Anleitung zum Clavierspielen* (1755) and *Die Kunst das Clavier zu spielen*, 4th edition (1762).


the German *galant* style and did not have a place in French-influenced music of the mid-eighteenth century. We might conclude, however, that with regard to the descending short appoggiatura, an onbeat execution was confined largely to the keyboard medium outside of Germany.

In a number of common contexts frequently occurring in Mahaut's concerti, we have previously concluded that the most likely intention was that of an anticipated execution. With regard to the two common figures currently under discussion, and in the light of our recent comments, several factors suggest that we might expect likewise, to find musical evidence of a prebeat intention. First, the non-keyboard nature of his music and second, the strong French influence in his background and musical education (reflected in his treatise and numerous solo and trio sonatas) set against a total lack of any evidence to suggest contact with, or influence drawn from, the Berlin school. Thirdly, we might consider the strong influence upon Mahaut of the Italian *galant*, in the form of well-known violin virtuosi in Amsterdam and the wide availability of their concerti, whose style would have included only the short anticipated grace to the exclusion of a short onbeat execution.

Thus, in the light of such comments, we might reasonably assume a prebeat intention for the appoggiatura appearing in figure 8.13a. In many other occurrences, however, this argument is made even stronger by the implication given by the context or the notation itself. We note a pre-bar notation in the second and third sequential repetitions of figure 8.13b(i), strongly suggesting an anticipated execution of the graces falling between descending thirds. The same execution of the descending appoggiatura is surely intended in the identical pattern of the first phrase which, however, does not show the pre-bar notation. If, logically, no
difference was intended, and since the pre-bar notation occurs not in the first but in the subsequent phrases, we must consider that an anticipated interpretation was generally expected regardless of the placement of the notation (this of course does not necessarily include the ascending appoggiatura in the example which will be discussed in the following section).

In figure 8.13b(ii), the sequence of descending thirds is similar to several seen above in figure 8.13a. Here, however, the necessary anticipation of the graces is made clear by the context, in that the final grace precedes not a consonance but a written out appoggiatura. In the light of our previous discussion, at least the last grace must, therefore, be anticipated, and thus it follows that the others should be likewise if we are to be consistent and maintain the continuity of the descending sequence.

We see, in other examples, single appoggiature not only filling in a descending third, but also preceding weak principals. In figure 8.13c(i), the context forms a phrase ending in which the 'boldness' of a short onbeat execution would be incongruous with the flattering expression required in such a place. In figure 8.13c(ii), the grace identifies the dissonant note but again precedes a very weak principal. This in itself would normally exclude a long interpretation which would have rendered the figure as four equal semiquavers. If such was intended, however, why was the following group of four semiquavers not written likewise, including, as it does, a dissonant seventh on the third semiquaver. Equally illogical would be a short onbeat execution, whose jerky lombard-like rhythm would have hindered the rhythmic drive of the figuration. It follows, therefore, that the grace was intended to pass unaccented between the two notes of the descending third.
There are, however, two figures involving descending thirds in the concerti in which it is
difficult to be sure of the intended execution. The first is seen in figure 8.14a(i). Here the
grace not only falls between a descending third but is also part of a repetitive, strong,
syncopated rhythm. Normally, as we have seen, our instinct would be to avoid disturbing
the syncopation which would result from an onbeat execution, but anticipate it instead, thus
maintaining the accent on the principal. Later in the sequence, however, two variations of
this syncopation appear several times in which the second might be regarded as being
identical with the first but written in regular notation (fig.8.14a(ii and iii)), with the grace
realised in real-time. This would, however, imply a long execution of the grace and apply
likewise, to figure 8.14a(i). On the other hand, perhaps the two figures (fig.8.14a(ii and iii))
are intended to be different from each other, hence their notational differences, pointing to
the anticipation of all the graces.

Secondly, we see in figure 8.14b some very confusing notation indeed. First, note that the
flute and both violins are in unison throughout the cadence, thereby excluding any
difference of interpretation between the parts. The written semiquavers in the flute and
violin I tend to imply a long onbeat execution of the melodically identical grace in violin II.
The question, therefore, becomes: does this imply a like-execution for the preceding three
grases in violin II and why do they not appear in the other two parts? This could of course
be simply a result of careless notation as we have seen many times before. If we consider,
however, the first quaver of the second beat as the principal of a trill, and the following
semiquavers as its suffix, then the preceding grace seen in violin II would be expected
automatically as the preparatory onbeat long appoggiatura. It remains uncertain whether the
first two graces in violin II are to be anticipated or rendered as four equal semiquavers,
although it would be unlikely that a short onbeat execution is intended. The problem is
likely a result of both careless notation and a certain amount of assumed ‘understanding’, particularly in the light of the cadential context.

Finally, when we consider the many contexts in which the figure \( \text{\ding{187}} \) occurs, we again find in the music itself, an unmistakable bias towards anticipation. Most obvious are those examples seen in figure 8.15a, in which we notice that the appoggiatura is not dissonant against the bass, but rather the principal itself (in fig. 8.15a(ii), forming a seventh). This written dissonance would of course be weakened if the appoggiatura were performed long on the beat, and we might relate it not only to Quantz’s preferred anticipation of such a grace, but also to the required prebeat execution of a grace preceding an already written out appoggiatura.

This is, however, not the only indication, as we see in the following examples. In figure 8.15b(i), the grace falls between two quavers descending by third and sits most naturally in anticipation. Note in figure 8.15b(ii) that the flute, violin I and violin II are in unison and yet the grace precedes the first quaver only in the flute. If this were to be placed on the beat either long or short, an undesirable harmonic effect would most certainly be had. The fact that it has not been carefully notated also in the unison violins suggests that it is superfluous to the harmony, decorative, and thus essentially anticipated. In figure 8.15b(iii), the same figure appears with a slightly different melodic outline. Here a short onbeat execution would disturb the rhythmic repetition within the phrase, hindering its continuity with the intrusion of a jerky lombard-style rhythm.

Finally, we must consider a particular context seen in figure 8.15c, in which a short onbeat execution of the grace may be more suitable. I refer to the cadential nature of the context,
whether or not it is actually notated with a trill, as such is implied by its cadential function. Just as we saw an implication of this in figure 8.14b above, the dissonance of the appoggiatura in this context is required to sound on the beat against the bass, resolving into the trill. Restricted by the short value of the principal, the appoggiatura is unlikely to be performed *long*, but instinctively shortened to allow more time for the trill itself, thus resulting in a short onbeat execution:

![The Ascending Grace](image)

The Ascending Grace.

The ascending appoggiatura is significantly in the minority in Mahaut's concerti. This is not to say that their numbers are few, but there are indeed a great many more of the descending form. As in the latter, we note again the almost consistent use of a flexible, but ambiguous quaver notation for the ascending appoggiatura which might represent anything from a short prebeat to an expressive *overlong* execution. In addition, the structural context in which we find such appoggiatura is predominantly consistent in its repetition of the preceding note, rising stepwise to a principal that is longer or of equal value to the previous one. This reflects the fundamental French usage that is documented since the beginning of the seventeenth century.

We have noted, with regard to the descending appoggiatura, that the French *coulé* in non-keyboard music remained predominantly anticipated through to the later eighteenth century (although it absorbed the Italian *galant*, onbeat *long* execution). The ascending

---

41 The shortening of an onbeat appoggiatura to accommodate a trill received greater discussion with regard to examples in fig.8.6.

42 The two occurrences of a semiquaver notation were discussed with regard to fig.8.3.
French grace, however, or *port de voix*, was subject to a much greater variety of rhythmical freedom that might, for example, extend an anticipated grace across the beat before resolving upwards to the principal. This said, the French sources unquestionably show that, up to around 1730-1740 in non-keyboard music, the essential character of an ascending grace was a rhythmically flexible *prebeat* execution. Between 1730 and 1760, we see in many French sources a significant move towards a longer *onbeat* performance, until we find in the works of L’Abbé le Fils (1761), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1768) and L’Abbé Duval (1764), discussions that are limited to various types of *onbeat* executions. That these more sustained, accented interpretations resulted from the direct influence of the Italian *galant* can be seen in a description given by Corrette in his flute treatise of 1735, in which he describes a *long* onbeat appoggiatura that diminishes quietly up to the principal, as a *martellement a la maniere Italienne* (see fig. 8.15d).

Note that such an execution retains the unaccented *pincé* or mordent, with which it was customary to complete the French *port de voix*, resolving naturally to the principal above. Frequently referred to also as the *port de voix feint* or *port de voix jette*, the same description is given by L’Abbé de Fils, J.-J. Rousseau, and in the vocal treatises of Duval (1775), Lacassagne and Lécuyer. As a parallel, the description of the onbeat ascending

---

appoggiatura given in the Italian treatise of Geminiani suggests that it has the same qualities as the descending form (performed long or overlong) but is always followed by a mordent, thus reflecting its French origin.\footnote{Geminiani, F. Prefaces to The Art and Treatise.}

In his M\textit{é}thode, Mahaut does not appear to distinguish any difference between the descending and the ascending form of the appoggiatura. As we have seen, his description is essentially that of the long or overlong interpretation found in almost every galant theoretical source. That Mahaut does not describe the addition of a mordent to the ascending appoggiatura does not in itself suggest that he did not use it, or even perhaps, generally expect it in the light of his considerable acquaintance with French music. The brevity, on the other hand, of his discussion, limited to the description of the onbeat long and overlong execution, shows likewise the strong Italian galant influence that Mahaut had absorbed in the 1750s.

Thus clearly, many of Mahaut's ascending appogiature are indeed to be interpreted with a long onbeat execution. Significantly, as with the descending appoggiatura, such an interpretation is undoubtedly demanded whenever the grace precedes a principal of more than one beat (although on rare occasions we also find it implied on a one-beat principal). Overwhelmingly, the two most frequent contexts in which this long interpretation is implied can be seen in phrase endings and in places where the resultant dissonance forms an expressive part of the melodic line. In the latter, it is apparent that the most common structural context involves an overlong execution due to a triple-value principal which, by nature, reaps the expressive value of the dissonance (examples of this can be seen in figures...
8.16a(i-viii)). In addition, many form an important expressive element in sequential passages (specifically fig.8.16a(iii/iv/vi/vii)) where the dissonance is reproduced several times over. Note also, that with the exception of the final two figures, the notes following the principal fall away quickly in descent, thus further highlighting the expressive function of the appoggiatura. This can be seen particularly in figure 8.16a(ii) where the raised appoggiatura is then lowered in descent following the principal.

In figure 8.16a(viii), the overlong appoggiatura sustains the colour and expressive intensity of the rising chromatic line that would otherwise be released if the principal was sounded on the beat. In figure 8.16b, we see two examples requiring the less common long execution, but they nevertheless form an expressive dissonance in the melodic line.

The overlong interpretation is also frequently required in the context of many phrase endings, although generally limited to a principal of uneven value (fig.8.17a(i-iii)). Here the ascent to a short and softly spoken principal results in an expressive and natural phrase ending, a better alternative to a prebeat interpretation that would add an unfavourable accent to the principal note. Likewise, the same applies to the numerous caesura in which a long execution of the grace might be implied, although, as we see in figure 8.17b(iii-v), these often precede a shorter principal of crotchet value. In these sequences, it is precisely the manner of execution required of a long interpretation that shapes each individual rising phrase, adding an expressive element in which the final note tapers off at the top of each figure. Such shaping would be removed by an anticipated grace.
In figure 8.17b(vi), we find an even smaller principal coupled with a weak interbeat placement that would normally exclude an accented onbeat appoggiatura. The context in which it appears within the orchestra does, however, suggest otherwise. Clearly the f-sharp of the solo appoggiatura needs to be struck against the semiquaver f-sharp appearing in the unison violins and viola an octave below, thus requiring an onbeat execution. One might suggest that the difference in notation between solo and accompaniment is perhaps due to the intended tapering of the principal note inherent in the notation and execution of an onbeat appoggiatura. The same intention, however, would equally have been implied by a real-time notation. Lastly, we observe in figure 8.17b(vii) that an onbeat overlong interpretation of the appoggiatura is, here, favourable not only as a phrase ending, but by its continuation of the syncopated line that would undoubtedly be disturbed by a prebeat execution and sustained principal.

The final context which we must consider, with regard to Mahaut’s onbeat ascending appoggiature, concerns those which precede a trill with either a cadential or decorative function. There are, however, surprisingly few trill contexts in Mahaut’s concerti approached by an appoggiatura from below. Of course, in the galant mid-eighteenth century, the favoured cadental preparation was essentially the accented descending appoggiatura. The contexts in which the former do appear (fig.8.18a-e), however, tend to suggest not the long or overlong execution seen above, but a shorter accented appoggiatura moving more quickly into the trill itself, and is a parallel to the variable shorter length of descending cadential appoggiatura, discussed with regard to figure 8.6. Note here in figure 8.18b we find the written out execution of ascending appoggiature approaching a trill, that is likewise ‘implied’ in figure 8.18a, and which we might expect applies proportionally to the remaining examples.
Near the beginning of this discussion, regarding the ascending appoggiatura, we spoke briefly of the rhythmic freedom that characterised the French *port de voix*, particularly with respect to its prebeat interpretation. This can be traced back at least to the vocal treatise of Bénigne de Bacilly (1668), who describes an anticipated *port de voix* in which “you must borrow a little from the following note to add refinement to the grace” [\(\text{\footnotesize \textbf{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet \textbullet}}\)] 51

Just under one hundred years later, in his treatise of 1762, Choquel describes the execution of the *port de voix* as having an “absolutely necessary semi-syncopated manner”. 52 Thus the two authors span a period in which clearly the rhythmic variety of the anticipated *port de voix* remained common practice in French music. In addition to the simple tied interpretation given above, Frederick Neumann, in his examination particularly of Bacilly’s ornamentation, identifies a number of other more subtle variations including the following, 53 in which clearly the harmonic effect of any appoggiatura is determined by both the tempo and the length of the suspension of the dissonance across the beat:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet} & \quad \text{\footnotesize \textbullet}
\end{align*}
\]

This freedom of approach towards the anticipated ascending appoggiatura, which might be described as *rubato*, is in fact strongly suggested in much of Mahaut’s usage of this grace in contexts that fall somewhere between the need for the melodic function and energy of a purely anticipated grace, and the strong harmonic effect of a longer onbeat execution. This is, of course, not surprising considering Mahaut’s substantial acquaintance with French style and practice. Thus, in figure 8.19a(i and ii), whilst one feels that a purely anticipated

---


53 Neumann, F. *Ornamentation*, p.50.
execution of the grace causes you to ‘pause’ too long on the minim principal, thereby disrupting the rhythmic drive, an onbeat interpretation would perhaps feel too ‘square’, the accented sustained dissonance dulling the brilliance and liveliness of the movement’s character. A solution is, therefore, to blur the edges of both executions with a quasi-syncopated rhythm (seen below the figures) that retains both the rhythmic energy and an element of dissonance. Likewise, in figure 8.19b(i-iv), in which we see the grace precedes smaller crotchet values. In these, a free rhythmic approach softens the strong repetitive accents produced by either a short anticipated or onbeat performance.

This is not to suggest, of course, that all anticipated contexts should be approached in this way with the grace stretched across the beat. Bacilly himself spoke of pure anticipation as the “usual procedure”.54 As we found with regard to the descending appoggiatura, the simple anticipated grace is usually implied in contexts in which the grace precedes a much shorter value (usually less than one beat) and excludes for one reason or another, an onbeat execution. Thus, those examples appearing in figure 8.20a not only precede a short principal of quaver value (with the exception of fig.8.20a(ii)), allowing little room for the harmonic effect of an onbeat execution, but are also placed on a significantly weak part of the bar which does not favour a harmonic accent. In addition, note that in figures 8.20a(i-ii) an onbeat interpretation would remove the rhythmic energy of the grace, dulling the liveliness and brilliance of its character.

The same might be said of figure 8.20b(i and ii). Here the former is particularly unsuitable for an onbeat grace in view of its interbeat, necessarily unaccented, placement. In figure

54 Bacilly, Remarques (1668), pp.141-3.
8.20c the anticipation of the grace is unmistakably required in order to avoid a disturbance of the following dotted rhythm that continues in a descending sequence. Note also the position of the slurs, joining short to long and weak to strong, likewise suggesting the anticipation of the preceding grace, resulting in a consistent rhythm and articulation.

Finally in this discussion, we consider figure 8.20d. Here the appoggiatura connects two notes ascending by step, but rather unusually moving from a long to a short principal. This is of course, contrary to the usual procedure of a *port de voix*, but more significantly, it does not allow an onbeat execution in which the principal must be approached by a shorter or equal value in order to make musical sense of its harmonic and expressive accent. This fundamental movement from short to long finds testimony in almost every theoretical source that deals with the subject. Therefore, such an appoggiatura fulfils a function that can be no more than decorative, melodic, and thus entirely anticipated.

*The Accent*

Finally in this chapter, we consider a third type of one-note grace which Mahaut calls *accent*. This is not to be confused with the Italian *accento* or German *Accent* which refer principally to the *long* onbeat appoggiatura. Instead, Mahaut’s *accent* is that of the typically French design in which a small *unaccented* note is slurred briefly and almost imperceptibly to the *preceding* principal:
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The accent is an appoggiatura introduced at the end of the principal note and articulated with the same tongue stroke.\textsuperscript{56}

Thus, in contrast to those in our previous discussions, this appoggiatura is slurred to the \textit{preceding} note and takes its time from it.

Mahaut’s illustrations show the \textit{accent} in its two most common designs in which the grace rises stepwise from the principal and the following note is either on the same level as the principal or descends stepwise from it (fig. 8.21).

As we found with regard to the previous types of appoggiatura, the brevity of Mahaut’s comments does not reflect the widespread use and discussion of this grace by other writers, although here most likely remaining within the constraints of the French style. The practice in French music in fact spanned well over a century from Bacilly (1668), who described the \textit{accent} as “very delicate, very lightly touched and quasi-imperceptible”,\textsuperscript{57} through to works appearing in the second half of the eighteenth century, such as the violin method of L’Abbé de Fils (1761) in which he says the \textit{accent} serves to connect two neighbouring notes.\textsuperscript{58} Along the way, the grace is described in the works of Jean Rousseau, L’Affilard, Loulié, Montéclair, Hotteterre, and Corrette, to name but a few,\textsuperscript{59} with almost complete consistency of execution if not of notation.

\textsuperscript{56} Mahaut, A. \textit{Méthode} (1759), p.20.
\textsuperscript{57} Bacilly, \textit{Remarques} (1668), pp.189-191.
\textsuperscript{58} L’Abbé le Fils, \textit{Principes du violon} (1761), p.15.
\textsuperscript{59} For further information regarding the discussions of these authors, see Frederick Neumann, \textit{Ornamentation}, chap.13, p.92.
The variety of the latter, ranging from vertical and diagonal dashes in the late seventeenth century to 'small-note' symbols towards the mid-eighteenth century, might be understood to result principally from the fundamental improvised nature of the grace. Thus, whilst Mahaut comments briefly on its use in his Méthode, we find not one notation of the accent in his concerti. One might propose, in the light of the French nature of such an ornament, that the Italianite galant nature of the concerti may suggest an adequate explanation for their absence. On the other hand, however, we also do not find their notation in Mahaut's solo, duo or trio sonatas or, most significantly, in the Airs, Minuets and Brunettes appearing at the end of his Méthode, which are undeniably French in style and name but do include an abundance of other one-note graces.

Thus the absence of any notation within the concerti does not in itself imply that the use of the accent was excluded or inappropriate. Its fundamental French nature does, however, suggest that it be used with good stylistic judgement and only in contexts that might welcome a French character.
Two-Note Graces

In this discussion we refer principally to a two-note ornamental slide known to the French as the *port de voix double* or *coulade* and consisting of two small notes, most commonly ascending stepwise to its principal. Whilst Mahaut does not mention the slide in his *Méthode*, we find in his concerti, and indeed in much of his other music, a large number of these ornamental figures all symbolised by a small semiquaver notation, such that they demand our consideration. In addition to their ornamental notation, however, we find an equally large number of slides written out in regular values of both a prebeat or interbeat variety, and the more numerous onbeat, accented type characterised by its lombardic rhythm. Of the former, examples of which are seen in figure 8.22, it must be noted that they appear in this form only in movements that do not make use of a small-note notation for like figures. Thus, with no indication in Mahaut’s *Méthode* of his intention with regard to the ornamental notations, the interpretative problem at hand is, like the one-note grace, one of placement (i.e. a prebeat or onbeat execution).

One frequent context, however, that remains unambiguous as to its required interpretation is that forming a two-note termination or suffix to a trill. Seen in figure 8.22(i-iv) in their written out form, they also appear frequently using an ornamental notation (fig.8.23), in which clearly the grace takes its time from the preceding note or trill to which it is slurred. This use of the two-note grace does, in fact, appear in Mahaut’s *Méthode* amongst his discussion of the trill where he calls it a “double cadence” or “trill with a turn” and discusses it as “nothing more than two grace notes added at the end of a regular trill” (fig.8.24). In addition to their required prebeat execution demanded by their cadential

---

function, we see in figure 8.23a and 8.23b that their notational placement is also strongly suggestive of a prebeat intention. In the first example the grace appears across the barline, pointing more to a prebeat rather than an onbeat execution, whilst in figure 8.23b the pre-bar notation of the second grace in each bar likewise suggests the same and can be assumed to apply to the remaining graces in the same manner. Later in this discussion we will see pre-bar notations supporting the interbeat execution of ornamental slides in a number of other contexts.

Whilst frequently left unmarked, any slurs that are notated in this cadential context are also indicative of a prebeat execution (fig. 8.23b-c), joining the grace to the preceding principal. It is interesting to note that, whilst we see an ornamental (small-note) notation in figure 8.23c, we have previously seen a like-figure, but proportionally larger in value, in its written out form in the same concerto (fig. 8.22f(v)). This is a particular characteristic of these concerti in which small-valued figures are most commonly written with an ornamental notation whilst larger, but identically executed figures, are sometimes found notated in regular values. This proportional difference applies more specifically to the notation of unaccented interbeat slides. In contrast, we will often find ornamental two-note slides sitting side-by-side within the same movement with written out onbeat lombardic slides, both ascending and descending, which are proportionally and rhythmically equivalent to the ornamental figures if the latter are also executed on the beat (i.e. ). Our musical logic, therefore, instantly suggests a difference in interpretation demanded by the differing notation, and thus points towards the prebeat intention of the ornamental two-note slides.
The co-existence of these contrasting but potentially equivalent notations in Mahaut’s concerti is not an isolated or uncommon occurrence. On the contrary, it is found innumerable times in the galant instrumental works of the Italians throughout the mid-eighteenth century. We have noted frequently the fondness of the Italians for the many forms of written out lombardic rhythms, including the onbeat slide (\(\text{\textcircled{a}}\)), that pervaded their music since the early part of the century. Thus, with the later introduction into their music of the small ornamental notation (\(\text{\textcircled{p}}\)), surely a difference of execution was intended. This reasoning is seen clearly in Frederick Neumann’s discussion:

\[
\text{\ldots the difference in notation suggests a difference in meaning, because a notational advance is logically used for the sake of greater precision, not greater ambiguity. It makes more historical sense to assume that the little notes expressed something that had previously been left to improvisation - to wit, anticipated slides - rather than that they expressed vaguely what had been expressed precisely a thousand times by regular notes.}^{61}
\]

An examination of the music itself reveals an unmistakable tendency towards anticipation, often in the light of rhythmically incompatible onbeat executions and harmonic considerations.\(^{62}\) As we have noted the Italian fondness for written out lombardic rhythms, so too have we seen it in Mahaut’s concerti. The co-existence of these two slide notations in Mahaut’s music is seen in the examples of figure 8.25. Note the rhythmic equality between figure 8.25a(i) and a(ii) if the first is executed on the beat. The weak metrical placement of figure 8.25a(i), however, contrasts strongly with the written out versions of a(ii) in the same movement and, together with its probable function as a suffix to the preceding trill, tends to imply a prebeat execution. Likewise, the prebeat intention of

---


\(^{62}\) For a more in depth discussion of musical evidence, see Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation*, chap.22, pp.229-331.
ornamental slides in figures 8.25b to 8.25e, all taken from the same concerto, might surely be implied by the contrasting notation of written out onbeat figures with which they appear alongside and, whilst they may not be entirely equivalent, would otherwise be rhythmically similar. Here, however, rhythmic and melodic considerations are also significant factors. In figure 8.25c an onbeat interpretation of the second slide would melodically and rhythmically disturb the equality of the following descending scale. Similarly, the syncopation in figures 8.25d and 8.25e would be distorted by an accented slide. In figure 8.25f a thematic return follows immediately on the heels of an ascending slide that would be rhythmically and melodically similar, although proportionally faster, to the following ornamental slide if the latter were placed on the beat. In no way can the contrasting notation be said to be accidental as the distinction is repeated several times throughout the movement, thus demanding a different, hence prebeat, interpretation.

It is a common view in earlier studies of baroque performance practice to perceive the regular execution of an ornamental slide as one that is begun on the beat. Certainly Robert Donington saw it as such in both his ground-breaking studies. As support for this principle he initially sites two late-seventeenth-century French authorities, Jacques Champion de Chambonnières and Jean Henri d'Anglebert. His following list of those that describe and illustrate the onbeat slide includes a number of English masters, "other Frenchmen" and the German galant composers of the Berlin school: Marpurg, Quantz and C.P.E. Bach. Whilst he does note briefly that two German composers, J.G. Walther (1708) and J. Heinichen

---

(1728), admit an interbeat interpretation, he concludes "it was not much recommended and is rather weak".  

This is to a certain extent, however, somewhat misleading. It is apparent from a more extensive study of French sources that an onbeat interpretation was not the accepted regular execution. Such an extensive study can be found in the work of Frederick Neumann, and his findings undeniably imply that, whilst their descriptions often remain ambiguous, the illustrations given by the majority of French authors unmistakably show a prebeat intention. Such examples are seen in figure 8.26, giving the illustrations of L’Affilard (1694), Loulié (1696), Hotteterre (1707/1715), Corrette (1758), La Chappelle (1737) and Marchand (1748). Loulié describes the slide or coulade as "two or more little notes placed between two distant tones in order to connect them more pleasingly", as does Montéclair. Their inclusion of larger slides (fig. 8.26b) points to their interbeat nature. Couperin, known for his onbeat instructions with regard to the single appoggiatura, does not actually explain the execution of the two-note grace although he writes it frequently. In contrast to the single appoggiatura, however, musical evidence suggests that his ornamental slides were intended to be taken in anticipation.

---


65 A greater discussion of these sources and their implied anticipation can be found in Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation*, chap.19, pp.205-210.


68 See Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation*, p.209.
In fact, the only significant contradiction to this is given in the ornament table of D'Anglebert (fig. 8.27), cited by Donington. A possible explanation for this conflicting evidence might, as we saw with regard to the single appoggiatura, be seen in the differing ornamental approach between keyboard and non-keyboard writers, of which the latter favoured anticipation. This explanation also goes some way to satisfy the conflicting instructions given later by the galant German composers which, again, were somewhat misleadingly represented in Donington's studies. Indeed, C.P.E. Bach rigidly admits only an onbeat execution, which is likewise described by Theophil Muffat (1736), Marpurg (1736), Agricola (1757) and Quantz (1752). Donington, however, failed to mention that all of these authors, with the exception of the clavecinists Muffat and C.P.E. Bach, also describe a type of anticipated interbeat execution which most call Nachschlag, meaning that it takes its value from the preceding note. Under this term, Marpurg's example (fig. 8.28a) appears in his treatise of 1763. Agricola, in reflecting a vocal technique, contrasts the loud lombardic execution with one that "fills in a leap and falls truly within the weak Taktglied and will be performed softer".  

Admittedly, Quantz's only specific instruction regarding the even two-note slide illustrates an onbeat lombardic execution. In his earlier chapter, however, regarding the improvised ornamentation of simple intervals, he describes how slide figures may be used to connect two disjunct principals (fig. 8.28b). His notational use of ornamental 'little-notes', including the two-note slide, and their subsequent realisation in 'real-time', shows without doubt an

---

69 Translation given by F. Neumann, Ornamentation, chap. 23, p. 235. See his footnote no. 12 (p. 235) for an explanation of the term Taktglied.

70 Quantz, Versuch, chap. 17, sect. II, par. 23/ fig. 43-33, p. 229.
intended interbeat execution.71 Leopold Mozart, so strongly influenced by the Italians, does not mention the slide until the second edition of his treatise in 1770, in which he describes only a Nachschlag execution, clearly understood by his illustration (fig.8.28c) and in his definition as “a pair of fast notes appended to the principal note”.72 With respect to non-keyboard interpretation, an earlier significant example can be seen in the treatise of the well-known German flautist, Johann Christian Schickhardt (1680-1762), published in the years between 1720 and 1730 and before the influence of the Berlin school.73 Whilst not explaining their execution, his many illustrations, including the ornamental notation of two-note slides, clearly imply an intended anticipated interpretation by their pre-barline placement (fig.8.28d). As we shall see, the same use of notation is found frequently in Mahaut’s concerti, with an equally strong prebeat implication.

Thus, whilst the onbeat doctrine of the German galant school certainly had a significant effect, we nevertheless see the frequent recognition of an anticipated execution, strongly reflective of the French and Italian origins from which the ornamental notation was adopted. Furthermore, it is likely that the influence of the onbeat interpretation was limited to those directly affected by the Berlin school, and in particular to keyboard players.

Returning once more to Mahaut, therefore, in the light of his strong French and Italian influences, contrasting with the much less significant, if not non-existent, influence of the Berlin school (which we concluded in respect to the single appoggiatura), we might expect to find an equally strong implication of an anticipated execution. This is borne out in the

71 Quantz, Versuch, chap.13, par.42, p.159.
72 Mozart, L. Versuch, 2nd ed.(1770), chap.IX, par.30.
73 Schickhardt, Johann Christian. Principes de la flûte . . . , Op.12 (Amsterdam, c.1730?), p.3.
many and varied contexts in which we find this two-note grace in Mahaut’s concerti. Some of the most obvious examples can be seen in figure 8.29a where the slur notations clearly imply that the small notes are taken in the time of the preceding principal and thus anticipate the following note. Likewise, in figure 8.29b the slur encompasses both the preceding and following principals, unmistakably describing the interbeat nature of the two-note slide. Many examples are, however, left unarticulated, giving no such obvious clue to their execution. In addition, many are rather confusingly slurred to the following principal. Whilst this might begin to imply an onbeat interpretation, there are a number of other factors within each musical context that suggest otherwise and rather negate the relevance of the placement of the slur.

In the four examples of figure 8.30a it is a rhythmic factor that negates an onbeat execution of the slides. In the first, the repeated syncopated element must surely not be disturbed by an onbeat grace at the beginning of the bar, whilst in figure (ii) an onbeat interpretation is incompatible with the triplet figures. The interbeat nature of the grace is clarified in the following bar by its extension to a three-note slide that is clearly prebeat. In the final two almost identical figures (fig.8.30a(iii-iv)), the descending scales would be both melodically and rhythmically disturbed by an onbeat execution that is surely undesirable.

Similar rhythmic and melodic considerations can be seen in the examples of figure 8.30b. In the light of the repetitive sequential treatment of the motive here, in figure 8.30b(i), it does not welcome an onbeat grace at the beginning of the second and third bars. In addition, the pre-barline and slur notation of the second slide clarifies the anticipated intention. Whilst no obvious clue is given for the execution of the slide in figure 8.30b(ii), except perhaps for its
weak placement suggestive of an interbeat nature, the continuation in the following bars of the fragmented pattern \( \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \) suggests that the first occurrence must not be rhythmically disturbed by an onbeat slide. Likewise, in figures 8.30b(iii-iv), the appearance of the single slide amongst a repetitive rhythmic/melodic pattern should not alter the pattern such as an onbeat execution would. Similarly, we must consider the continuous rhythmic nature of the semiquaver figuration in figures 8.30c(i-ii), while, in addition, the speed of such figuration would negate an onbeat interpretation.

The weak placement of the principal following the slide is also a significant factor in suggesting a prebeat execution, thus eliminating an inevitable and undue rhythmic accent if placed on the beat. Such contexts are seen in figure 8.30d(i-ii). In the second example, the repetition (*) introduces a second slide immediately following the first, preceding, however, an already written out appoggiatura and must, therefore, not be placed on the beat where it would alter the intended dissonance. The prebeat nature of the second slide would, therefore, demand a like-execution of the first in both repetitions. Similarly, the full harmonic effect of the dissonant seventh which follows the slide in figure 8.30e would not be felt so strongly if it were delayed by an onbeat execution of the grace. We must also consider the general character of a movement, and thus, in figure 8.30f, only a prebeat slide maintains the elegance and smoothness of the melodic line, particularly in the total absence of any written lombardic rhythms that might give justification to an onbeat interpretation.

Finally, we note in a few examples (fig.8.31) that the two-note slide does not move stepwise to the following principal, but instead leaps downwards towards it. The slur notation seen in figure 8.31a, linking the grace to the preceding note, highlights its resemblance to the one-
note accent, discussed in the previous section, and thus strongly implies its interbeat nature, whose time is taken from the preceding principal.

Having established the general anticipated nature of the two-note slide in Mahaut’s concerti, we must now consider a number of examples that suggest more strongly an opposing onbeat execution. The significant common feature of all the following examples is the much greater length of the following principal than we have seen previously (all representing two or more beats), together with their strong metrical placement at the beginning of the bar. In figure 8.32a the ascending slide in the solo flute consistently coincides with a descending written-out slide in the accompanying violins. The voice-leading would, therefore, welcome a like-execution. Perhaps a possible explanation for the difference in notation can be seen in the greater length of the principal note in the flute, making it more laborious to write out in real values as an onbeat slide than those in the violins below. Similarly, in figure 8.32b, the ornamental notation of the first slide conflicts with the descending, but otherwise equivalent, slide at the beginning of the next bar, but would in itself be much more rhythmically complex to write-out (seen below the figure). The prebeat nature of the second slide is without question, but an onbeat execution of the first certainly sits better in this context.

Other considerations can be seen in the following examples. In figure 8.32c the first slide is immediately preceded by a group of demi-semiquavers allowing little time to anticipate the following grace. The leap between the slide and its preceding principal, in figure 8.32d, eliminates the usual connective function of the grace, pointing more to an onbeat rather than interbeat execution. Likewise, the same implication can be said of figure 8.32e. Here, in addition, the well spaced notation seen in the manuscript itself visually suggests a stronger
onbeat intention as opposed to a pre-barline, interbeat interpretation. Lastly, in figure 8.32g, we note a principal of a slightly shorter value that is nevertheless performed more easily and satisfactorily as an onbeat grace.

Thus, whilst Mahaut's concerti demonstrate an unmistakable bias towards the anticipation of the two-note slide, it is apparent that an onbeat execution was also part of his language in which the significant factor was the length of the following principal. An ornamental slide notation preceding a principal value equal to or less than one beat was, in all probability, intended as a prebeat grace. In contrast, musical evidence suggests that those preceding a larger principal are overwhelmingly onbeat slides, uncharacteristically written in an ornamental fashion to facilitate easier and quicker notation.

Finally, it is necessary to comment briefly on the notational differences between the different collections with regard to the two-note grace. It is significant that whilst we find numerous written out onbeat slides within the Brussels concerti, not one ornamental notation is used, suggesting perhaps, that the anticipated grace was here left solely to the improvisation and discretion of the performer which, after all, was the French tradition from which the ornamental notation was developed. The Karlsruhe, Regensburg and Stockholm collections, on the other hand, demonstrate a much greater use of the ornamental notations alongside the still numerous written out slides. Whilst some prebeat figures in longer values are indeed found written out in real time, the anticipated execution is more consistently implied by an ornamental notation.

Interestingly, there are a number of movements amongst the Stockholm concerti in which, again, no small-note notations are found. Unlike the Brussels concerti, however, in addition
to its onbeat figures, we find an equally large number of written out prebeat figures suggesting that, in these movements, the copyist chose to write out his ornamental figures, leaving little to the whim of the performer. Once again, we note that the notation of these ornaments throughout all the collections reflects the national and stylistic differences between the probable copyists, of which, we understand, only the Brussels concerti might be in Mahaut’s own hand. For an example, we need only look at the Brussels concerto in D major and its duplicate in the Stockholm collection, in which the latter includes a large number of ornamentally notated slides with a clear anticipated intention, that consistently remain un-notated and presumably improvised in the Brussels manuscript.
The Interpretation and Execution of the Trill

When considering the numerous notated, and indeed unnotated, trills throughout Mahaut’s concerti, two issues become fundamental to their performance: the note upon which the trill is begun and the extent to which this note is sustained before beginning the alternations.

The Upper Auxiliary Start

In his *Méthode*, Mahaut gives us a clear statement with respect to the first issue:

To execute the trill you begin on the note above the one with the trill sign and with which it forms the interval of a second. The interval can either be a whole tone or a semitone. . . Always begin with the borrowed note and end with the note on which the trill is marked.  

In his following discussion, Mahaut is unique among his contemporaries in distinguishing between the French and Italian execution of the trill, principally with respect to the length of the first note and the speed of the following alternations:

The French sustain the borrowed note before the trill and accelerate the beats towards the end of the ornament. The Italians on the other hand do not sustain the borrowed note and play the beats at the same speed throughout. In both cases the trill lasts as long as the value of the given note.  

In both models, he says, a turn can be added, thereby known as the *double cadence* and is “nothing more than two grace notes added at the end of a regular trill” (fig.8.33b).

---


Mahaut’s description of both the French and Italian interpretations does indeed reflect the respective basic models of numerous eighteenth-century authors. The sustained auxiliary can be seen in the early-eighteenth-century French ornamental tables of Rameau (1706) and Dandrieu (1724) (fig. 8.34a), and in the earlier works of Jean Rousseau (1683/1691), Georg Muffat (1698), Loulié (1696) and L’Affilard (1694), labelled cadence appuyée, a term used by many in addition to cadence préparée to describe identical trills. The additional ‘turned’ suffix at the end of the trill, described by Mahaut as a double cadence, was also a basic pattern found in contemporary French theoretical works, most commonly using the same terminology, but also under various other labels including cadence tournée, used by L’Abbé le Fils. The acceleration evident in Mahaut’s French model is confirmed by French authors including Couperin, who says: “Although in the ornament table of my first book the alternations are notated in equal values, they must nevertheless start more slowly than they end, but the acceleration must be imperceptible”. This can also be seen in models given by Corrette (1758) and La Chappelle (1737) (fig. 8.34b).

---

79 Muffat, Georg. *Florilegium II* (Passau, 1698); modern ed. *DTÖ*, vol. I, no. 2; vol. II, no. 2; Preface.
80 Loulié, E. *Eléments* (1696), p. 70.
82 L’Abbé de Fils, *Principes* (1761).
84 Corrette, M. *Le parfait maître à chanter...* (1758).
Likewise, Mahaut’s description of an Italian execution (i.e. without a sustained upper auxiliary) is illustrated by Geminiani in his treatise⁶⁶ as his basic trill or *trillo semplice*, alongside a similar model (*trillo composto*) that includes the additional suffix described by Mahaut (fig.8.34c). The same basic model is found in Tartini’s work⁶⁷ (fig.8.34d(i)) and whilst he fails to actually specify a required upper-note start throughout his extensive discussion of the trill, his models all show such an execution. Here, however, we also note additional examples that show a French type of acceleration in the alternations (fig.8.34d(ii) and (iii)), thus demonstrating that Mahaut’s models must not be interpreted as hard and fast rules and that the boundaries between national styles with regard to the trill were somewhat blurred. Indeed, both French and Italian theoretical works of the late-seventeenth century through to after the mid-eighteenth century show, in addition to the basic models discussed above, an enormous variety and flexibility in their trill models. These are, in themselves, reflected in the many and varied contexts found throughout Mahaut’s concerti that necessarily require a much broader approach to their execution than is perhaps suggested by his *Méthode*.

The most fundamental trill context within the concerti is, of course, that of the cadence. Here the unquestionable requirement of the trill is well understood even today, requiring little in the way of explanation. What is significant, however, is the general inconsistency with which such trills are indicated, as can be seen in the examples of figure 8.35. Such recurring lack of notation is most abundant and noticeable in the cadential context, thus underlining the ‘expected’ and understood requirement, making the notation of the trill


somewhat redundant. In addition to this characteristic, which might be considered universal among composers of the early to mid-eighteenth century, Mahaut displays a more individual trait throughout all collections of his concerti that serves to identify a trill requirement whether notated or not. I refer to his fondness for decorating a written out upper auxiliary preceding the trilled principal, most commonly in a sextuplet pattern or with a descending lombardic slide. Examples of such can be seen in figure 8.36, in each case highlighting a cadential context and thus the essential trill requirement. The question of whether to begin the trill by replaying the upper auxiliary will be discussed shortly. The examples of figure 8.36 also reflect not only the enormous number of such figures, but the consistency with which they appear throughout all four collections, making them somewhat a feature of Mahaut's musical style.

We must also note that, with regard to the inconsistent notation of a cadential trill, the essential requirement of such is often implied equally strongly by an upper auxiliary grace preceding the intended trilled principal or by a written out 'turned' or anticipated suffix. Figure 8.37 shows four identical cadences taken from the same movement (all concluding a solo episode before the tutti entrance) that are nevertheless notated in three different ways. Whilst the trill symbol itself does not occur until the third cadence in bar 77 (fig.8.37c), previous occurrences were notated with only an upper auxiliary grace (fig.8.37b) or left unmarked, showing only the written suffix anticipating the tonic (fig.8.37a and 8.37d). That all four cadences were intended to be executed in an identical manner is without question, and we can conclude that the notation of an upper auxiliary grace, or simply the inclusion of a written suffix in a cadential context, strongly implies an intended trilled principal. Conversely, inherent in a cadential trill symbol is an upper auxiliary start. Similar examples are found throughout the concerti and are illustrated in figure 8.38. Of course, many
unmarked contexts have a trilled precedent earlier in the movement, but others, such as figure 8.38c(ii) and (iii), rely solely on the written suffix and the upper auxiliary grace to imply the essential trill requirement. The turned suffix in particular (fig. 8.38b) is notable for its frequent lack of trill symbol and we shall see shortly that, even in a non-cadential context, this suffix carries a strong trill implication.

With regard to the notation of the upper auxiliary grace, we have previously concluded in our discussion of the single appoggiatura that such a grace in a cadential context was naturally sustained in a long or overlong execution. That the notation of such a grace also carries a strong trill implication confirms that the cadential appoggiatura preceding a trilled principal was likewise intended to be executed on the beat and sustained. As, however, the majority of such appoggiature are left un-notated, their absence does not exclude an onbeat held execution, but is on the contrary to be understood.

It is important to clarify that the sustained execution of a grace preceding a notated or un-notated trill is, in Mahaut's concerti, unquestionably applicable only in a cadential context and is not necessarily appropriate in another. That said, it is significant that, with the exception of the anticipated upper auxiliary of the trilled Italian mordent, the notation of such a grace preceding a trill is found only (although inconsistently) in a cadential context. This might suggest that Mahaut's intended execution of the upper auxiliary preceding a trill in any other context was not necessarily of the sustained variety.

Thus, whilst Mahaut claims that the Italians do not sustain the borrowed note, seen confirmed among the basic models of Geminiani and Tartini, the implied sustained execution of the initial upper auxiliary in Mahaut's cadential trills closely resembles the French model
given in his *Méthode*. This sustained appoggiatura in a cadential context was, however, not limited to a stylistic feature of the French, but had become, by the mid-eighteenth century, a somewhat universal *galant* practice. We have previously discussed the expressive execution of the *long* and *overlong* cadential appoggiatura of the Italians, later to be formalised by the German *galant* school, showing that, alongside those basic Italian models already seen, sits a ‘prepared’ trill featuring a sustained appoggiatura beginning. The cadential use of this execution is confirmed by Tosi: “such preparation is needed in most final cadences and in various other analogous locations”\(^{88}\), and is likewise found amongst the models of Geminiani (fig. 8.39a)\(^{89}\) and Tartini (fig. 8.39b),\(^{90}\) the latter notated simply with a grace and trill symbol shown in a cadential context.

Whilst the length of the *long* or *overlong* appoggiatura in isolation was subject to some universally acknowledged ‘rules’\(^{91}\) that we might label as *galant* practice, it was illustrated with much greater variety of length when discussed within a trilled context. For example, the models given earlier by French writers Rameau and Dandrieu (fig. 8.34a) show a length of appoggiatura that varies from less than half to three-quarters of the trilled principal. Others, including Corrette and Lécuyer (1769),\(^{92}\) illustrate the more common duration of half a principal of duple length. Likewise, the appoggiatura preceding a principal of ternary length is shown ranging from one-third to two-thirds its value. Thus both French and Italian

---


91 See discussion with regard to the one-note grace.

authorities are much more vague when it comes to the length of a sustained appoggiatura leading into a trill than when it does not.

With regard to Mahaut’s concerti, we have already seen the necessity for a more flexible approach to the length of such appoggiature when preceding a trill, particularly with a principal of slightly shorter value or in his gigue-like finale movements. This allows sufficient time for the trill itself to be heard, thus adding sufficient brilliance without sounding hurried or unclear, resulting from an appoggiatura that was too long.93

This flexibility and freedom with regard to the length of the sustained cadential appoggiatura is illustrated in Mahaut’s many contexts in which he writes out the upper auxiliary as an accented (i.e. onbeat) appoggiatura. If viewed as a written out prepared trill (\( \frac{e}{f} \rightarrow \frac{e}{f} \)), part of a single harmonic progression (for example V(6/4)-I) that would otherwise have been written as \( \frac{f}{e} \), then we might consider one of three rhythmic ‘realisations’ of trills such as those in figure 8.40a. The first and simplest possibility is to perform the upper auxiliary as written, hence reflecting the acknowledged rules for a long and overlong accented appoggiatura. Rameau explains that “the note which is slurred to a trill or mordent serves as a beginning to each of these ornaments”.94 By necessity, this of course means that the trill itself, beginning on the second note, is initiated from the principal, although slurred to the preceding appoggiatura. Such a model is given by Rameau (1724), Lacassagne (1766), J.-J. Rousseau (1768) and L’Abbé le Fils (1761), the latter also showing acceleration in the following alternations (fig.8.40b).

---

93 See discussion with regard to the one-note grace.

94 Rameau, Pièces de clavecin (1724), ornament table.
Such rigidity, however, in conforming to the prevailing 'rule' is unlikely to have been adhered to, particularly where more subtlety or smoothness in the rhythm or, in particular, more time was required for the trill itself. Thus our second possibility is to anticipate the trill and perform it within the time of the written appoggiatura. This free rhythmic treatment is seen amongst Couperin's models (fig. 8.40c(i)), and their continued relevance to the galant practice of the mid-century, despite a much stronger tendency towards an onbeat start, is confirmed by Engramelle in 1778 with regard to the mechanical organ (fig. 8.40c(ii)). Likewise, a model given by Francoeur ('neveu') shows the anticipation of a much shorter trill (fig. 8.40c(iii)). Such an execution in Mahaut's concerti would be particularly relevant to a context such as figure 8.40d(i), where the appoggiatura is sustained across the barline making it exceedingly long in comparison with the following trill if the latter were not begun until the second beat. In addition, the shorter treatment of the appoggiatura and the interbeat beginning of the trill can be seen in figure 8.40d(ii), clearly indicated in the notation itself.

As a third possibility, we might consider an execution known as the tremblement lié. This involved suspending the written appoggiatura into the second beat (i.e. making it even longer) so that effectively it allowed the trill to begin with the required onbeat upper note:

This is, today, a popular execution, in which we seek to satisfy what is assumed to be the common historical doctrine regarding the upper note start of a trill. Sources for it are, however, few in number and Frederick Neumann suggests that the only French/Italian
model for it is given by Corrette in his Violoncello method of 1741 (fig. 8.41a). This is not to suggest, on my part, that it was not frequently used. The extension of the dissonant appoggiatura is particularly appropriate in slow and expressive movements and would work well in such contexts seen in figure 8.41b, particularly where the written out upper auxiliary is not part of a single chord progression and is, therefore, not dissonant unless suspended into the second beat. This execution should not, however, as is often the case, be used without due thought and consideration, particularly in those contexts where the beat into which the upper auxiliary is tied is not articulated in another part, preferably in the bass.

My caution regarding the tremblement lié and, indeed, straightforward repetition of the upper auxiliary when already preceding the trill, in favour of a main-note or anticipated start, stands somewhat in contradiction to the well-known discussions of Robert Donington, who categorically states:

> There are no standard exceptions, throughout the middle and late baroque periods, to the upper-note start of regular trills, not even when this means repeating, on the start of the trill, the same note as has been heard immediately before it.\(^{96}\)

Donington supports this view with a statement made by Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg from his keyboard treatise of 1755:

> A trill, wherever it may stand, must begin with its auxiliary note . . . If the upper note with which the trill ought to begin, immediately precedes the note to be trilled, it is

---


either to be renewed by an ordinary attack, or has, before ones starts trilling, to be
connected, without a new attack, by means of a tie, to the previous note.97

Donington, however, based his argument almost entirely on evidence gathered from
German sources of the mid-eighteenth century (such as Marpurg) in which the fundamental
accented upper-note start had formalised into the rigid, much less flexible, style of the
German *galant* school and is the principal source for the execution discussed above as the
tremblement lié. Thus Donington’s discussion reflects only the German models of C.P.E.
Bach, Marpurg, Agricola and Leopold Mozart (fig. 8.42a) and, in the light of these models,
he claims that they “may be regarded as summing up the regular and international practice
of the main baroque period”.98

The style of the German school was, as we know, however, not necessarily applicable to
composers outside their influence. Clearly Donington’s argument did not take into account
the much greater freedom evident in the French and Italian models of the same period and
even overlooked a suggested anticipation of the trill within the Berlin school itself. This is
given by Quantz who describes the execution of a short (‘half’) trill where time is limited,
inserted between an appoggiatura and the principal note, that clearly indicates an interbeat
placement. Quantz also refers to the French character of such an execution, “giving
brilliance to a piece”99 (fig. 8.42b).

97 Marpurg, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Anleitung zum Clavierspielen* . . . (Berlin, 1755), 2nd ed. 1756, i, ix, pp.55-
56.


Thus we have seen, in Mahaut's varied cadential contexts above, an unmistakable requirement for a preceding upper auxiliary that is placed on the beat, receiving a strong accent and is sustained to some degree, thus closely resembling Mahaut's French model in his *Méthode*. Whilst a substantial number of trills in Mahaut's concerti fall into this cadential context there are, however, an equally large number that occur on principals of much shorter value, particularly amongst the solo figuration in which their function is solely to enhance the melodic line rather than the expressive effect of the harmony. To this end, they do not require the sustained harmonic treatment of the upper auxiliary which in many places and in the light of limited space, is simply not feasible. Thus, with regard to these trills, we might consider an interpretation resembling Mahaut's second (Italian) model in which he says that the borrowed note is not sustained and the alternations begin immediately.

Such contexts for which this execution is appropriate are, again, many and varied. Among the most frequent, however, are those that are not only of shorter length, but are approached by a leap from above or below (fig. 8.43a-c). The figure 8.43a illustrates a number of common examples in which the isolated trill leaps upwards out of the figuration or melodic line and demands an immediate start to the trill. Significantly, we note in (ii) that only the second bar is marked with a trill (subsequent appearances are all left unmarked) and in (iii) that it appears correctly in the second and fourth bar whilst missing in the first and appearing only in violin II in the third bar. The inconsistency and somewhat casual notation begin to suggest that a trill was commonplace and generally expected where an isolated note rose out of the figuration. The two examples in figure 8.43b show similar contexts, although the trills are not isolated but leap upwards in sequence. In the first figure the syncopated placement of the trills in itself, let alone the short value of the principal, demands an immediate start to the alternations and excludes a sustained upper auxiliary.
The variety of descending contexts is seen in figure 8.43c. In the first example we note the use of an unusual symbol for the trill (x), contrasting rather strongly to the three more common symbols (+, tr, 4v) found in Mahaut's concerti. As such, its use here tends to suggest a significant contrast in meaning, but remains entirely ambiguous as no like symbol appears throughout the concerti or is described in Mahaut's *Méthode*. Whilst it appears isolated in the concerti, however, it was nevertheless a well-known alternative to the more common symbol for the trill (+), used particularly by non-keyboard French writers in the seventeenth and early-eighteenth century. We might consider that these markings were added later by Mahaut or perhaps by another musician.

A significant context which undeniably requires the immediate start of the trill alternations occurs when the ornament adorns the first note of a new phrase or follows a rest (fig.8.44a). Here its function is purely melodic and does not welcome a sustained upper auxiliary even if the principal itself is of considerable length. Confirmation can be found in Quantz and Leopold Mozart, both of whom were strongly influenced in their ornamentation by the Italians. With regard to the dotted context in figure 8.44a(ii), however, a slightly different interpretation is described by Tartini and Leopold Mozart in which the principal itself is sustained before alternating with the upper auxiliary, effectively, trilling on the dot. This execution will be discussed shortly in considering the more controversial main-note start of certain trills.

100 For a discussion of the symbolic notation of Mahaut's trills, see the end of this section.

101 It is possible that a mordent is intended by this symbol (x) which would sit well in this context. Whilst Mahaut describes this ornament in his *Méthode* (chap.VII), he does not use a symbol and thus we cannot confirm the above possibility.

102 Quantz, *Versuch* (1752), chap.9, par.8, p.104 and L. Mozart, *Versuch* (1756), chap.10, par.11, p.191.
Similar considerations apply likewise to sustained trills that appear amongst the figuration (fig. 8.44b). Again, their singular melodic function is without doubt, with the initial upper auxiliary supplying only an accented attack to the trill. In both figures, however, we note an extremely frequent occurrence in which the trill symbol itself is not marked until subsequent repetitions or appearances. Again, we might conclude that the requirement of a fast and brilliant trill on such notes was generally assumed and understood whether or not it was notated.

An almost inaudible upper auxiliary beginning the trill is also strongly demanded where the principal itself is dissonant against the bass. Such examples are seen in figure 8.44c where the principal is commonly a seventh and thus, in order to ensure that we do not change this dissonance into a consonance, we must avoid placing too much emphasis on the upper auxiliary.\(^\text{103}\) In these figures, the shortness of the initial upper auxiliary is also more comfortable in the light of the approaching leap.

Characteristic of the concerti are the number of trills appearing in a context in which the principal is immediately preceded by the same note as an upbeat to the trill (i.e. \(\text{\textit{r}}\)). These usually occur amongst the solo figuration and can be seen in figures 8.45 and 8.46 in their most prominent contexts. In particular, Mahaut was clearly fond of the energetic rhythmic/melodic formula appearing frequently in his gigue-like finales in both its ascending (fig. 8.45a) and descending (fig. 8.45b) forms. Here the metrically weak placement of the trill means that a sustained upper auxiliary is not at all appropriate, whilst the immediate start of the trill beginning with the upper note provides the necessary attack

\(^{103}\) Shortly we will discuss contexts in which the principal is an even stronger dissonance, forming an appoggiatura that would require anticipation of the upper auxiliary.
and distinction between it and the preceding note which might otherwise be lost if the trill were begun on the principal itself. In figure 8.45a(iii) we note a slight variation of this figure, made more agreeable for the character of a slow movement, but necessarily executed in the same way.

The same repetition of the principal tone is also found in an entirely different context, involving a dotted quaver principal and a written-in two-note suffix (fig.8.46a). Here such trills are simply too short to sustain the upper auxiliary but, as in the previous figures, are necessarily begun immediately from the upper note to ensure clarity. Finally in figure 8.46b, we see some additional contexts along the same lines in which the length of the principal does not allow a sustained appoggiatura. In addition, the weak placement of the trill in figures 8.46b (iii) and (iv) allow only an immediate start or, perhaps, an anticipated auxiliary, a possibility discussed in the following paragraphs.

Thus we have seen in Mahaut’s concerti a considerable variety of trill contexts requiring either a sustained appoggiatura or an immediate start to the alternations, both of which are initiated by an onbeat upper auxiliary and resemble the two models given in Mahaut’s Méthode. There are, however, a significant number of contexts in the concerti in which an execution beginning with an accented upper auxiliary is not perhaps the best interpretation or is even extremely unfavourable in the light of a variety of harmonic and melodic considerations.
In his *A Performers Guide To Baroque Music* (1973), Robert Donington makes a statement regarding what he believes to be the importance of the accented upper-note start that has had a significant influence on our approach to the execution of trills today:

It is impossible to overemphasise the importance of thus stressing the top notes of a trill, not the bottom notes. If the top note start is not given the accent, very firmly, and very accurately on the beat, it might as well not be there. Throughout the entire trill, the accentuation has to be this way up: top notes and not bottom notes getting the sense of accent. A top-note start, unaccented and just before the beat, so that the stress comes not on the auxiliary but on the main note, defeats its own purpose, and though it is a mistake very commonly heard today, it is still a mistake: just as much so as a main-note start. The top note is the important note: think of it as an appoggiatura to which the repercussions on the main note are merely the unimportant resolution.  

It is unfortunate, however, that in making such a statement, Donington has overlooked the much greater variety of models and possibilities that exist in French and Italian sources of the early and mid-eighteenth century which, admittedly, appear to a much lesser extent (with the possible exception of Quantz and Leopold Mozart) in the more rigid doctrine of the German galant style. Whilst Donington claims that an anticipated auxiliary or a main-note start is a "mistake", we find models and descriptions for both in French and Italian sources and proposed in contexts where such executions are much more favourable; of these we see parallels in Mahaut's concerti.

Let us first look at Couperin's basic model in the early part of the century, today commonly understood as an authoritative source for the accented upper auxiliary start. Whilst it is true that he proposes an upper-note start for every trill, his model (fig.8.47a) has been the subject of conflicting interpretations as to the placement of this upper auxiliary. Whilst his

---

trill certainly begins on the upper note, we see an uneven number of alternations in the first bar contrasting with the evenness of the second and third bars, both of which show a metrical accent on the principal at the beginning of each bar. Clearly this begins to suggest the prebeat nature of the first upper auxiliary.\textsuperscript{105} Such implication has, this century, been ignored by many and in some cases altered to reflect the prevalent doctrine, including Brunold (with regard to French harpsichord ornaments) in 1925 (fig.8.47b). Frederick Neumann suggests that Brunold’s reprint was then later used mistakenly by Germani, Mellers and Aldrich.\textsuperscript{106} Neumann goes on to show some of Couperin’s musical contexts in which written-in prebeat upper auxiliaries are slurred to trilled principals, allowing only a main-note start to the trill itself (fig.8.47c).

Such written out specimens might not provide direct evidence about the interpretation of a symbol, but they add further confirmation that a grace-note type was part of Couperin’s vocabulary.\textsuperscript{107}

Similar and frequent examples can be found in Rameau’s music, and closer to the mid-century, in the methods of David (1737) (fig.8.48a), Fouquet (c.1750) (fig.8.48b) and the violin treatise of L’Abbé le Fils (1761) (fig.8.48c).\textsuperscript{108} Whilst such models seldom appear in Italian theoretical works of the period, with the exception of a single example by Tartini (fig.8.48d), we find frequent examples of an implied anticipated auxiliary in their music, either as a written out prebeat upper note or in the ‘little-note’ notation of the grace. The latter can be seen frequently in the first sonata of Geminiani’s Opus 4 (fig.8.48e) where the

\textsuperscript{105} This is essentially the argument proposed by Frederick Neumann, which he discusses in great detail in his Ornamentation, chap. 25, p.263.

\textsuperscript{106} Neumann, Frederick. Ornamentation, chap. 25, p.266.

\textsuperscript{107} Neumann, Frederick. Ornamentation, chap. 25, p.265.

\textsuperscript{108} For further discussion of these sources see Frederick Neumann, Ornamentation, chap.26, p.281.
undeniable prebeat nature of the auxiliary grace is indicated by its semiquaver and demi-semiquaver notation.

Such a prebeat intention is found numerous times throughout Mahaut's concerti as a written out anticipated auxiliary, most commonly within the melodic context of a fragmented descending scale. Figure 8.49(a-c) illustrates a representative collection of examples showing the three rhythmic contexts in which these trills most frequently appear. Whilst we note that the required slur joining the auxiliary to the trilled principal is almost consistently missing, the function of the preceding note as the anticipated auxiliary is demanded by the limited 'space' of such trills, thus excluding a repeated upper auxiliary in the time of the principal itself.

Note in figure 8.49b(iii), that the last trill appears in a rather different context in which the trilled principal repeats the preceding note, thus forming a dissonance against the bass before resolving to its lower neighbour. In other words, the trill itself adorns a written out appoggiatura. Just as we concluded in our previous discussion with regard to the one-note grace, the upper auxiliary that precedes a written out appoggiatura, whether this be 'decorated with a trill or not, must not be allowed to change the inherent dissonance into a consonance by placing the auxiliary on the beat. This is confirmed by Quantz:

> If there are shakes upon notes which form dissonances against the bass, whether the augmented fourth, the diminished fifth, the seventh, or the second, the appoggiaturas before the shakes must be very short, to avoid transforming the dissonances into consonances . . . this must be avoided as much as possible if the beauty and agreeableness of the harmony are not to be spoiled.\(^{109}\)

\(^{109}\) Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap.8, par.10, p.96.
In his earlier discussion concerning a single grace preceding a written appoggiatura, Quantz stated that it be "reckoned in the time of the previous note in the upbeat". Thus, where he later said short, we can conclude an intended anticipated execution.

The example above is just one of a multitude of such figures found throughout all collections of the concerti, demonstrating Mahaut's fondness for further enhancing the expressive effect of a written out appoggiatura by the addition of a trill. Whilst all such figures show the same melodic outline (i.e. repetition of the preceding note followed by descent to the lower neighbour) they appear in various rhythmic contexts of which the most common is that of equal quavers as seen in figure 8.50. The need to anticipate the initial upper auxiliary is confirmed in the continuo figuring in figure 8.50b and 8.50d. In the former, the figure '6' implies that the principal itself is to be struck against the bass and not its upper neighbour. Likewise, in the latter, an onbeat principal is demanded by the figure '4' in the basso continuo. Figures 8.51a and 8.51b illustrates two slightly different rhythmic contexts, although essentially the required execution of the initial auxiliary remains the same. This is so, even in the examples of figure 8.51b, where the principal is of greater length, resulting in an overlong appoggiatura. An onbeat auxiliary would still unfavourably alter its harmonic effect no matter what its length.

Mahaut's fondness for these figures is highlighted in figure 8.51a(i) where they form one of the main motivic elements of the ritornello. The general inconsistency with regard to the symbolic notation of the trill found in its many later appearances demonstrates the extent to

---

110 Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap.8, par.6, p.94.
which the trill is fundamentally associated with such written out appoggiature in Mahaut’s concerti.

A third prominent context within the concerti that undoubtedly requires an anticipated auxiliary is one already referred to a number of times as the *Italian mordent* (i.e. a three-note lombardic figure adorned, more often than not, with a trill upon the first note (fig. 8.52a)). Previously we established the fundamental prebeat nature of the initial auxiliary in this standardised melodic/rhythmic formula,\(^{111}\) which is most often found where the principal is otherwise too short to sustain a proper trill. Tartini demonstrates with such figures, that which he calls the perfect execution of an unadorned anticipated appoggiatura (fig. 8.52b). It is interesting that, whilst those examples taken from Mahaut’s Brussels collection (fig. 8.52a) are all notated with both the preceding grace and the trill symbol, the following examples (fig. 8.52c), representing the remaining collections, are notated only (although inconsistently) with the preceding grace. We know, however, that where possible, the addition of a trill was an inherent element of this standard ornament, as confirmed, it will be remembered, by Tartini in his treatise.\(^{112}\) Thus we can conclude that a trill was surely intended in all examples of figure 8.52c wherever speed and time permit.

Finally, with regard to the anticipated auxiliary, we might consider a number of contexts in which the principal is preceded by a descending third. It will be recalled that, in this context, a single appoggiatura is most favourably performed as a prebeat grace, in accordance with the French stylistic origin of such an ornament. That this grace might precede a trilled

---

\(^{111}\) See our earlier discussion with regard to the one-note grace.

principal, as we saw in figure 8.50b(iii), should make no difference to its prebeat placement. An examination of Quantz’s tables, in which he seeks to demonstrate the embellishment of a plain *Adagio* (fig. 8.53a), provides us with a number of similar contexts as that described above and as seen in figure 8.53b and 8.53c. Here Quantz’s instructions clearly state that, whilst the semiquaver and quaver principal notes remain strong, the four little notes, including the one preceding the trill, are to be weak, clearly implying their interbeat character and reflects his previous comments regarding the anticipation of appoggiature lying between descending thirds. In addition to this understanding, we note in figure 8.53b that the interbeat nature of the auxiliary preceding the second and third trills is confirmed by its pre-barline notation, implying the same execution for the first trill, which had clearly been assumed. On the other hand, in figure 8.53c, the distinction between a prebeat and short onbeat placement of the auxiliary is much less defined (almost indistinguishable) in the light of the fast tempo and syncopated rhythm.

**The Main-note Start**

Just as we have seen substantial evidence to suggest that the anticipated auxiliary or ‘grace-note’ trill was indeed widely used, and is appropriate in Mahaut’s concerti within relevant contexts, we also find, amongst French and Italian sources, significant endorsement of the main-note trill. I refer to a trill that begins immediately on the principal and is not preceded by its upper auxiliary. In French sources it is referred to under a variety of terms, but from about 1730 can be found under the titles *cadence subite*, *précipitée*, *jetée* or *coupée*. There is, however, much confusion surrounding this terminology, in which they will often deviate

---

113 Quantz, *Versuch* (1751), chap.14, par.42, p.177.
in meaning between different authors. Thus it is not the labels themselves that are significant, but the descriptions and, where given, the illustrations. An example from the early part of the century can be seen in L’Affilard’s model (1705) (fig. 8.54a). Here the short trills clearly begin on the principal, although the second trill is in fact preceded by a written-in upper auxiliary resembling a grace-note trill. Later in 1737, La Chappelle’s model unmistakably implies a main-note start (fig. 8.54b) although he does not actually explain its execution, which might be considered fairly obvious.

Whilst the upper-note start is a fundamental principal in L’Abbé Duval’s basic trill model, he later speaks of the *cadence subite* which, he says, is never preceded by the upper note and is used when the principal is of shorter length, “or when taste requires it”.\(^{114}\) In contrast to this is L’Abbé le Fils’ accelerating model (fig. 8.54c), which clearly involves rather a long principal yet undeniably begins on the main note. In 1768, Jean-Jacques Rousseau defined the main-note trill under the term *battement*, contrasting it with the ‘normal’ *cadence* beginning on the upper note:

> A French vocal ornament which consists in shaking a trill upward from a note which one has started plain. The *Cadence* and *Battement* differ in that the *Cadence* starts with the note above the one on which it is marked; whereupon one shakes alternately the upper and the true note: by contrast the *Battement* starts with the very note on which it is marked; whereupon one shakes alternately this note with the one above.\(^{115}\)

A significant context in which the main-note trill was intended becomes apparent in the late-galant theoretical works of Lécuyer (1769) and Duval (1775). Both describe the *cadence*


subite and the jettée as trills with an immediate start, in which the subite descends and the jettée ascends, clearly implying a main-note start in the latter. Their appropriate use, however, appears to be defined by their melodic context in that the subite is used where the melodic line descends and the jettée where it ascends (i.e. approached from below), as can be seen in Lécuyer's illustration (fig. 8.54d).  

Such melodic considerations would seem to have a significant relevance to many contexts in Mahaut’s concerti where short trilled principals, approached from below and often in a syncopated rhythm (such as those seen in figure 8.55a), are much more comfortable executed from the main note than from the upper auxiliary in addition to being melodically more pleasing. In particular, this is an important consideration in figures, such as figure 8.55a(ii) and especially figure 8.55b, where a sequence of trills occurs in a conjunct rising line in which the continuity or smoothness of this line would be broken by an upper auxiliary start to each trill. In addition to Lacassagne’s French model (1766) (fig. 8.55c) illustrating this execution, confirmation is also found in Italian sources, principally that of Tartini. The latter relates both ascending and descending trill chains to the portamento or glissando effect on the violin, executed by sliding a single finger and is only possible as a series of trills if they are begun from each of the main notes (fig. 8.55d). The same instructions are given, not surprisingly, by Leopold Mozart who adds an example of chromatic ascent and descent (fig. 8.55e) similar to Mahaut’s usage in figure 8.55b, which is to be executed in a like manière.

116 Lécuyer, Principes (1769), 11-13 and Duval, Méthode agréable (1775), p.11.

117 A greater discussion of Tartini’s and Mozart’s instructions on this point can be found in Neumann, Ornamentation, chap.30, p.349 and chap.31, p.381.
Further endorsement of the main-note trill is found amongst the basic models of Geminiani (fig. 8.56a). In this, it appears that the principal is to be sustained a little before beginning the alternations. Whilst, as we have seen, all Tartini’s ‘basic’ models are initiated from the upper note (although we have already noted the main-note implications of his trill chains), Frederick Neumann suggests that the value of this upper-note evidence is later undermined in a well-known letter written by Tartini to Signora Maddalena Lombardini, in 1760. Among other things, the letter discusses the trill for which the given model (fig. 8.56b) clearly shows a main-note start.\(^{118}\)

In addition, we previously considered a context involving a dotted principal (fig. 8.44a(ii)). In that discussion, we concluded that its execution most certainly required an immediate start to the trill, possibly from the upper auxiliary. Tartini, however, strongly implies in his treatise a main-note start, by first sustaining the principal: “it will make an excellent effect to trill [only] on the dot as shown in the following example” (see fig. 8.57).\(^{119}\)

Again, this is repeated by Leopold Mozart: “If ones desires to perform dotted notes without an appoggiatura, one can insert a little trill at each dot”,\(^ {120}\) and is followed by Tartini’s model although in a different key. Thus the sustained principal, together with Mozart’s comment “without an appoggiatura”, unmistakably implies a main-note start and might well be applied to like-contexts in Mahaut’s concerti. In addition to these dotted figures, we also find in the concerti similarly sustained principals that precede much longer trills, tied over several bars (fig. 8.58a and b). Here the sustained principal is written out, making it very

\(^{118}\) See Neumann *Ornamentation*, chap.30, p.348 for further comment.


\(^{120}\) Mozart, L. *Versuch* (1756), chap.10, par.19, p.194.
clear where the trill is to begin. If the latter, however, were begun from the upper note, it would in effect break the sustaining tie with a semi-articulated accent that was clearly not intended. A shorter version of this execution is given in the studies from the violin treatise of the Frenchman L'Abbé le Fils, likewise showing a sustained main-note beginning (fig. 8.58c). In an almost identical context from the concerti (fig. 8.58d), the tied suspension excludes the anticipated upper auxiliary that might otherwise have preceded the trilled principal which is, in itself, a written out appoggiatura.

Finally in our discussion of the main-note start, we might consider contexts in which the principal suffers from an extreme lack of time or space, thus allowing only one alternation that necessarily must begin on the principal itself in order to finish correctly on the main note (this is essentially an inverted mordent). The requirement for such a short trill is clearly apparent in figure 8.59a(i) and (ii). In the repeated trills of figure 8.59b(i) and (ii), a main-note start is favourable not only because of the short value of the principals. Here the trills fulfil simply a melodic function, adding a certain brilliance to the repeated notes, but at the same time must not disturb the melodic line by placing greater emphasis on the upper auxiliary of each trill. Indeed, an anticipated auxiliary would also ensure greater prominence of the principals, but would not be possible at these tempos.

Further Matters of Notation

We turn now to some further matters involving the notation of trills in Mahaut's concerti. In our earlier discussion, with regard to cadential contexts, we saw frequent examples in which the missing trill was implied simply by the notation of a following suffix, either written out
or using little grace notes. Whilst in these contexts the requirement of a trill is a little more predictable or understood, identical suffix notations also appear amongst the figuration and non-cadential contexts with an equally strong implication of an intended trill, in which the latter is either missing entirely or inconsistently notated. Thus, in figure 8.60a, whilst identical figures appear a third below in violin II, the trill symbol appears only in the first violin. Clearly the suffix figures in the second violin were enough to convey the trill requirement (remembering that the manuscript exists only in parts, not having been composed in score), producing an intended identical execution in both violins. Likewise, figure 8.60b shows a single part in which only the second and third repetitions are marked with the required trill, and in figure 8.60c, the symbol does not appear until the third figure but is undeniably intended on the first two. The final three examples (fig. 8.60d-f) show the intended suffix notated as a two-note grace-like slide. Their function as a trill suffix and inherent interbeat placement is confirmed in the first two examples upon repetition of the figure. The third follows an identical but descending sequence in which both trill and suffix are fully clarified. Thus the shorthand nature of the notation in the second bar is clearly understood.

The final issue to be considered here is the differing symbolic notation of the trill throughout the collections. The Brussels concerti, with a few deviations to be considered shortly, symbolise the trill with a small cross (+), while the two German collections of Karlsruhe and Regensburg use the well-known tr symbol and the Stockholm concerti consistently utilise a small chevron (〜). In his Méthode, Mahaut states that "the Italians usually mark it with a t or tr and the French with a small cross (+)". ¹²¹ In the latter, Mahaut was obviously

¹²¹ Mahaut, Méthode (1759), chap.V, p.10.
referring solely to non-keyboard music as the French almost consistently used a differing symbol in their keyboard music, that of the chevron (\(^{ \swarrow }\)). Thus the Brussels collection, in its non-keyboard idiom, clearly suggests the French stylistic tendencies of its author or copyist.

Whilst the \(\text{tr}\) symbol, as implied by Mahaut, was first and foremost of Italian heritage, it was also the symbol adopted by the Germans for use in their instrumental music other than that for the keyboard. For the latter, they adopted the chevron of French origin and reflected French keyboard usage, principally the more rigid application of the accented upper-note start. Thus J.S. Bach never used the chevron except in his keyboard music. His son, C.P.E. Bach, in his clavier treatise, distinguishes between the keyboard chevron and the \(\text{tr}\) symbol used in other media. Significantly, Marpurg shows the three symbols \(^{ \swarrow }\), \(\text{tr}\) and \(+\) to mean exactly the same thing (fig. 8.61) and whilst Agricola does not specify any difference between them, changes his trill symbol from \(\text{tr}\) to \(^{ \swarrow }\) in his keyboard examples.\(^{122}\) In contrast, both the essays of Quantz (flute) and Leopold Mozart (violin) consistently use only the Italian \(\text{tr}\) symbol, reflective of their non-keyboard content.

The significant difference in trill notation between the Brussels and German collections adds further support to our earlier conclusions that the latter were copied by members of the respective German courts, reflective of their own notational styles, and are unlikely to be in Mahaut's own hand. Similarly, the same might be said of the Stockholm collection. Whilst we know fairly little of the eighteenth-century Swedish notational tendencies with regard to

the trill, we might surmise that either the chevron was used by them more widely in both keyboard and non-keyboard music, or they were perhaps closer to German usage and the copyist of Mahaut’s concerti had a certain bias towards the keyboard which was reflected in his notational style.

Earlier, we mentioned that the Brussels collection, whilst largely reflecting French usage of a small cross (+), had in addition a small number of exceptions. The first of these, already briefly discussed, appears in a single occurrence in which three identical figures are marked with the symbol ‘x’ (seen in fig.8.43c(i)). Here we concluded that this was simply a less common French trill notation used in non-keyboard music and may have been added later by another hand. The symbol was more commonly used by seventeenth-century authors including Bacilly, D’Ambruys and Marin Marais in their vocal works, but was in no way used exclusively. It also appears in Montéclair’s Méthode of 1709.123

A somewhat more perplexing exception is the use of the Italian symbol tr, not unusual in itself, but definitely so when set alongside the French cross, as we find a number of times throughout all four concerti of the Brussels collection. For example, in figure 8.62a(i), this two-bar sequence is repeated five times, the first three notated with the Italian tr, and the last two with the French cross (+). Likewise, the following figure (fig.8.62a(ii)) is repeated three times, the first two with the Italian tr and the last with the French cross. In figure 8.62a(iii), the two distinct trilled figures appearing in quick succession are notated quite illogically with contrasting symbols. A difference in execution, that might have been implied by Mahaut’s contrasting descriptions for each symbol in his Méthode, is clearly not relevant.

123 Montéclair, Méthode (1709), p.41.
here in that both trills require a short upper-note start (onbeat or perhaps anticipated), but
exclude a sustained appoggiatura, particularly in the second figure, due to the weak
placement of its principal. In addition, when the phrase is repeated three bars later, the
symbols are reversed, making nonsense of any intended difference of execution.

This contrasting notation not only appears on subsequent repetitions, but also between
parts. In figure 8.62b(i) the two violins are in unison, yet the second uses the symbol tr and
the first, the French cross. Likewise in the following example (fig.8.62b(ii)), the flute is
notated with tr and the second violin doubling a third below, with a cross (+).

Other more isolated occurrences of the Italian symbol often appear in cadential contexts
which match the implied execution of previous or subsequent cadences marked, in contrast,
with a cross (+). Such an example is seen in figure 8.62c where the required execution of
the first and third trills is identical to the cadential execution of the second. It is apparent,
therefore, that we cannot mistake the Italian symbol notated in the concerti, to necessarily
imply the ‘Italian’ execution described in Mahaut’s Méthode.

Thus we can conclude that, although the two symbols are often simultaneous or sit side by
side, they do not in any way imply a contrasting execution. As we have seen throughout our
discussion, the choice of execution, principally with regard to the length and placement of
the upper auxiliary, is determined instead by factors evident in each context, not by the
symbol used, and reflects a far greater variety of designs than that found in Mahaut’s
Méthode. If, in fact, the Brussels concerti are in Mahaut’s own hand, we can only surmise
that the use of the Italian symbol alongside the French cross is due to the significant Italian
influence upon Mahaut while in Amsterdam, set against his French musical education and, in addition, to a certain amount of careless notation.
The Use of Mordents In the Concerti

With the exception of the abundant written out Italian mordent, already discussed at length, no other symbolic indication of the mordent appears throughout Mahaut’s concerti. This does not necessarily suggest, however, that the use of such was not intended. It will be remembered that the Italians themselves had no common symbol for the mordent, although its use and various designs are described in the ornament tables of both Geminiani and Tartini. Likewise, the symbols used by French composers were equally inconsistent, particularly in their non-keyboard works, often appearing simply as two small grace-notes. This symbolic variety, and in many cases omission, points suggestively towards the spontaneous or improvised nature of the ornament whose intended use was generally understood without the need for symbolic indications.

In his Méthode, Mahaut describes two types of mordent under the headings battement and martellement alongside other essential ornaments including the vibrato (flattement) and the appoggiatura. The battement, he says, “is performed on a note by alternating it very quickly once, twice or more with the note directly below it”, while the martellement is executed in the same way but begun on the lower borrowed note which is struck “two,

124 Geminiani used a symbol of two parallel oblique lines, influenced by his residency in England and is also to be found in the works of other English composers, but was not common beyond its shores.


126 The symbols that do appear in French works are used principally in keyboard music, ranging from Couperin’s, Rameau’s ‘hook’ and the more recognisable used by Siret, Dandrieu, David and Corrette. The latter, however, uses such a symbol only in his harpsichord works and comments in his violoncello treatise upon the lack of mordent symbol for this instrument, resorting to the notation of two grace-notes to illustrate its improvised execution.

127 The term *mordent* is used only in the English translation of Mahaut’s treatise by Eileen Hadidian [chap. VII, pp.19-20].
three or four times as quickly as possible”. The fact that Mahaut provides no symbol alongside his descriptions of either type further supports the view that the lack of symbolic indication for this ornament throughout the concerti does not exclude their use, but rather points to their essential and understood requirement.

Whilst Mahaut gives no illustration of the *battement*, his description of the necessary fingering strongly suggests that the principal is sustained following the ornament:

> The finger which plays the mordent always stays raised after the ornament is finished, except in the case of d''. For example, the mordent on g', whether it is played with f' natural or f'-sharp, uses the fourth hole, which remains open after the ornament is done to sound the g'. The mordent from c'' to d'' uses the fourth hole which stays closed after the ornament to sound d''. The mordent from c''-sharp to d'' uses the second and third holes, which stay closed after the ornament to sound the d''. With this knowledge you can easily play mordents on all notes.129

As the *martellement* differs only in the note upon which it starts, we might assume a similar execution which is, in fact, confirmed by the illustrations following his description of the *martellement* (see fig.8.63).

What remains ambiguous in both types, however, is the placement of the ornament: before or on the beat. This ambiguity is not limited to Mahaut, but is a significant problem in the discussions of many of his contemporaries, with the exception perhaps of C.P.E. Bach and his followers in the German *galant* school. Rather than a rigid right or wrong placement, the variety of illustrations shown in the sources suggest, in contrast, a flexibility of execution which might vary from context to context. This approach is captured in Lacassagne’s

---

French vocal treatise of 1766, in which he says the *martellement* is “more or less long or short, more or less tender or lively”. In Mahaut’s illustration of the *martellement* (fig.8.63), whilst the ‘little-note’ notation of the ornament and the large notation of the sustained principal might visually suggest the anticipation of the mordent itself, we cannot automatically rule out the possibility of an onbeat interpretation. The triple *martellement* would, in fact, be too long to anticipate fully except in a very slow tempo.

Note also, that only the first example (i.e. the *Simple* or single mordent) begins with a *longer* lower auxiliary, logical in the light of the limited space available for the multiple mordent. More significant, however, is the resemblance of this single mordent to the *port de voix et pincé*, already discussed at length with regard to the single ascending appoggiatura. In that discussion we noted the commonplace rhythmic freedom of the *port de voix* where the placement and length of the initial lower auxiliary was determined principally by its context rather than by a rigid ‘rule’, and might feasibly occur before, across, or on the beat. This freedom is likewise seen in the description of mordents, particularly in French sources, where some authors clearly illustrate an onbeat lower auxiliary, whilst others show an anticipated one. Here the mordent is in many cases labelled as a *pincé* and the lower mordent as a *port de voix et pincé*, as seen in Rameau’s examples in figure 8.64a. Note that, in his earlier treatise (1706), Rameau shows an immediate start to the multiple lower mordent whilst later (1724 and 1731) lengthening the initial lower auxiliary. Both, however, are clearly placed on the beat. Likewise, in De Lusse’s flute treatise (c.1760), we find a similar execution to Rameau’s earlier example, this time labelled simply as *Pincé*

---


(fig. 8.64b(i)). De Lusse shows in addition, however, a presumably anticipated lower auxiliary preceding a multiple mordent that concludes with a turn (fig. 8.64b(ii)). Anticipation of the lower auxiliary is also suggested by Dandrieu’s model for the *port de voix et pincé* (fig. 8.64c). Frederick Neumann suggests that the assumption of an interbeat meaning for the small grace-note is supported by “the metrical equivalence of the regular notes in model and transcription”.¹³¹ That such an anticipated execution might have been equally relevant to French-influenced composers outside its borders can be seen in the adoption of Dandrieu’s models by Belgian/Dutch composers Fiocco (1730), and van Helmont (1739).¹³²

Like Mahaut, Corrette uses the term *Martellement* to label his mordent beginning on the lower auxiliary (contrasting this with the label *pincé* for the upper mordent, discussed shortly). We have already seen Corrette’s *Martellement à la manière Italienne* (fig. 8.64d) which shows an *overlong* realisation of the appoggiatura. The implied Italian origin of such a lengthened auxiliary suggests that the ‘normal’ French interpretation was a much shorter or even anticipated *port de voix*, illustrating again, the significant variety of executions relevant to the mordent in French and Italian *galant* sources.

A similar, but more ambiguous, model is given in the French vocal treatise of Lacassagne (1766) (fig. 8.64e). Here Frederick Neumann suggests that the model indicates the full anticipation of the double mordent “in as much as the alternations belong to the following

¹³¹ Neumann, F. *Ornamentation*, chap. 12, p. 82.

It might equally, however, represent the written out realisation of a multiple mordent following a long lower auxiliary, similar to Corrette's model above, that would otherwise have been indicated as a lower mordent on a dotted minim d (i.e. $\text{\textcopyright} n \text{\textcopyright} n \text{\textcopyright} n$).

Not surprisingly, models for the lower mordent found in the galant German sources of Theophil Muffat, Marpurg, Agricola and C.P.E. Bach all illustrate an onbeat execution of varying lengths with regard to the initial auxiliary (fig. 8.65a-b). Quantz's models (fig. 8.65c), however, more closely resemble the ambiguous notations found in the French and Italian sources above, suggesting greater flexibility of placement and length for the initial auxiliary. Significantly, these models follow on from Quantz's discussion of the ascending and descending appoggiatura whose placement and length were determined, once again, by their context.

Thus a close association was clearly existed between the port de voix et pincé and the lower mordent with regard to notation and execution. This suggests that, where one finds in Mahaut's concerti, and indeed in the works of his contemporaries, the simple notation of an ascending appoggiatura indicated by a small grace-note (\textcopyright n), we might admit not only a possible pincé to the port de voix, but also a double or triple pincé, resembling Mahaut's martellement. We have previously examined Mahaut's many notated ascending single appoggiatura in figures 8.16 to 8.20. The possible addition of a multiple mordent is clearly more applicable to those ports de voix preceding larger principals such as those in figure 8.16a(i-viii), in which we concluded an onbeat, more or less sustained, appoggiatura leading into the pincé. The martellement might equally be applied to shorter port de voix, including

\footnote{Neumann, F. Ornamentation, chap. 36, p.433.}
those that may be executed in a somewhat syncopated manner by anticipating and straddling the beat (fig.8.19a and b), whilst the single mordent or pincé might follow the fully anticipated port de voix preceding much shorter principal values. This would, of course, necessitate the pincé itself being placed on the beat and receiving the accent.

As we saw earlier, there are in Mahaut’s concerti a number of ascending appoggiatura that precede a principal notated with a trill symbol (see fig.8.18). It will be remembered that the most common galant cadential formula involved not an ascending appoggiatura, but a descending one. The number of ascending cadential appoggiatura in the concerti is indeed much less in comparison with the descending form. We might, therefore, consider the possibility, and this is by no means intended as a definitive interpretation, that in this context the trill symbol may be taken to mean a multiple mordent, thus alternating the principal with the lower auxiliary rather than the upper, and naturally follows from the port de voix. This duality of the trill and the mordent as mirror images of each other was a common Italian feature throughout the seventeenth-century, known as tremulus ascendens and the tremulus descendens. This had a significant influence on seventeenth-century German authors and became part of the ‘Italo-German’ tradition. Frederick Neumann’s examination of this ‘tradition’ suggests that, whilst the double meaning of the tr symbol was not consistent throughout all Italian/German composers of the period, it was “probably common throughout the seventeenth century [and] was still to be found in Domenico Scarlatti”. The duality was certainly carried into the eighteenth century in Italy, a reflection of which can be seen in Geminiani’s basic model for the mordente, showing a multiple mordent in

---

134 This was discussed in the light of the fundamental rhythmic freedom of the port de voix with regard to the ascending one-note grace.

135 Neumann, F. Ornamentation, chap.37, p.439. For his entire discussion see the whole of chap.37 in addition to his discussion of Scarlatti in chap.30.
which one can clearly see a strong resemblance to the old *tremulus descendens* (fig. 8.66). He does not, however, use the symbol tr, but the old English symbol of two oblique lines already mentioned. Thus it is possible that we see in Mahaut a hangover from this tradition, embedded in his not insignificant Italian influences in which the presence of the lower auxiliary preceding the trilled principal may suggest an intended multiple mordent, rather than the conventional trill more commonly preceded by the upper auxiliary. This interpretation certainly works well in all such contexts within the concerti (fig. 8.18), but must be left to the taste and judgement of the performer.

Returning now to Mahaut’s *battement*, we note even greater ambiguity in its intended placement, particularly due to the lack of any illustration. As we shall see, however, from other similar descriptions of a mordent beginning on the principal itself, this ambiguity is simply a reflection of the flexibility that this ornament possesses. In earlier French texts this mordent is referred to as the *pincé*, in this case unattached to the *port de voix*. Whilst, in Couperin’s ornament table of 1713 (fig. 8.67a), it would appear that only the *Pincé continu* is undoubtedly begun on the beat, he later states in his treatise of 1716 that “the alternations and the tone on which they end must be comprised in the value of the principal note”\(^{136}\), thus implying that every mordent beginning with the principal is initiated on the beat. Frederick Neumann, in his discussion of Couperin’s ornaments, however, points out many contexts in his music that suggest an exception to this rule which he claims is justified by Couperin’s many remarks regarding the need to approach notation and ‘rules’ of execution with much flexibility, rather than rigid application.\(^{137}\)

\(^{136}\) Couperin, *L’art de toucher le clavecin*, p.19.

Likewise, we see the same onbeat realisations given by Rameau (fig. 8.67b), Dandrieu (fig. 8.67c), Corrette (fig. 8.67d), Foucquet (fig. 8.67e) and in the flute treatise of De Lusse (fig. 8.67f). Significantly, we note that all these illustrations are given with regard to the keyboard and, with the exception of Corrette and Foucquet, show principally the multiple mordent which, by necessity, is more likely to be placed on the beat than before it. With regard, however, to instruments other than the keyboard, including the voice, and in particular to the single mordent or pincé, this onbeat placement is much less clear both in notation and description. We have already noted the differing notation of Corrette’s single pincé for the clavier and the more ambiguous notation for the cello (fig. 8.68a). Similarly, in his treatise of 1737 (fig. 8.68b), David uses the same grace-note notation for the voice, whose anticipated interbeat nature is implied by its description as being *feint et précipité*. 138

Likewise, around thirty years later, Duval and Francoeur imply an interbeat execution by use of the term *flatté*, meaning ‘flattered’. Duval, however, illustrates the single mordent as an onbeat ornament (fig. 8.68c) while describing it as a “light inflection of the throat” preceding a long note, thus implying a contradictory, unaccented execution. 139 This ambiguity and contradiction between notation and implied performance perhaps points once again to the flexibility inherent in this ornament. Further suggestion of this can be seen in Lécuyer’s contrasting description. Whilst he uses the ‘interbeat’ grace-note notation (fig. 8.68d), he describes it as “a sort of whiplash which renders the note more brilliant” 140, the implication being a much more violent, hence accented, execution. We note also that all


three of these authors describe the single mordent under the term *martellement*, clearly contrasting with Mahaut's use of the term to describe a mordent beginning on the lower auxiliary which reflects Corrette's usage in his *Martellement à la manière Italienne*. Importantly, it is clear that the term is not indicative of either an onbeat or prebeat execution, since both contrasting usages include suggested examples of both. It is, therefore, but another example of terminology that is defined differently by one composer to another and can only be interpreted in the light of his own performance indications.

We have previously seen numerous examples and discussed extensively the abundance of 'Italian mordents' that appear throughout Mahaut's concerti. I refer of course to the three-note lombardic figures that appear written out and are usually preceded by an anticipated upper auxiliary and, if time, an onbeat trill (\[\text{\fig} \]\). The existence of these figures as standardised formulas, together with their written out notation, suggests that they are not the same mordents described by Mahaut under the term *battement*. This assumption is supported by Tartini's description of a single, double and triple *mordente* (fig. 8.69a) in addition to the aforementioned mordent design. Whilst Tartini fails actually to state his intended execution with regard to placement in his description of the *mordente*, his comments reveal a strong tendency towards anticipation. These are in line with much of the non-keyboard French sources and contrasts with the accented nature of the formalised 'Italian mordent' above. In his discussion, Tartini describes two models of the *mordente*. The first is an uncommon kind not usually described as a mordent and consists of three conjunct notes beginning one note above or below the principal and written in the small grace-note notation (fig. 8.69b). Significantly, he states that the accent "does not fall on the three added notes but on the principal written note of the melody, so that the three added
notes are played or sung piano, the principal note forte”. Following his description of the second more common type (fig.8.69a), including the single, double and multiple models, he states that they are performed in a like manner to the first kind (i.e. in anticipation), with the accent falling on the principal note.

Confirmation of this anticipated interpretation in Tartini’s discussion can be found in the treatise of Leopold Mozart who, as we know, is more aligned to Italian practices of ornamentation (and in particular to Tartini) than to the rigid ideas of the German galant school in Berlin. With regard to the mordent (fig.8.70a), he says, “the little notes quite quickly and quietly, so to speak, grasp at the principal note and vanish at once, so that the principal note only is heard strongly”. This he equates to the Italian Mordente and the French Pincé. Later he clarifies the required execution further, stating that “the stress of the tone falls on the note itself, whilst the mordent, on the contrary, is slurred quite softly and very quickly onto the principal note, for otherwise it would no longer be called a mordent”. Such a description can imply only an anticipated execution of the mordent and clearly reflects both French and Italian galant practices.

In addition to his Mordant, Mozart also introduces a ‘prolonged’ mordent which he calls battement (fig.8.70b). These are similar to Mahaut’s description of the multiple battement but differ in that they begin always on the lower auxiliary, better resembling perhaps the

141 Tartini, Regole ..., facs.ed., p.17 [trans. given by Frederick Neumann, Ornamentation, chap.39, p.453].

142 Leopold Mozart, Versuch (1756), chap.11, par.8, p.206.

143 Leopold Mozart, Versuch (1756), chap.11, par.13, p.208.

144 Mozart specifically contrasts this structural difference with his Mordant that begin on the principal itself [Versuch, chap.11, par.16, p.209].
models given for Mahaut’s marcellement. Unlike the latter, however, their essential prebeat nature, although not specified, can perhaps be seen in Mozart’s statement regarding their function:

\[
\ldots \text{one uses this battement in lively pieces in place of the appoggiatura in order to perform certain otherwise empty notes with more spirit and very gaily.}^{145}
\]

In other words, it is to be used in places where the harmonic effect of a sustained appoggiatura (or port de voix in the case of a marcellement) is not favourable or, perhaps, in descending leaps that do not welcome the pincé. Further clarification is seen in Quantz’s discussion of his battemens which, he says, “may be introduced in leaps, where appoggiaturas are not permitted, to enliven the notes and make them brilliant”.\(^{146}\) Whilst, however, Quantz’s second illustration (fig. 8.71b) is identical to Leopold Mozart’s examples, beginning on the lower auxiliary, he also includes, under the title Battemen, the single oscillation beginning on the principal, thus resembling Mahaut’s basic description of the battement but described as a Mordant by Leopold Mozart and Tartini. It will be remembered that Quantz’s mordent (or pincé), on the other hand, was always attached to an ascending appoggiatura or port de voix which may itself have been accented, and of various length, or anticipated, but nevertheless distinguished from the pincé that followed (fig. 8.65c). In contrast, the notes of the battemen are always “produced with the greatest speed”\(^{147}\), negating any emphasis on the initial lower auxiliary such as we might see in Mahaut’s marcellement. In the case of all of Mozart’s examples and Quantz’s second example (fig. 8.71b), the function of the battemen as an alternative to an ascending

\(^{145}\) Leopold Mozart, *Versuch* (1756), chap. 11, par. 16, p. 209.

\(^{146}\) Quantz, *Versuch* (1752), chap. 8, par. 15, p. 98.

\(^{147}\) Quantz, *Versuch* (1752), chap. 8, par. 15, p. 98.
appoggiatura (where the latter is not favourable) would suggest that the ornament be anticipated, thus avoiding an accented lower auxiliary. Admittedly, however, the harmonic effect of such an accent at this speed would be largely negligible and, in the absence of any specific instruction, might point once again to a certain flexibility in its placement.

Thus what we have is an enormous confusion of terminology, particularly in regard to the use of the terms *battement* and *martellement*. In interpreting Mahaut's descriptions, however, those of his contemporaries shed enough light on the matter to support certain conclusions. Firstly, Mahaut's *martellement* is essentially that of the French *port de voix* followed by a single or multiple *pincé* and completed by a sustained principal. The execution of the *port de voix* may be anticipated or accented and of variable length depending on considerations of context. It is unlikely, however, that the entire ornament, including the *pincé*, was anticipated. Mahaut's *battement*, in contrast, is the basic design described by the French as the *pincé* and by the Italians as the *mordente*, beginning on the principal. Both national styles show a clear tendency towards anticipation, placing the accent on the concluding principal, although undoubtedly subject to subtle variation. Such ornaments are also described as *battemens* by the Italian influenced German composers, Leopold Mozart and J.J. Quantz. Whilst the latter also includes models beginning on the lower auxiliary, their unvarying speed and purely melodic function set them apart from Mahaut's *martellement*, thus receiving no accent and pointing again to a probable anticipated execution.
The Cadenzas

Although the appearance of written out cadenzas is in no way consistent throughout Mahaut's concerto manuscripts, we are lucky to find seven such written out ornamentations, the briefest in the first movement of the second D major Karlsruhe concerto and more substantial ones in all three movements of two Stockholm concerti. In addition to these we find with much greater frequency, although still far from consistently, the more usual marking indicative of a cadenza: that of the fermata ( \( \vdash \) ), thus indicating, as was the custom, only the intended insertion point of the cadenza and leaving the content to the performer. When it appears, the fermata is most commonly found over the penultimate note in the solo part, preceding in most cases, a return of the tutti or orchestral ritornello. It is also, however, sometimes found placed over the tonic preceding the trilled dominant, or indeed earlier in the movement over a sustained dominant seventh. We will return to the latter context towards the end of this discussion. The intended insertion of Mahaut's cadenza and orchestral pause prior to the final ritornello of a movement reflects the early-classical development of the solo concerto in which we see the cadenza becoming a greater structural element, no longer simply fulfilling an earlier baroque ornamental function, and later to reach much greater length and harmonic diversity in the cadenzas of the Classical and Romantic eras.

It is apparent, however, that throughout the development of the baroque and early-classical cadenza, there were very few specific 'rules' with regard to its placement, content and execution, thus resulting in the well-documented abuses and liberties taken, particularly, by many Italian singers and violinists. This freedom and fundamental improvised nature is reflected by the meagre discussions given to it by most authors and omitted by many
including Mahaut, with the exception of Quantz and, towards the end of the century, of Johann George Tromlitz. In common agreement, however, is the essential requirement of the cadenza to surprise and please the audience unexpectedly before the end of the solo part. To this end and to avoid dulling this effect, 'good taste' permits only one cadenza in a movement, as stated by Quantz with regard to a singer:

The object of the cadenza is simply to surprise the listener unexpectedly once more at the end of the piece, and to leave behind a special impression in his heart. To conform to this object, a single cadenza would be sufficient in a piece. If, then, a singer makes two cadenzas in the first part of an aria, and yet another in the second part, it must certainly be considered an abuse; for in this fashion, because of the da capo, five cadenzas appear in one aria. Such an excess is not only likely to weary the listeners, especially if all the cadenzas are alike, as is very often the case, but also may cause a singer not too rich in invention to exhaust himself all the more quickly. If the singer makes a cadenza only at the principal close, he retains his advantage, and the listener retains his appetite.

This is an important consideration when we later discuss a number of Mahaut's movements in which more than one fermata is notated and, in particular, where they appear within several bars of each other prior to the final ritornello.

A second commonly agreed fundamental element is a reflection in the cadenza of the prevailing sentiment or passion of the movement. Thus "a joyful one should not be introduced into a sad one, nor a sad one into a joyful one; they must proceed from the principal passion".

---

148 Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap.XV and Tromlitz, Unterricht (1791), chap. XII.

149 Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap.XV, par.5, p.180.

150 Tromlitz, Unterricht (1791), chap.XII, par. 9, p.262.
It is apparent, however, that as the cadenza became a more structural element of the concerto movement, certain ideas did change over the course of the *galant* and early-classical periods. I refer principally to the earlier baroque ideal that the cadenza was suitable only in more substantial and serious movements, perhaps a reaction to the earlier abuses by many performers:

The abuse of cadenzas is apparent not only if they are of little value in themselves, as is usually the case, but also if in instrumental music they are introduced in pieces in which they are not at all suitable; for example, in gay and quick pieces in two-four, three-four, three-eight, twelve-eight and six-eight time. They are permissible only in pathetic and slow pieces, or in serious quick ones.\(^{151}\)

Thus, with regard to the concerto, Quantz’s comments above would seem to suggest that the cadenza may be introduced only in the fast first movement, often lengthy and serious by nature, and in slow movements, but must be avoided in the quicker and joyful finales, many of which possess time signatures described by Quantz above. It must be remembered, of course that although written in Berlin in the early 1750s, Quantz’s *Versuch* represents the style and ideals of earlier years in Dresden between 1730 and 1740, and thus the early development of the solo concerto. In obvious contradiction to his views, two of Mahaut’s written out cadenzas appear in finale movements of gay and dance-like characters with time signatures of three-eight and two-four. In addition, six other third movements are marked with a fermata over the final trilled dominant of the solo part and whilst these are unlikely to imply the insertion of lengthy or harmonically intense cadenzas, which would certainly contradict the character of the movement, we can assume, at least, the insertion of a small decorative passage.

---

\(^{151}\) Quantz, *Versuch* (1752), chap.XV, par.4, p.180.
We shall see that the written cadenza given in the finale of one of the Stockholm manuscripts is, in fact, the longest cadenza of all three movements. Thus despite the impression given by Quantz there was, by this time (c.1750), clearly an acceptance of the cadenza in all three movements of the concerto. Confirmation of this is found in the more 'modern' flute treatise of Johann Tromlitz, representing performance practices at a time which blurred the distinction between late-baroque/galant and the Viennese Classic symphonic styles. Clearly familiar with and indebted to Quantz's Versuch, Tromlitz's treatise is the first significant work to expand upon Quantz's work and revise some of its old-fashioned ideas to reflect changes of practice between the 1740s and 1780s. Thus in it, Tromlitz states that “... [cadenzas] are made at all degrees of tempo; whether the piece goes slow or fast, one makes a cadenza before the final trill".\textsuperscript{152} In addition, Tromlitz describes the elaboration of a sustained dominant in a finale Rondo in six-eight, with an unmeasured decorative passage as a lead-in to the final ritornello theme (fig. 8.72). The placement and function of this cadenza is not unlike cadenza indications in many of Mahaut's finale movements.

In addition to this 'standard' single cadenza over the final cadence of the solo part, we find two other structural patterns in Mahaut's manuscripts. The first is a double fermata in which the initial one appears over a tutti dominant seventh chord followed by a rest in all parts, and then a passage for solo and basso continuo leading into the final cadence, with a further cadenza indication over the trilled dominant. The passage linking the two is of variable length and, as we shall see, is often cadenza-like in itself by nature of its virtuosic and chromatic figuration.

\textsuperscript{152} Tromlitz, \textit{Unterricht} (1791), chap.XII, par.6, p.260.
The second alternative pattern that we shall discuss consists not of a fermata, indicative of a freely invented decorative passage at the whim of the performer, but of an already composed *measured* and virtuosic passage of figuration *accompanied* by a dominant pedal in the basso continuo or acting-bass. This either occurs as the conclusion to the last solo episode or as the entire episode leading into the final ritornello. Following such a passage the question remains whether to add a further cadenza, freely invented over the concluding trilled dominant. A striking feature of these passages is the thin and transparent texture immediately preceding the full orchestral sound of the ritornello. This is, however, found not only in the measured cadenzas but as a common element in all but one of Mahaut's movements. Here the texture will consistently reduce to two parts at some point preceding the final solo cadence, thus acting as a lead-in to the single line of the solo cadenza or, in the absence of the latter, maintaining maximum contrast with the following ritornello. This effect is clearly seen in the previous pattern where the two-part passage following the tutti fermata over the dominant leads into a possible solo cadenza on the second fermata.

Whilst both patterns described above are not peculiar to Mahaut (the measured and accompanied cadenza can be seen in a number of Vivaldi's concerti), it becomes apparent that they do form a further unifying element between the different collections of his concerto manuscripts.

We might now examine more closely the seven written out and unmeasured cadenzas and, in other movements, the implication of Mahaut's fermata markings.
Written out Cadenzas

The seven cadenzas occur in three different concerti, one in the Karlsruhe (fig.8.73a) and two in the Stockholm collections (fig.8.73b and 8.73c). In the Karlsruhe concerto, the cadenza is written out only in the first movement and contrasts with the slightly more elaborate (although not overly so) cadenzas appearing in all three movements of the Stockholm concerti. All are written in much smaller notation with an obviously finer pen nib and remain unmeasured although contained between two bar-lines, thus indicating the tutti entrance.

In comparing the cadenzas, an interesting observation can be made with regard to the actual position on the page in which each is to be found. In both the Karlsruhe concerto and all three movements of the tenth Stockholm concerto, the cadenzas are notated at the conclusion of the appropriate movements (fig.8.74a and 8.74b), to be inserted at the fermata marking in the solo’s final cadence. Furthermore, that belonging to the second movement of the latter is found at the end of the finale alongside that movement’s own cadenza. This can only be due to a lack of space between the second and third movements in the manuscript itself, suggesting that these cadenzas were added after the concerti themselves were copied. Since we know the latter not to be in Mahaut’s own hand, it is probable that the cadenzas were not those written or performed by Mahaut, but are the invention of the copyist or perhaps a flautist who subsequently performed from these manuscripts, thus sketching his own cadenza.

---

153 The association of the written cadenza with the fermata marking is clearly established in the Stockholm manuscript, by a pencilled-in line linking the two (fig.8.74b).

154 This is unlikely to be the case in the Karlsruhe concerto, as certain notational elements such as barlines and fermata markings suggest that both the concerto and cadenza were written by the same hand.
cadenzas represent an attempt by the copyist to notate those that he heard performed, perhaps by Mahaut himself.

In contrast to the observations above, the three cadenzas appearing in the third Stockholm concerto are all written within the solo part itself, eliminating the need for a fermata marking, and are distinguished from the preceding accompanied figuration of the last solo episode by their small and unmeasured notation using, again, a finer pen nib (fig. 8.74c). Thus we can conclude that, where the previous cadenzas were likely to have been added afterwards, these were added during the notation of the concerto movements themselves and are, therefore, more likely to represent decorations that were either heard during Mahaut's performance or had been written into Mahaut's original manuscript from which this was copied. It is equally possible, of course, that Mahaut had no influence on the content of these cadenzas and they are again an invention of the musician who copied the manuscript.

We concluded previously when examining the handwriting of the various concerti that, whilst we understood that the Stockholm manuscripts were not notated by Mahaut, we also recognised that they were not all by the same hand, and that the tenth concerto in particular appeared to have been notated by a different copyist. In comparing the notational style of the cadenzas in the two Stockholm concerti, in addition to their position on the page, several other features stand out to support this conclusion. Firstly, in all three movements of the third concerto the term Libertum appears beneath the written cadenza, contrasting with, although identical in meaning to, the term Arbitrio, appearing under each fermata marking in the tenth concerto, indicating the insertion of the cadenza. This term also appears at the insertion point in each of the accompanying string parts, clarifying the meaning of these
fermata markings. A notational feature appearing only in those of the third concerto is the use of a wavy line encompassing each cadenza from beginning to end, again helping to distinguish it from the ‘ordinary’ figuration that precedes it and the beginning of the ritornello that follows it.

The most significant difference between the cadenzas of these two Stockholm concerti lies, however, in their phrase lengths and virtuosic figuration. Like that found in the Karlsruhe concerto, the cadenzas of the third Stockholm manuscript all consist of a single, short decorative phrase followed by a trilled cadence. Thus they reflect Quantz’s statement that vocal and wind cadenzas “must be so constituted that they can be performed in one breath. A string player can make them as long as he likes, if he is rich enough in inventiveness. Reasonable brevity, however, is more advantageous than vexing length”. This is perhaps something that is overlooked by some modern flautists who will often perform a long and florid cadenza that would, perhaps, be considered in the eighteenth century, more suitable for a string or keyboard instrument.

It could not be claimed, however, that those in the tenth Stockholm manuscripts could be performed in one breath. They are, by comparison, much longer, consisting, in the first and second movements respectively, of two and three substantial phrases in addition to the concluding trilled cadence. We also see, in the second movement, a series of fragmented phrases followed by an extended phrase concluded by the cadence. In each case, the intended phrasing is indicated by the use of fermatas at places where the figuration and

155 Quantz, Versuch (1752), chap.XV, par.17, p.185.
energy is intended to pause. This can also be seen in the shorter cadenza of the Karlsruhe concerto (fig.8.74a), creating a separate phrase for the concluding cadence.

Naturally associated with these fermata points is, of course, the space to breathe and one may note that each phrase has been composed within the normal capacity of a single breath. Therefore, they do not necessarily contradict Quantz’s view quoted above, but reflect the development of the wind cadenza in the second half of the eighteenth century. Confirmation of this can be seen in the flute treatise of Tromlitz whose ideas, it will be remembered, are not contrary to Quantz’s, but represent a revision or extension:

I have said that a cadenza for a wind instrument must be playable in one breath; but one can also provide the opportunity to take breath if the figures or passages are arranged accordingly... thus the player never lacks breath and the material certainly does not suffer from it.\textsuperscript{156}

In addition to their length, we also note, between cadenzas of the two Stockholm concerti, a considerable difference in their content or figuration. The technical difficulty of those in the tenth concerto (fig.8.73c) is considerably greater than those in the third, displaying much faster figures and more complex groupings. It is possible that the more simplistic cadenzas of the third concerto represent only an intended outline, inviting further elaboration, and as such would support our suggestion that they were sketches made by Mahaut or by a copyist upon hearing Mahaut’s performance. Such further elaboration is also suggested by the notation of the final cadence of each cadenza. Here, in each case, both the trilled dominant and preceding tonic are written as minims in regular-size notation, but are unlikely to have been performed in such a uniform manner.

\textsuperscript{156} Tromlitz, \textit{Unterricht} (1791), chap.XII, par.13, p.264.
Despite such differences, all seven cadenzas also display considerable similarities. All are based upon the simple elaboration of the tonic and dominant chords using scale and arpeggio figures including triplet and sextuplet sequences and patterns of ascending and descending thirds. Whilst such figurations played at speed may sound technically impressive, they do not reflect the more artistic trend of the early-classical concerto, recorded by Quantz and Tromlitz,\(^{157}\) of introducing thematic elements into the cadenza, thus limiting the 'excesses' of some performers and creating a greater degree of unity of sentiment and content. As such, the cadenzas in Mahaut's manuscripts represent an extremely conservative approach, remaining within a very narrow harmonic range and are artistically unimpressive, certainly not matching the quality of the inventive figuration of the concerti themselves. Only the second movement cadenza of the third Stockholm concerto is harmonically more interesting, rising to a descending chromatic line, and as such invoking a more intense passion that reflects the character of the movement to a much greater degree.

As a final comment with regard to these cadenzas, we note that only the first and third movement examples from the tenth Stockholm concerto are actually begun on the dominant. The second movement and those from the Karlsruhe D major and third Stockholm concerti are all initiated on the tonic preceding the trilled dominant, and begin in most cases with figuration that outlines the tonic chord. This clarifies for us a considerable number of situations that we will discuss shortly in Mahaut’s manuscripts where no cadenza is ‘supplied’ and in which the fermata appears over the preceding tonic, sometimes suspended into the dominant in the bass. Without such confirmation we may have considered this placement to be an error in notation.

\(^{157}\) Quantz, *Versuch* (1752), chap.XV, par.8, p.179 and Tromlitz, *Unterricht* (1791), chap.XII, par.9, p.262.
Fermata Markings

Whilst they are not uncommon, the appearance of Mahaut’s fermata markings indicative of a cadenza in the final solo cadence of his concerto movements are not, by any means, consistent. In each of the Brussels and Karlsruhe collections, for example, only one movement contains this marking. Taking the remaining concerti into account, with the exception of the third and tenth Stockholm concerto already noted, in most cases the fermata will appear in only one or occasionally two movements in each concerto. The lack of notation in a substantial number of concerti is, however, not unusual in that we know the insertion of a cadenza at this point to be somewhat mandatory and does not necessarily require an indicative marking. It is, therefore, significant perhaps, that the two movements in the Brussels and Karlsruhe collections to possess fermatas over their final solo cadence (with the exception of the first movement of the second D major Karlsruhe concerto (fig. 8.73a)), are in fact finale movements. In the light of Quantz’s comments quoted earlier, regarding his dislike for such cadenzas, we might suppose that their insertion in these movements may not, at the time of composition, be generally expected without some indication. In the Brussels movement (fig. 8.75a) the fermata appears over the final solo dominant before the return of the ritornello, but does not appear in any accompanying parts. Whilst, as we shall see, the inconsistency of markings between parts has no significance other than careless notation, the speed and gay character of the movement suggests, perhaps, that only a small decoration was intended.

The Karlsruhe movement (fig. 8.75b) on the other hand finds the fermata marked in both the solo flute and bassi, these being the only parts playing. Here the fermata is marked in the solo over the preceding tonic and suspended into the dominant chord, the length and
transparency of which would welcome a much more substantial decoration. Other finale movements to be notated with a fermata at this point include four Stockholm concerti seen in figure 8.75c(i-iv).

We note, therefore, that there are significantly fewer numbers of first and second movements notated with a fermata over the final solo cadence (particularly in the Brussels, Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti; a larger number appear in the Stockholm concerti but are still far from consistent). Yet, those that do appear in these movements suggest the insertion of a much more substantial or harmonically intense cadenza, such that we would expect in a more 'serious' movement. This is particularly notable where the fermata appears over the sustained dominant, clearly indicating a cadenza, to be followed by a written-in decorated approach to a concluding trilled cadence such as those seen in figure 8.76. The implication is of course that the added cadenza is in addition to and distinguished from the decorated cadence which we might not necessarily assume in a lively finale movement. In figure 8.76b the missing fermata in the moving bass part makes the intended performance of this bar somewhat ambiguous. If the concluding cadential phrase in the solo is to be accompanied, it must be decided between the two players at what point the bass enters following the cadenza. On the other hand, it would be plausible to perform the entire bar of the bass part (concluding on the dominant) beneath the sustained solo dominant and before the cadence is begun leaving, of course, the concluding trilled cadence unaccompanied.

As we have seen, the notation of the fermata is somewhat inconsistent throughout all Mahaut's concerti. This inconsistency, however, does not only exist from movement to movement, but also between parts within the same movement and at the same cadence. We have seen, in our previous examples, many similar to figure 8.76b above and 8.77a in which
the fermata appears only in the solo flute and is missing in the accompanying part or parts, but with the clear indication of an added decoration of some suitable length. In addition, although less common, we also find the cadenza indication not in the solo part where the fermata is missing, but in one or more of the accompanying parts. Thus, in figure 8.75c(iv) we see only the trilled dominant in the solo flute, but with the intended fermata found in the basso continuo and over the coinciding rests in the violins. Similarly in figure 8.77b, the fermata, missing in the solo flute and bassi, is found over the required rests in violin 1. Thus clearly the omission of a fermata in the solo part does not negate the addition of a cadenza, but should be viewed as the possible omission of a notation that was simply ‘understood’.

Interestingly, however, at the conclusion of the last solo in the slow movement of the eleventh Stockholm concerto (fig.8.77c), both the fermata and the dominant itself is missing in the solo flute, appearing only in the basso continuo, after which the flute concludes the cadence with an upbeat trilled dominant leading into the tutti. Clearly here, no solo cadenza is to be admitted but is replaced by a sustained dominant in the bass with perhaps a small decoration or trill.

The strong implication of a substantial cadenza by a fermata notation can be seen in a number of slow middle movements in which the final solo cadence remains undecorated and written in sustained note values, such as we see in figure 8.78a, that in itself demands elaboration. Likewise, in the Adagio of the seventh Stockholm concerto (fig.8.78b), although here the solo fermata is found over the preceding sustained tonic and suspended into the dominant appearing in the bass. Interestingly, the fermata appears in the bass a bar later over the dominant suggesting that, although the cadenza is initiated from the tonic, it does not begin until the bass reaches the dominant. Such an intended placement of the solo
cadenza was suggested likewise in the Karlsruhe collection (fig. 8.75b) and, whilst it is possible to view these examples as cases of misplaced notation in the solo part, the intention is confirmed by the written out cadenzas in both the Karlsruhe and Stockholm collections discussed earlier, in which the cadenza is initiated from the preceding tonic and moves into the dominant.

Returning now to our comments regarding the omission of a fermata over the final solo cadence, we see in figure 8.79a a few of many such examples in which the solo dominant is adorned only with a trill. Whilst a fermata notation appears likewise in none of the accompaniment parts and since we have previously concluded that their omission does not negate an intended elaboration, these contexts would each welcome a cadenza of appropriate length. In figure 8.79b, whilst the solo dominant is marked only with a trill, the possible cadenza intention is confirmed in the Stockholm duplicate of this concerto with the notation of a fermata on the trilled dominant. Thus, despite the jocular character of this finale movement and rhythmic drive of the bass into the ritornello, it once again does not negate a possible, albeit brief, cadenza.

In more serious movements, the implication or requirement of an inserted cadenza in an unadorned final solo cadence is particularly evident where the cadence remains rhythmically and melodically simplistic. Examples such as those in figure 8.79c, therefore, not only welcome but demand significant elaboration of the solo part. A similar, but more unusual, example can be seen in figure 8.79c(iii). Here, a chromatic passage at the end of the final solo episode, accompanied only by two violins, rises to a dominant chord before falling immediately into an unaccompanied cadential passage stretched over three bars. The
unusually long slur over this solo passage suggests its intended ornamental nature (i.e. a basic outline open to decoration in the form of a cadenza).

In addition to the many unadorned examples above that welcome, if not require, an inserted cadenza, there are others, although much less in number, whose context would suggest the omission of a cadenza. For example, in figure 8.80a the final solo cadence is preceded by four bars of virtuosic sextuplet passage-work over a repeated quaver accompaniment in the bass before moving chromatically into the cadence itself. The virtuosic nature of this passage, together with its sudden transparent texture, makes an additional cadenza over the trilled dominant almost redundant, particularly in the light of the already considerable length of the movement. At the end of this chapter we will see further examples of Mahaut’s accompanied cadenza-like passages appearing at the end of the last solo.

In many contexts it is the voice-leading or rhythmic placement of the solo dominant that actually negates the addition of a cadenza. For example, in figure 8.80b(i) the rhythmic unison of the flute and violin I would make the addition of a cadenza difficult with regard to synchronisation. Whilst the following semiquaver could be omitted from the first violin, its presence is not indicative of a cadenza intention by the author. Similarly, in figure 8.80b(ii), whilst the final solo trill sits on a sustained dominant capable of containing a cadenza, it is supported in the violins and viola (as acting-bass) by a continuous rhythmic accompaniment \( \text{PVPyP V} \) that continues unbroken to the end. The continuity of this accompaniment would suggest that no interruption (i.e. cadenza) was intended and, therefore, any elaboration of the solo trilled dominant must be limited to that contained within the written dotted crotchet.
In figure 8.80c(i) the trilled dominant appears on the last quaver of the bar as an upbeat to the ritornello. Thus again, whilst it is possible to add a small ornament, it would not welcome an extended flourish such as a cadenza. Likewise, in figure 8.80c(ii) the dominant is already ‘filled-out’ in a very simple cadential context that again does not welcome an elaborate improvisation.

Finally, in figure 8.80d we see a collection of examples taken from lively and gigue-like finale movements. Whilst we have discovered that this context alone does not exclude the insertion of a cadenza in Mahaut’s work, these examples possess a tremendous forward rhythmic drive into the ritornello that negates any hesitation or slowing down, let alone the grand ‘pause’ required for the insertion of a cadenza. At the same time, the approach to the cadence in every example is done so in a dramatically reduced two-part texture that, in the absence of a cadenza, ensures maximum contrast with the full texture of the following ritornello.

To this point we have discussed the cadenza implications of those fermata notations appearing or not appearing over the final solo cadence, inevitably preceding a ritornello of varying length. Whilst this use of the fermata is the most common, we also occasionally find it earlier in a movement over a sustained and tutti dominant seventh chord. Such a context is usually followed by a short rest in all parts. In these, however, it is unlikely that the insertion of a cadenza was intended, principally in the light of such a requirement later in the movement over the final solo cadence. For example, in figure 8.81a the fermata over the dominant seventh appears at the end of the penultimate solo episode. As we have seen, however, not only is a cadenza implied later over the final solo cadence, but is actually written into the part (fig.8.73b(ii)) and, as we know from our previous discussion, only one
such cadenza should be admitted to a single movement, lest it should suffer from excessive
decoration. In addition, we note that the chord beneath the fermata is the dominant seventh
of the dominant and, contrary to the usual requirement of a cadenza, does not resolve into
the tonic but into the dominant itself. Likewise, in figure 8.81b the dominant seventh chord
appearing at the end of the penultimate solo episode is that of the relative minor. The
cadenza, it will be remembered, was implied in the final solo episode cadencing into the
tonic (fig.8.75c(ii)).

Finally, in figure 8.81c the fermata appears seventeen bars before the final solo cadence into
the ritornello. Whilst the chord is indeed a dominant seventh of the tonic, it is, however,
followed not by a cadence into the tonic itself but by a short decorative passage in the tonic
minor, again making the insertion of a cadenza inappropriate. We have already seen the
more probable cadenza indication at the final solo cadence (fig.8.75c(iv)). Thus it is unlikely
in all such contexts that the insertion of a cadenza was admitted on these dominant sevenths
chords. It is more probable that the fermata here was indicative only of a sustained tutti
chord or perhaps a trilled seventh in the flute followed by a short termination. Such a
performance is described by Tromlitz which, significantly, he distinguishes from the fermata
over the final solo cadence:

If the fermata sign is written over a long note followed by a rest and then a new idea,
either in the same tempo or in another, then on this long note, which is usually the
fifth of the key in which one is playing, a trill is made, growing and then diminishing
again, cut off very short with a short termination, for as long as the solo player pleases,
then a moment of silence, and then going on again.158

158 Tromlitz, Unterricht (1791), chap.XII, par. 3, p.258.
The fermata, notated over a sustained dominant seventh chord, also occurs in a significant number of other movements, although this time notated near the end of the final solo episode, followed almost immediately by the final solo cadence itself. As we mentioned briefly earlier, this 'double' pattern was a particular characteristic of Mahaut's concerti presenting itself again and again. The 'formula' can be described as a sustained tutti dominant seventh chord followed by a rest in all parts preceding a decorative passage of varying length and dramatically reduced texture leading into the final solo trilled dominant which may, or may not, be notated with a second fermata.

Whilst the formula does not appear in the Brussels collection, we find it in both the Karlsruhe and Stockholm collections and in the Regensburg concerto. In the third movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto (fig. 8.82a) the final solo episode builds dramatically to a sustained dominant seventh chord marked by a fermata in all parts. The rest is followed by a sparsely accompanied eight-bar chromatic passage that is cadenza-like in itself before reaching the final trilled dominant. Similarly, in the third movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig. 8.82b), the tutti dominant seventh chord is again marked by a fermata in all parts. The passage that follows, however, is considerably longer (nineteen bars) than the previous example and consists of the most virtuosic passage work so far encountered in the movement. Immediately preceding the final trilled dominant the texture dramatically reduces, not unexpectedly, to the two-part flute and basso continuo, producing maximum contrast with the following ritornello.

Unlike these, however, the following two examples show a much shorter connecting passage (fig. 8.82c and 8.82d) consisting of no more than a one- or two-bar elaborate approach to the cadence. The virtuosic nature of all such passages that we have seen would
perhaps suggest the requirement of additional elaboration in a more simplistic passage such as that seen in figure 8.82d. Despite such differences, we note in all examples the essential element of a much reduced two-part texture, usually flute and bass, prior to the cadence. In figure 8.82c the fermata over the dominant in the bass is in all probability, also intended for the flute, falling chromatically to the dominant seventh.

Significantly, we note that none of the examples we have discussed so far includes a fermata over the final solo trilled dominant. Such a limited survey would initially suggest, therefore, that the insertion of a cadenza was intended over the earlier dominant seventh, conflicting with the intended placement seen in both the written out cadenzas and in the single fermata notations over the final solo cadence. Further examination, however, of the remaining Stockholm manuscripts reveals a more complete notation that includes an implied fermata over both the preceding dominant seventh and the final trilled dominant of the solo. Whilst here the intention of the added fermata over the final dominant is clear, it nevertheless, as we have seen previously, suffers from inconsistent notation between parts. Thus, in both figures 8.83a and 8.83b, whilst the fermata is marked in all parts over the dominant seventh chord, it appears only in violin I, viola and bassi over the following final dominant, leaving the solo flute notated only with a trill. Likewise, in figure 8.83c the fermata appears only in the bass over the final dominant, whilst in figure 8.83d, the notation is reversed, leaving the bassi without a fermata.

Despite such inconsistency, it is clearly apparent that a fermata was intended over both dominants. Significantly, the omissions occur only over the final dominant where the intention is most likely to have been 'understood'. This having been established, the important question to be considered in this context, therefore, is on which dominant (or
both?) is the insertion of the cadenza intended. Having previously concluded that only one cadenza may be admitted in any one movement, we can assume that the two fermatas are not indicative of the same interpretation, and we have likewise noted the strong cadenza implications of those numerous fermata appearing over the final solo cadence with or without a written out cadenza. In addition, several other factors suggest that the alternative insertion of a cadenza over the preceding tutti dominant seventh chord was somewhat inappropriate. Firstly, we have already noted the failure of such a context to cadence immediately into the tonic. Secondly, the virtuosic and often highly ornate nature of the following ‘connective’ passage would make the insertion of a preceding cadenza improbable. It would, in addition, introduce possible performance problems in the absence of a cadence involving synchronisation of the subsequent bassi entrance following the cadenza. Confirmation of this conclusion can be seen in the second movement of the tenth Stockholm concerto. Here we have already noted the written out cadenza which is undoubtedly applicable to the fermata appearing over the final dominant of the solo part (fig. 8.73c(ii)). What we did not note previously is the tutti dominant seventh chord appearing one bar earlier and marked likewise with a fermata in all parts. The latter is clearly not indicative of a cadenza but rather a sustaining of the dominant chord, perhaps decorated briefly with a trill or similar ornament.

That said, and despite the evidence of the written out cadenza above, it is also possible to view this double formula in a different light. We might consider that the decorative two-part passage that connects the two fermatas is in fact the intended cadential conclusion to a more substantial solo cadenza inserted over the preceding dominant seventh. The use of accompaniment in the cadence is not unusual in Mahaut’s manuscripts as we shall shortly see. This would require, of course, careful synchronisation of the bassi entrance and a more
limited decoration of the final trilled dominant, probably no more than a trill. Thus the performer must consider the choice between two possible interpretations, each with its own merits. It may well be worth considering, however, that in those contexts, where the initial dominant seventh chord is followed by a lengthy and virtuosic ‘connective’ passage, that the former be left more simply adorned, saving the solo cadenza for the final solo cadence.

The Accompanied Cadenza

As we mentioned briefly near the beginning of this section, the freely invented solo cadenza was not the only type evident in Mahaut’s concerti. Throughout all the collections, we also find examples of a highly virtuosic, but measured, cadenza accompanied in most cases by a dominant pedal. This cadenza usually exists as either the whole of the last solo episode or as its concluding section immediately preceding the final ritornello. Such a model, whilst less common than the ‘ad libitum’ virtuosic inventions above, was not otherwise unknown in the eighteenth century and can be seen particularly in many of the woodwind and cello concerti of Vivaldi, in which his final solo episodes unfold over a dominant pedal point. A particular characteristic, however, not so evident in Vivaldi’s models, is Mahaut’s fondness for maintaining a sparse texture throughout the cadenzas, usually placing the pedal in the basso continuo or acting-bass and almost always reducing it to a two-part texture in its concluding passage, thereby retaining maximum contrast with the following ritornello.

Thus, in figure 8.84a, the last eight solo bars preceding the ritornello is played out over a sustained dominant pedal in the viola, the texture reduced by the absence of the bass and with the sustained pedal producing a transparent quality. Note also, that just as we saw in the written out unmeasured cadenzas, the solo figuration is centred on the notes of the
dominant chord, alternating with the tonic. Likewise, in figure 8.84b the last twelve bars of
the solo unfold first over a pulsating dominant pedal in the repeated quavers of the viola and
then over a unison sustained pedal in both violins and the viola, producing a striking
contrast of texture preceding the final solo cadence. A more unusual example is seen in
figure 8.84c, where not only is the bassi dominant pedal doubled in both the viola and violin
II, but where the first violin introduces a syncopated countermelody to the solo figuration
above, producing overall a much fuller and busier texture than we have come to expect in
these passages. As a result, an additional unmeasured cadenza, inserted over the final trilled
dominant, would perhaps be welcomed here, not only to provide effective contrast to the
following ritornello, but to rectify the shortness of the final solo episode.

The examples appearing in the Karlsruhe and Stockholm collections are somewhat less
strict in their use of this cadenza model. In both figures 8.84e and 8.84f, representative of
many, the dominant pedal appears only during part of the cadenza-like passage, resorting to
a two-part texture involving the solo figuration over a moving bass in the concluding
section. In the first, the pedal appears only for a total of one-and-a-half beats, although the
cadenza ‘effect’ of the entire passage is undeniable. Finally, in figure 8.84g, taken from the
Stockholm collection, the same formula is used in the final solo episode, while replacing the
dominant with a tonic pedal in the basso continuo. The tonic pedal point is also strongly present in the virtuosic figuration itself. Once again, the rhythmic drive of this finale movement through the final cadence into the ritornello, tends to negate the need for, or perhaps even excludes, an additional cadenza over the trilled dominant.
CHAPTER NINE

ARTICULATION

In discussing the articulation apparent in Mahaut's concerti we note that whilst a large amount of the music remains unmarked with articulation, much of what is notated is contradictory and often ambiguous. It becomes clear that much understanding on the part of the performer is assumed, particularly with regard to the articulation of certain rhythmical patterns and melodic designs, so that in many cases seemingly isolated and ambiguous markings are simply confirmation of an already expected and 'assumed' articulation. In this chapter we will look at the articulation of motivic or thematic ideas in the ritornello, and subsequently those that appear amongst the figuration, often implying an understood 'formula' for certain figures.

We might note here that whilst the Brussels, Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti are dealt with in considerable detail, those of the Stockholm collection add little new insight into Mahaut's use of articulation (with the exception of the thirteenth concerto, being the duplicate of the Brussels D major concerto) serving instead only to consolidate our conclusions established in the other collections. With this in mind, the following discussion has been considerably condensed to focus on the Brussels, Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti, but in no way diminishes the scope of our conclusions.
Thematic Articulations

Certain notations are to be found in Mahaut's concerti with regard to articulation, particularly associated with thematic material, that Frederick Neumann would term essential, in that they strongly affect the character of the material and are in a sense 'non-negotiable', despite often being inconsistently notated.

The opening of the Brussels e minor concerto is characterised by a descending semiquaver scale (fig.9.1a) which remains invariably detached. The implication is of a short, sharp bow stroke in the strings and crisp tonguing in the flute when it repeats the theme at the opening of the first solo. The ritornello also features a contrasting motif, first appearing in bar 19 (fig.9.1b). Here the three quavers are consistently slurred, except for the second figure in violin II, which is clearly implied. After alluding to the main theme in the first solo entry, this slurred motif reappears in the flute part in a sequential pattern (fig.9.1c). Only the first figure, however, is slurred as we are to already understand the essential legato quality of this motif. Likewise, in the third tutti it appears without articulation in a descending sequence in the bass (fig.9.1d). The placement (i.e. following a statement of the theme) and its melodic outline make clear its association with the original figure, and hence its intended legato.

The third movement of this concerto, like many of Mahaut's final movements, exudes a gigue-like dance character (opening seen in fig.9.1e). As such, its motives demand short,

---

energetic bow-strokes and tonguing, with the exception of some clearly notated legato triplet figures.

Four different motivic elements feature in the first movement ritornello of the Brussels d minor concerto. The first is the obviously detached rising syncopated line in the opening bar (fig. 9.2). A legato lombard slide figure occurs in the second bar and reappears ten times throughout the ritornello. This figure is consistently slurred in both unison violins for eight of these appearances with the missing slurs seen in bars 11 and 12. Here the omission is perhaps due to the tied suspension across the bar-line, where a full slur encompassing the entire figure is probably expected. The essential legato quality of this lombard slide is made further apparent in the second, third and fourth ritornello passages, where it is again consistently slurred in both violins.

In the four bars following the initial thematic statement, we see, together with the lombardic slide, a third motivic element. The intended articulation, however, of these descending semiquaver scale figures remains ambiguous. The first appearance on the third beat of bar 3 in the viola is unmarked, yet the same figures in the following three bars in the viola are slurred (their placement beneath the lombardic slide might suggest their legato intention). The descending semiquavers that precede these figures, however, are left detached except for bar 6, in which the second beat (and the last beat) is also slurred. This makes the rising sequence inconsistent. In addition, the same descending figures above in the violins (on the first two beats of the bar) also remain detached, including bar 6. Thus the markings in the viola remain somewhat confusing, particularly in the light of its octave doubling of the violins. Good judgement would demand that we are at least consistent in our articulation
and must, therefore, assume either a *legato* intention on all the descending semiquavers or perhaps only in the viola beneath the lombardic slide.

No such confusion lies in the interpretation of the last motivic figure, appearing in the following bars (bars 7-9). Whilst the markings in each individual violin part appear inconsistent, the 'combined picture' portrays a clear *legato* intention.²

The second movement (*Larghetto*) of this concerto also features a motivic lombard-style figure which dominates the movement (fig. 9.3). Although disjunct, its essential *legato* character is understood by its almost consistent slurring in eight out of eleven appearances. Those slurs missing in bars 5 and 6 can be assumed by their sequential repetition of the first phrase (bars 1 and 2). Likewise, the persistent answering mordent-like figure in the first violin also shares this *legato* character. Whilst they are again almost consistently notated with a slur throughout the movement, this notation is missing in the first two bars suggesting, perhaps, that a *legato* execution was generally to be expected or understood for such figures.

We note in the final movement (fig. 9.4) the same lively dance-like character that we saw in the third movement of the e minor concerto, suggesting again the use of short, detached articulations. Also like the e minor movement, this is broken only by stepwise *legato* triplet figures, although here they play a much more prominent role. The intended *legato* of these figures is clearly notated throughout the ritornello (and indeed throughout the movement) in

² We cannot be so sure, however, of the leaping semiquaver figures (marked with an *) which all remain detached. In the light of their simultaneous placement with the slurred conjunct figures, we might possibly assume a *legato* intention.
both the unison violins and the viola, including the disjunct triplets in bar 5. Thus, in the
light of the careful and consistent slurring of all such figures in the ritornello, we can
probably assume, in contrast, the detached articulation of other thematic elements.

The opening ritornello of the Brussels D major concerto is noticeably bare of any
articulation (fig.9.5a). This alone, however, does not necessarily imply only the use of a
detached style. We must bear in mind the generally unmarked nature of the entire movement
with the exception of some suggestive, but inconsistent, slurs in the solo figuration to be
discussed later. When we compare this concerto with its duplicate in the Stockholm
collection, we find a contradiction with regard to the articulation of the motivic descending
semiquaver-scale figures. Whilst they are invariably detached throughout the Brussels
manuscript, a slur appears over the figures in the thematic statement at the opening of the
first solo in the Stockholm manuscript (fig.9.5b). They are not, however, slurred in the
strings of the ritornello. It is possible that the copyist has indicated a legato execution for
these figures only in the solo flute (under which it is not doubled by the strings) in the light
of the speed, at which such a figure is more naturally and comfortably slurred on the flute
than tongued.

The light-hearted dance character is once again prevalent in the third movement of this
concerto (fig.9.6a). The apparent detached articulation of the ritornello is broken only by
the essential legato execution of numerous motivic triplets. The slurred notation of these
triplets is consistent with the exception of three figures in the first violin (bars 8-10), which
must be understood by the sequential repetition of the previous slurred triplets and by the
notation in the second violin a third below. Likewise, a number of missing slurs in the following ritornelli can be assumed by the same reasoning.³

The detached articulation, however, of the opening bar becomes questionable when we consider markings on the same figure in later appearances. Whilst it remains detached again in the opening of the second and fourth tutti, the stepwise ascent is slurred in both the opening of the second solo (in the flute) and of the final ritornello in violin I (fig.9.6b and 9.6c). Thus we might consider that a legato execution of the stepwise figure was assumed by the copyist in obvious contrast to the following disjunct semiquaver figures, and that the later slurs serve only as a clarification of this intention. Further support for this interpretation comes from a comparison with the Stockholm manuscript in which all appearances of the opening motif are notated with a slur.

The first movement of the Brussels A major concerto shows a generally detached character in the ritornello, requiring a short, energetic bow-stroke in the strings (fig.9.7a). This is contrasted only in figure 9.7b by a sequence of onbeat legato slide figures in the violins. The slurred notation is consistent in both parts and on both ascending and descending figures.

The essential legato quality particular to Mahaut’s onbeat lombardic slides is a feature of his music that appears again and again as is to be discussed more extensively later. Here, however, the figure does not play a significant motivic role in the movement and, other than a similar legato lombardic figure occurring briefly in the solo figuration, it does not reappear until the da capo. Of greater importance is the syncopated motive in the following bars (fig.9.7c). Whilst it again includes a pair of conjunct semiquavers, they remain, in contrast

³ All triplet figures in the Stockholm manuscript of this movement have been consistently slurred by the copyist, thus clarifying the legato intention.
to the previous figures, consistently detached in every appearance throughout the movement. Their unstressed nature inherent in their inter-beat placement also distinguishes them from the previous figures, and thus the *legato* character of figure 9.7b does not necessarily imply the same execution of the semiquavers in figure 9.7c.

*Legato* triplets are, once again, a motivic element of the second movement, presented by the flute in the opening theme (fig. 9.8a). Here they are essentially an ornamentation of the plain 'air' and, along with other ornamental figures, are consistently slurred throughout the movement. The violoncello accompaniment, however, remains entirely unmarked. We can only assume a broad, sustained bow-stroke.

The eight-bar theme of the final movement is characterised by a leaping slurred quaver figure (fig. 9.8b). Without such articulation markings one could not immediately assume a *legato* execution of this disjunct motif. Thus the intention has been carefully notated in both violins, with the exception of violin I in bar 8 which is understood, and effectively contrasts the detached semiquaver motif in bars 10 to 14 (the articulation of the repeated semiquavers in the viola will be discussed later). When the ritornello theme returns, however, in bar 125 (fig. 9.8c), prior to the final solo episode, the notation is less consistent, appearing only on four of seven figures in the first violin and not at all in the second. Clearly we are to already understand the *legato* nature of these motives.

It is also possible that the copyist has assumed, but neglected to notate, the *legato* intention of similar figures in the first solo episode (fig. 9.8d). Although these quaver figures are not disjunct, they allude to the ritornello motif by their significant contrast to the disjunct
semiquaver figures that precede and accompany them. At a fast speed it would be natural to slur such figures on the flute in a cantabile style.

Later we will see the implied legato intention of most of Mahaut's lombardic dotted figures. Standard dotted figures, however, overwhelmingly imply a detached articulation in which the majestic element is heightened by overdotting. The second movement of the Brussels e minor concerto (fig.9.9a) clearly demands a detached articulation for the dotted figures, in contrast to the carefully notated slurred triplet figures with which they alternate (we can assume the legato intention of the unmarked triplets in bar 2 of the bass). This is provided, of course, that we have not chosen to soften the dotted figures to a triplet rhythm, as was discussed earlier, thus presenting the possibility of slurring the long to the short. Likewise, in the second movement of the Brussels A major concerto we might assume a detached articulation for the descending dotted figures, once again set in strong contrast with triplets, whose legato character has been carefully notated throughout the movement (fig.9.9b).

The lilting character, however, of dotted figures in a compound time signature tend to suggest a different approach than the one above. Printed in figure 9.10 is the entire second movement of the Brussels D major concerto. A dominant feature of the movement is the constant use of the rhythmic motif \( \text{\begin{figure}[h] \centering \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig910.png} \caption{Figure 9.10} \end{figure}} \) in various melodic outlines. The written articulation, however, is not consistent, presenting more questions than answers. For example, whilst the dotted figures in the opening bar are unmarked, the second figure is slurred on its return in bar 6, again leaving the first identical figure unmarked. The third and fourth repetitions in bars 14 and 19 are again without articulation on the dotted figures. Are we to take the slur in the second appearance to imply a consistent legato intention? Likewise, slurs appear in the flute part of bar 5 but not in the first violin playing the same
figures a third below. These two parts should at least be consistent in their articulation. In bar 15, both the stepwise and disjunct figures in the flute are slurred, yet previously, in bars 7 and 8 and later in bars 21 to 25, similar figures are left unmarked. Thus, whilst the majority of these rhythms remain unarticulated, the occasional slurred figures do begin to suggest a legato intention which the copyist may have assumed the player to immediately understand. It is unlikely, however, that such an assumption could be made with regard to the disjunct figures appearing throughout the movement. Perhaps, therefore, the markings are indicative only of a general legato quality, which would suggest detached, but broad and sustained, note lengths. In bars 9 to 12 the unison writing suggests a probable intended detached articulation, as has been the tendency shown in other unison passages in these concerti. It is at least apparent that the necessity to slur such dotted figures as in the opening bar is not essential to the character of the motif, or it would have been notated more precisely.

The opening of the first Karlsruhe concerto in D major is characterised by a descending slurred quaver scale (fig. 9.11a). The legato nature of this figure is clearly established by its invariable notation in flute, violin I and violin II in both bars 1 and 4. On its three subsequent appearances, however, the notation is not so consistent. In figure 9.11b the slur is omitted in the flute, and in figure 9.11c and 9.11d it is missing in both flute and violin II. Thus violin I remains the only consistently slurred part in every ritornello, despite its unison doubling with the flute. We can, therefore, assume the legato intention of all appearances, as demonstrated by the first.

The essential legato quality of the ascending and descending demi-semiquaver runs in the second movement is clearly notated in all eleven figures of the ritornello and throughout the
movement. Less clear is the intended articulation of the repeated-note semiquaver figures in bars 3 and 4 (fig.9.12a). Here we see what appears to be a *staccato* notation in the flute and violins. On closer examination of the manuscript, however, the markings might equally be interpreted as very short dashes (fig.9.12b). As such, they are likely to imply a *portato* type of articulation, produced by a continuous bow-stroke (during which the bow is not lifted from the string) or breath of air (during which the tone is hardly interrupted), in strong contrast to the short, sharp articulation of a *staccato* interpretation. The intention does not become clear until its appearance in the second ritornello (fig.9.12c). Whilst the first violin remains articulated in the same way, we see in violin II (a third below), the addition of a slur to the dots/dashes, clarifying the *portato* interpretation. Since logic demands that both parts are consistent we might conclude that the slurred-*staccato* was implied by the earlier, incomplete notation, which was assumed by the copyist to be understood. The apparent implication is that this articulation was automatically expected on such figures as these involving repeated notes, and the later complete notation in the second violin serves only as a clarification of this intention.

The same articulation style is apparent in the third tutti with regard to a different figure (fig.9.12d), although here it is the slur notation that implies the *portato* rather than the use of dots or dashes. The abundance of repeated notes beneath the slurs clearly demands some degree of detachment, thus implying a *portato* bowing or, in the flute, a slurred-*staccato*. The similarity in 'effect' of those repeated semiquavers to the earlier figures suggests that the two incomplete methods of notation both implied the same intention and were, in fact, used interchangeably.
Like those in the Brussels collection, the final movements of the Karlsruhe concerti again display a jocular and dance-like character, and in this concerto (Kr. D major, No.1) the finale is no exception in inviting short, detached articulations. The ritornello opening (fig.9.13a), however, is contrasted strongly in its second half by carefully notated legato figures in the flute and violins (fig.9.13b).\(^4\) The slurs are missing only in violin II in the second phrase, whose legato intention we can assume. The change in character is also reflected by a change in texture and dynamic, in that the basso is omitted and replaced by a high pedal in the viola, while both phrases are consistently marked piano.

The same legato figures appear later, beginning in bar 133 (fig.9.13c), initially as the string tutti and then immediately becoming the accompaniment to the next solo episode. Again, the passage is characterised by the same reduction in texture and dynamic, although the notation of the latter is missing in the first phrase. The legato notation, however, is much less 'explicit' than in the initial ritornello and becomes even less so with every reappearance. Here, in the first phrase, violins I and II are slurred only in the first two bars and in the second phrase the second violin's markings are also omitted. At the entry of the solo we find the slur only in the first bar of violin II and, in the final repetition, no markings appear at all. Thus by the fourth phrase the performer is assumed automatically to understand the legato nature of the passage. The same contrasting character is seen later in figure 9.13d, where the solo is accompanied by stepwise figures in the violins, marked piano in violin I. Whilst the two-bar descent is consistently slurred in the second violin in all three sequential repetitions, the notation in the first violin remains ambiguous, if not contradictory, until the third repetition (fig.9.13d(iii)) where the intention becomes clear. We can only conclude

\(^4\) Here, the pattern of articulation, slurred in groups of three quavers, is rather unusual and is more commonly executed with a 2+1 pattern of two slurred, plus one detached.
that the first two markings, appearing to tie two notes across the barline, is instead a hastily written longer slur, pointing to the general *legato* character of the figure. Its association in character, texture and dynamic to the original *legato* ritornello passage also implies its likewise slurred execution, the assumption of which is clearly suggested by the copyist’s lack of careful notation in the first violin.

Thus the movement presents the suggestion that a *legato* articulation is strongly associated with contrasts of character achieved by quieter dynamic and sparser texture. This goes some way to explain the remaining contradictory slurred passages in the movement. In the opening of the first solo the ritornello theme is altered by the addition of a slur on the ascending scale in the third and fourth bar (fig.9.13e), effectively softening the sharply articulated character of the original. This is consistent in the second phrase and again in bars 91 and 92, the only other solo thematic statement. Is this then to imply that the original string ritornello was also intended to be performed with a *legato* ascending scale? We have already noted, however, the consistency with which the original detached articulation was contrasted in figure 9.13b by carefully notated slurs. If we were to execute the ritornello opening with a similar *legato* character, it would considerably soften this contrast. It is more likely, perhaps, that the slurs appearing in the solo statement (fig.9.13e) are, rather, a reflection of the quieter character and thinner texture contrasting the stronger string ritornello.

The opening ritornello of the second Karlsruhe concerto in D major (fig.9.14a) is dominated by two figures: the detached and repetitive octave leaps of motive ‘A’ and the slurred, conjunct semiquaver pairs in motive ‘B’. Whilst the interpretation of motive ‘A’ needs little
discussion, we find motive ‘B’ reappearing throughout the ritornello in various guises with fairly inconsistent and haphazard articulation markings. The initial statement in bars 2 and 4 (being identical) shows an explicit paired slurring of the semiquavers, with the exception of the first pair in violin II which we can assume to be legato based on its similarity to violin I.

In bars 5 and 6 (echoed in bars 7-8) the motive is used to create a new phrase in which bar 6 (and 8) is so similar to the original motive that the semiquavers demand a legato execution despite their lack of articulation. Whilst bars 5 and 7 are identical except for their register, the legato markings appearing in violin II are inconsistent. In bar 5 we see the first and not the second pair of semiquavers slurred, but the reverse in bar 7. Thus clearly a legato was intended on all the semiquaver figures which must also include those a third above in the first violin. Likewise, we see the consistent slurred notation of all three parts in bar 13, omitted two bars later in a sequential repetition, with the exception of the second violin. In the following passage (bars 16-21) the semiquaver pairs are consistently slurred in both violins, becoming much less so on their repetition. Thus, although many of these motivic pairs are either left unarticulated or with inconsistent markings, we are given enough to imply a legato intention on all such figures. When the ritornello returns in the third tutti, it is marked again by variable notation, between parts and sequences that is clearly not intended, and likewise when the motive is used by the solo or as accompaniment to the solo. For example, bars 48 and 49 (fig.9.14b), which are clearly based on motive ‘B’, remain unarticulated in the flute whilst violin I (a third below) is notated with a slur on each second pair. In contrast, the twelve semiquaver accompaniment figures in the following six bars are slurred consistently in both violins (fig.9.14c). Thus, whilst the copyist has notated slurs in a rather haphazard manner, it is apparent that the essential legato quality of this motive is to be understood from its initial appearance.
Similar figures are also found as a prominent ritornello motive in the third movement of this concerto. Here, however, their *legato* intention is much more consistently notated, with only a few exceptions towards the end of the ritornello (fig.9.15a), by which time a slurred execution is unquestionable (e.g. viola, bar 36, and violins, bars 42-44). The new material opening the second tutti is again based on these original onbeat ‘slide’ figures (fig.9.15b), although in a slightly altered form. Again, we find each figure slurred, missing only in violin I of bar 87, which we can assume. The remainder of the second tutti restates the original conclusion to the ritornello, this time with entirely consistent slurring, thus confirming the *legato* intention of its first appearance. Likewise, the same figure is consistently slurred when used to accompany the solo (fig.9.15c). The latter, however, remains unarticulated on identical figures, presumably left to the soloist’s understanding.

The intended execution of figures in the third tutti is less clear (fig.9.15d). Whilst here they resemble a mordent figure rather than the original lombard-like slide, they are essentially an ornamentation of the original syncopated motive, first appearing in bars 15 to 22 (fig.9.15a). As such, we might expect a *legato* intention in the light of their ornamental nature, and, whilst the passage remains almost entirely without articulation markings, we find a single slur in the second violin of bar 134. Such a placement could not have been used to imply a *legato* execution for the entire passage but is, perhaps instead, indicative of the copyist’s assumption of a *legato* intention being automatically understood from the start of the passage. A similar notation appears in figure 9.15e, which must be viewed in the same light. Thus the undeniable implication throughout the movement is the slurred execution of all onbeat semiquaver figures.
Such an implication, however, is not so obvious when the semiquavers occur between the beats, as such receiving no accent. For example, the figures first appearing in bars 3 and 7 (fig.9.15a) remain unarticulated in both violins, as they do in almost every other appearance throughout the movement. It is not until the third tutti that we find a marking that suggests otherwise (fig.9.15f). Here the second violin alone is notated with a slur in identical bars 123 and 127, once again, suggesting that this is simply confirmation of an already expected interpretation. Likewise, when the figure appears as an off-beat accompaniment to the solo (fig.9.15g), *legato* markings do not appear until the first and second repetition of the phrase (fig.9.15g(ii-iii)), and only then in the first violin.

Thus throughout the first and third movements of this concerto, we have seen a strong implication of an expected *legato* execution of all onbeat, lombard-style slide figures and, to a slightly lesser extent, slide figures appearing between beats, at least within the context of an *Allegro*. Likewise, we see similar figures in one of Mahaut’s slow movements, the *Grave* from the Karlsruhe Concerto in E-flat major. Here the motivic onbeat slide figures are once again articulated inconsistently, but with a clear *legato* implication if we are not to take the omissions literally but, rather, as errors (fig.9.15h). It is apparent that Mahaut was particularly fond of such figures, and we will later see, again, strong indications of their intended *legato*.

The dominant motive in the opening of the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto again presents confusion between *staccato* and an implied slurred-*staccato* interpretation. The motive in the opening two bars (fig.9.16a), on first impression, suggests a short and sharply articulated execution of the repeated semiquavers. As we noted, however, in the slow movement of the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, on closer inspection the markings would
likewise be more accurately described as very short dashes. These markings are identical with those that appear several bars later to articulate repeated-note sextuplets, some with the addition of a slur (fig. 9.16a, bar 4 and 6). The figure appears frequently throughout the movement notated in exactly the same way (fig. 9.16b and 9.16c), and it is not until the fifth appearance that we see any confirmation of a possible 'tongued-legato' intention (fig. 9.16d). Here both the motivic figure and the following repeated semiquavers are marked by the same short dashes together with a slur. This articulation was seen earlier, not only on the sextuplets, but also on a string of repeated semiquavers (fig. 9.16e) in which the slurs are notated in a very hurried and haphazard manner. Likewise, the final bar of the solo preceding the da capo is notated with both dashes and a slur (fig. 9.16f). Thus, once again, subsequent use of the motive confirms an intended articulation that is not altogether clear on the first appearances. In the light of the rather inaccurate, hurried manner in which we have seen slurs notated, it is possible that, in these first appearances (see fig. 9.16a), the slur joining the first two notes was intended to encompass the entire figure. It begins to suggest that wherever Mahaut or the copyist has notated what at first appears to be a sharp detachment by the use of dots may in fact be intended as a shorthand for a portato bowing or 'legato-tonguing', where the dots are to be read instead as short dashes and imply the addition of a slur. This particularly applies to repeated notes, but we will see that it is also strongly implied on scale figures in this and other movements.

The second movement of this concerto, shows us an almost identical figure, although this time in a much slower tempo (fig. 9.16g). Here the intended articulation is clearly notated on

---

5 The articulation of sextuplets in particular is discussed later in this chapter.

6 The term 'tongued-legato' is used here as the woodwind equivalent to the more common string term: slurred-staccato.
its initial appearance, this time with the slur extended to encompass the repeated notes, although becoming less consistent in the following two bars. Thus, again, we see the notation of short dashes/dots implying a tongued-legato.

The first movement of the Regensburg concerto shows us examples of the same inconsistencies and implied articulations, albeit probably notated by a different copyist. In bar 5 (fig. 9.17) we see the repeated-note figure notated only with dots (dashes) in violin I, but with its true intention clarified in violin II where the same figure, a third below, is notated with both dots (dashes) and a slur. The notation is repeated exactly on the third identical figure in bar 6, but in the second figure no articulation appears in either part. Clearly the implied execution is that of a consistent slurred-staccato bowing on all three figures. More extended passages in the strings involving similar notations are found both later in this movement, beneath the solo flute, and in the Adagio, and will be discussed with regard to the string articulation.

A second, strong motivic element of this movement are the frequent sextuplet and triplet figures. They likewise, suffer from ambiguous markings with regard to the staccato or slurred-staccato and these are included in the subsequent discussion on the articulation of triplet figures which feature strongly in Mahaut’s work.

We saw in many of the Brussels concerti the tendency to treat motivic dotted figures in a simple time-signature, as strongly detached, coupled with probable overdotting to heighten the majestic quality. The same interpretation is suggested in the Karlsruhe collection and is particularly strong in the first two movements of the Karlsruhe G major concerto (fig. 9.18a and 9.18b). Clearly the strong and proud motive displayed in the opening of the first
movement demands such a *majestic* execution whilst, perhaps, those in the *Largo* might call for a slightly softer approach. The latter, however, remains unarticulated throughout the movement with no markings that might otherwise imply a *legato* interpretation. The repeated notes, included in the dotted figures, demand at least some degree of separation and, whilst it is possible to interpret them with a *portato*-like articulation, perhaps softening the rhythm to a triplet, this would produce a sluggish, dirge-like quality that is unlikely to be intended. The figure itself is strikingly similar to that in the first movement, effectively linking the two movements together, and as such should reflect some of its *majestic*, strongly rhythmic and articulated character.

Likewise, the string dotted figures appearing in the *Adagio* of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto invite expressive overdotting and, by association, a strong detached articulation (fig.9.18c). As we saw in the Brussels collection, these figures effectively contrast the essential *legato* quality of the triplets with which they are juxtaposed, but never simultaneous.

Not all dotted figures, however, even in simple time signatures, are intended to be detached in such a way. The *Adagio* to the first Karlsruhe D major concerto clearly implies a *legato* execution of the figures in bar 7 (fig.9.19a) with the notation of slurs. Although part of the ritornello, they are not strongly ‘thematic’, and as such do not demand the proudly detached articulation of the *majestic*. We note, however, that the slurs are not consistently notated in all three parts. Whilst the violins are joined in groups of four, the flute is articulated in pairs. In contrast, when the passage later returns (fig.9.19b), we see the first violin articulated in fours and the second in twos. Each part is clearly intended to be executed in the same way. Thus it is apparent that the distinction between the two articulations is not significant or
essential to the character of the figure, but rather the general *legato* quality, possibly leaning
towards the lilting nature of a softer triplet rhythm.

We have seen this softening of a dotted figure to a triplet implied a number of times in
Mahaut’s work. Clearly, however, not all such figures are intended to be coupled with a
*legato* articulation. For example, we discussed earlier the probable softening of the dotted
figures in the opening theme of the concerto in Karlsruhe G major (fig.9.20a), due to their
simultaneous placement with sextuplet figures in which they are intended only as a harmonic
support, not as a counter-rhythm. In the light of the disjunct and detached nature of the
sextuplet figures, it follows that the accompanying dotted figures also remain detached,
applying likewise to the upbeat figures.

The *Adagio* of the Regensburg concerto opens with a two-bar dotted theme that would
invite the stylistic *majestic* character produced by overdotting and strong detached
articulation (fig.9.20b). In subsequent statements, however, several markings occur that
might suggest an otherwise *legato* execution of certain dotted figures, notably those
forming a sequence of descending thirds. Approaching the end of the opening ritornello (bar 9)
two pairs of figures in the first violin are slurred, leaving all the others, in both its own
and in the doubled flute and second violin parts, detached. In the second tutti (fig.9.20c) we
find a similar passage in which another slur appears in the flute part on a single dotted pair
(one of six), leaving both violins unmarked. In isolation we could probably happily ignore
these slurs, regarding them rather as a copyist’s error or even misjudgement. When the
theme returns for the final time, however, we find a larger number of slurs, although by no
means consistently (fig.9.20d). Here every dotted figure in the first violin is slurred (whilst we find none in the unison flute part) and one in the second. This notation begins to suggest that either the copyist has, only in the final tutti, clarified the intended articulation or perhaps having changed his mind, whilst neglecting to correct the lack of articulation in previous statements, or that the legato interpretation was automatically expected, with or without notation, from its first appearance. The latter conclusion would seem unlikely in that we have only seen an implied legato execution of Mahaut’s dotted figures when they invited a ‘lilting’ character, usually (but not always) associated with the presence of triplets.

---

7 A single slur also appears in the flute part of bar 21, although this particular marking can be explained as a misplaced tie, seen correctly positioned in the first violin with which it plays in unison.
Figuration

The Articulation of Triplet Figures

The frequent use of triplet figures is a prominent feature of Mahaut's figuration and appears most commonly in the form of stepwise semiquavers. An examination of these figures reveals a strong implication of a legato execution as has already been seen in those figures forming a motivic element in some movements.

Previously we noted the essential legato character of the thematic triplets in the Brussels e minor concerto, movement II; d minor concerto, movement I and III; D major concerto, movement III; and A major concerto, movement II. Numerous other appearances in the solo passage-work and accompaniment figures of these concerti support this essential quality.

The notated articulations found in figure 9.21 to 9.23 show complete consistency in the legato intention of conjunct triplets. In figure 9.23d, however, in contrast to almost every other triplet figure in the movement, we find a bar of ascending arpeggio triplets with no articulation markings at all. By their disjunct nature we might conclude that they are intended to remain detached.

Figure 9.24a, repeated several bars later as figure 9.24b, from the first movement of the Brussels d minor concerto, shows the violins in thirds with their triplet figures consistently slurred except the last figure in violin II which must be understood. In figure 9.24c, the triplets are the only conjunct figures amongst otherwise disjunct solo passage-work and also the only figures marked with a slur, thus highlighting the same essential legato character
that we saw in the ritornello triplets. Likewise, figure 9.24d and 9.24e show us passages of stepwise triplets that are invariably slurred in all relevant parts.

The Brussels concerto in D major (fig.9.25a) shows us a descending sequence of stepwise triplets in which every figure is slurred. This is notable only in as much as the rest of the movement remains almost entirely deficient of articulation markings. A similar passage occurs in the third movement (fig.9.25b) which this time is left unmarked. Here, in the light of the motivic role that these triplets play in this movement and their essential legato quality already discussed, there is no confusion as to their intended interpretation.

The imitative passage in figure 9.26a opens the first solo episode of the third movement of this concerto. The articulation, however, between the two parts is not consistent in that the legato markings on the mordent-like triplets that appear in the violin are constantly missing in the flute. There can be no reason why a flute cannot or should not slur these figures and, by nature of the imitation, we must conclude that they are intended legato in both parts. Likewise, the slurred figures in bar 16, left unmarked on their sequential repeat in bar 20, must be understood legato. In the same way, the solo triplet figures of figure 9.26b are inconsistent in their markings. Here only two of eleven identical figures are slurred. In addition, these markings do not appear as we would expect, on the first of each sequence, but randomly on the sixth and last. We can only surmise that their legato performance was automatically expected and that the inconsistencies in notation are only a matter of haste.

\footnote{In the Stockholm manuscript of this concerto we find that all these triplet figures are consistently slurred throughout all parts.}
The ritornello, however, of the third movement to the Brussels d minor concerto includes not only slurred stepwise triplets (which form the majority), but also figures of leaping thirds (fig.9.27a). Likewise, the solo passage of running triplets, consistently slurred in figure 9.27b, includes the last figure in each bar which rises in thirds. We also see, in another movement (fig.9.27c), the viola slurring triplets which leap by thirds and fourths. All of these figures are both preceded and followed by slurred stepwise triplets, suggesting that, where the occasional leaping figure appears in a passage that is predominantly conjunct and legato (unlike the arpeggio figures of fig.9.22d), a slurred interpretation must be assumed to preserve the character of the passage.

In addition to their abundance in solo figuration and as a prominent thematic element, Mahaut also used the stepwise triplet frequently to decorate the approach to a cadence. Here they serve a purely ornamental role and, once again, the essential legato quality of these figures is apparent from the numerous examples (fig.9.28-9.31).

In figure 9.29c, at the end of the movement, the necessity for a slurred execution of the triplet is demanded by the legato marking of the first appearance in bar 7 at the end of the first half (fig.9.29b). Whilst both figures in figure 9.30b appear detached, we have noted before the motivic nature of the conjunct semiquaver triplet in this movement along with its legato character. To contradict that here, where it appears in a purely ornamental role, would be illogical and unmusical. Once again, those in figure 9.31c, appearing at the end of two solo episodes, lack articulation. They are, however, the same cadential figures that are slurred in the ritornello (fig.9.31b). We can only conclude that a legato execution was assumed in the solo part.
Whilst the essential *legato* quality of the conjunct triplet figures found in the Brussels concerti might (and probably does) apply likewise to the other collections, we find the majority of the figuration is left unarticulated, giving us little indication of a *legato* intention. Figure 9.32 is, in fact, the only consistent *legato* triplet notation throughout the remaining concerti.

A feature of the triplets is the frequent lack of their indicative figure '3', which tends to coincide with a lack of articulation. Most prominent in the Karlsruhe G major concerto, we find in its figuration an abundance of conjunct and disjunct triplet figures, lacking both articulation and their rhythmic '3'. This first occurs in the opening solo, seen in figure 9.33a. Here the descending quaver triplets might conceivably be intended detached, but speed probably demands the following semiquaver figures of bar 18 to be, at least in part, made *legato*. Later, in other movements, it is apparent that these descending runs following a leap, in what is in essence a sextuplet, are commonly articulated in the following pattern:

In figure 9.33b and 9.33c we see a small representation of the abundance of these figures amongst the virtuosic passage-work. Their apparent detachment, however, is not limited to the triplets alone, but includes up-beat flourishes of hemi-demi- and demi-semiquavers, which in later appearances are slurred. Thus the lack of articulation in these passages does not necessarily dictate detachment. Just as we have noted the frequently incomplete rhythmic notation of triplet figures, it is likely a result of the copyist omitting those markings that he felt to be automatically understood. Perhaps this explains the sudden

---

9 This is, of course, not unusual in manuscripts of this time.
legato notations later in the movement (fig.9.33d). Following the sequence of straightforward unarticulated descending triplet runs (probably assumed legato), the copyist has made clear, both that the rhythmic change still includes a triplet figure, and its intended slurred execution (this perhaps could not be automatically expected since it is not entirely conjunct). Clearly these markings should be understood to apply also to the identical figures in the following bar.

The third movement to the G major concerto displays similar stepwise triplet figures lacking both their rhythmic indication and any articulation (fig.9.34a). Again we can assume the speed to dictate a legato execution probably omitted by the copyist.

Bars 35 to 42, shown in figure 9.34b, however, include not only stepwise but also disjunct figures leaping by thirds or fourths to two repeated notes. The same figures were seen in the first movement (fig.9.33b). Just as we are not limited to a detached execution of the stepwise triplets, these too might be intended otherwise. Similar figures occur throughout the concerti and the strongest implication of a particular articulation pattern appears in the first movement of the Regensburg concerto. Although perhaps notated by a different copyist, they might at least imply a particular character to these figures whenever they appear in Mahaut's work. Whilst appearing only in the first and third bar of figure 9.35a, clearly the articulation pattern is intended to apply to the entire passage. Initially, however, we are only given the descending slur and do not see the ascending form until the third bar. This would suggest that the pattern was expected to be immediately understood and that these markings represent merely a haphazard clarification of the intention. Later in the movement (fig.9.35b) we find the same pattern of figuration reappear without articulation markings, which is clearly assumed to be understood. Thus we have seen in these concerti
the tendency to omit certain articulation markings that might be deemed to be obvious to
the performer. That this particular pattern is one such example is clear from its reappearance
in a number of movements, such as the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto (fig.9.35c and
9.35d), all without clarification of the intended articulation.10

The third movement of the E-flat concerto once again shows us detached triplets whose
legato execution is not implied until notated in a subsequent appearance (fig.9.36a-c). Thus
we begin to reach a conclusion that, at the very least in an Allegro movement, conjunct
triplet figures of semiquaver value or less have an implied legato execution (in line with
most baroque and early-classical manuscripts) and figures such as figure 9.36d should be
automatically understood in this light.

Finally, we see in the Regensburg concerto the same notational inconsistency. The essential
legato quality of the stepwise triplet is implied in the opening of the ritornello of the first
movement (fig.9.37a). Whilst here the slur is initially missing in the flute, it appears in the
unison first violin and a third below in violin II. In the second bar it appears in both unison
flute and violin I, but this time omitted in violin II. A slurred triplet then appears in the
following two bars in the first violin. Thus clearly a consistent legato was intended.
Likewise, we see the same intention in the opening of the first solo (fig.9.37b), although
missing on the second triplet. The same implication is given in figure 9.37c and can be
assumed in figure 9.37d, not least by its ornamental function. As in the Brussels collection,

10 A large number of these figures appear in Mahaut's Méthode, which he articulates in exactly the same
manner [see Mahaut, Méthode, chap.VIII, pp.22-23] and is further discussed at the conclusion of this
section.
this last example illustrates again Mahaut's penchant for using the \textit{legato} triplet to decorate a cadential approach.

The \textit{Adagio} to this concerto contains, in the solo flute, a sequence of unmarked triplet figures (fig.9.38) followed almost immediately by a passage of semiquaver sextuplets clearly marked \textit{legato} for each group (the articulation of the latter is discussed in the following paragraphs). Numerically, these two groupings are equivalent and one might suggest that it is the articulation which is to highlight the rhythmic or metrical difference between them. Thus, whilst the triplets might indeed be intended detached (although gentle and sustained), with a heaviness on the first of every three, we might easily apply those triplet articulations that we find illustrated in Mahaut's \textit{Méthode}. In this light, we note that the passage includes two types of figures: \textit{-} \textit{-} (a leap followed by a step) and \textit{-} \textit{-} . We find two types of articulation for these figures, both of which highlight the triplet grouping: \textit{-} \textit{-} and \textit{-} \textit{-} .

The sextuplet figures mentioned earlier are a characteristic of a number of concerti in this collection. Whilst they are metrically equivalent to triplets, differing only in their notation, they are almost consistently distinguished from them by their articulation in that the implied \textit{legato} on conjunct figures encompasses the group of six as a whole, rather than two groups of three, thus ensuring a single accent or crotchet beat instead of two quaver beats (i.e. in the case of semiquaver figures). In figure 9.39a the slur encompassing the sextuplet is given only on its second appearance (bar 49), implying once again an expectant \textit{legato} performance on such figures. Likewise, in the same movement, descending scale figures (fig.9.39b) are consistently slurred as a group of six with the exception of the initial leap.
Similar figures are found in the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto (fig. 9.39c). This concerto, however, features strongly the use of a slurred-\textit{staccato} articulation in the flute, already seen as a thematic element. Also called the \textit{pearl-stroke}, this was for the flute a somewhat new articulation appearing in \textit{galant} music, derived from violin bowing technique, in which the notes were detached but played in one bow-stroke. In his flute treatise of 1735, Michael Corrette equates its performance on the violin to that on the flute: "it is necessary to tongue all the notes on the same stroke of wind". Their first appearance (fig. 9.39d) gives an almost consistent notation, missing only the slur in the second sextuplet. Likewise, in figure 9.39e the slur in the second bar is understood. This passage, however, appears earlier (fig. 9.39f) unmarked, to which we must assume the same articulation. In figure 9.39g the intended execution is given only on its second appearance, and finally, in figure 9.39h, we have a consistent notation on both groups. Thus, whilst the notation is often inconsistent, there is a strong implication, after its first appearance in the ritornello (fig. 9.39d), that all such figures should be performed in the same way, probably including the simple figures of figure 9.39c.

The slow movement likewise includes semiquaver \textit{legato} sextuplet figures, although with no implication of slurred-\textit{staccato}. Again a slur on the second figure in bar 13 and bar 41 is suggested by the first (fig. 9.40a and 9.40b). The slurred-\textit{staccato} is, however, implied on the smaller demi-semiquaver figures seen in figure 9.40c. Only the first is fully notated, with the dots being understood in the second and third, whilst both slur and dots must be understood in the last figure. In the third movement, slurred-\textit{staccato} is almost consistently indicated in the first sequence of sextuplet figures (fig. 9.40d) and is probably intended for

\begin{footnote}
Corrette, Michel. \textit{Méthode pour apprendre aisément à jouer de la flûte traversière} (Paris and Lyons, 1735).
\end{footnote}
the remaining figures throughout the movement, generally marked only with a slur (fig.9.40e-h).

As we have seen, the thematic arpeggio-like sextuplet in the opening of the Regensburg concerto always remains detached, probably due to its disjunct character. Other sextuplets, however, occur throughout the movement in which an apparent legato is automatically expected. For example, in bars 26 and 27 (fig.9.41a) the slur appears only on the third figure, but must be assumed for the first two as well. Figure 9.41b is properly notated, whilst in figure 9.41c, only the first figure is slurred. On some figures there is also an implication of slurred-staccato. In bar 29 (fig.9.41d) the first group is marked with dots or very short dashes, whilst the second is made legato. Yet, in the following two bars repeated in sequence, these figures are both marked with a slur. The middle note of each figure is repeated, thus requiring some degree of separation, and so it is probable that the legato markings are shorthand for a slurred-staccato, implied by the dots in the first figure. The shorthand, however, has not been used consistently, as we can see in bars 139 and 140 (fig.9.41e), where the sextuplets have all been notated with dots except in one group, to which is added a slur. Since the slur occurs on the figure’s fourth repetition we can only conclude that a slurred-staccato was intended for the entire passage, which the performer was expected automatically to understand.

Similar passages occur in the second movement where sextuplet figures are almost consistently marked legato (fig.9.41f). Again the inclusion of repeated notes demands some degree of detachment, and thus implies the use of slurred-staccato. This reflects the frequent use of like articulations in the string accompaniment which shall be discussed later.
Ornamental Figures

As we have seen in some of the motivic figures, there is a strong implication in Mahaut's work of an expected legato execution of any written out mordent. For example, in the Larghetto of the Brussels d minor concerto (fig.9.3) we noted that whilst the initial mordent figures in the first violin were unarticulated, subsequent legato markings on all remaining like-figures left us in no doubt as to the expected interpretation of the first two. Likewise, in the first movement of the Brussels e minor concerto, we find the intended slur clarified on the mordent's second appearance in the solo flute (fig.9.42a).

Making an even more frequent appearance in these concerti is the 'Italian' mordent (i.e. a mordent figure preceded by an unaccented upper auxiliary, usually with the addition of a trill on the first note of the mordent producing a strong accent). The clichéd formula of these mordents also demanded a slur that encompassed the entire figure. Their essential legato quality was, however, so much part of its character that the slur would frequently be left to the performer's understanding. The notation in Mahaut's concerti, whether credited to himself or to a copyist, is no exception. Figure 9.42b shows us two passages in the solo flute, each consisting of four 'Italian' mordent figures. Yet only the first is articulated with a slur, from which we can assume a like intention for the remaining figures. Similarly, in the first movement of the Brussels A major concerto (fig.9.42c), the first two occurrences are slurred (bar 73-75) but not the identical figures in the third (bar 95).

In the Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti, we find even less notation of the essential slur. The third tutti in the Karlsruhe G major concerto (fig.9.43a), for example, shows the mordent in imitation between two parts, neither of which has been articulated. It is,
however, not the only element of the ‘formula’ that has been omitted: in bar 55 (violin II) the upper auxiliary has also failed to be notated, which is clearly not intended to be taken literally.

Similar figures appear in the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto, but, whilst those in the first movement (fig.9.43b) are fully notated with a slur, the more frequent figures in the second movement are notated much more casually without (fig.9.43c) (with the exception of the mordents in bar 19 (fig.9.43d), whose slurs clarify the legato intention of such figures). Whilst the movement as a whole is not entirely without notated articulation, it does demonstrate the tendency to omit such markings on certain figures, which we will soon discuss, whose essential legato quality is such an obvious part of its character that it is assumed to be understood. Thus these ‘Italian’ mordent figures are not alone in their often incomplete notation. This type of abbreviated notation used for such cliché figures is seen even more clearly in the second movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig.9.43e). Whilst the first two figures are missing their customary slur, the final two are missing both their slur and their upper auxiliary, although clearly they are intended to be identical to the first in the rising sequence.

By far one of the most abundant figures in Mahaut’s concerti, in addition to the frequent triplets, is the aforementioned lombard slide, ascending or descending, filling in the interval of a third. We have already seen these figures in a number of movements taking a strong motivic role where their overwhelming character was essentially legato. In addition, these figures often form a prominent part of the solo figuration where their notation strengthens the strong legato implication. For example, we saw, in the first movement of the Brussels A major concerto, lombard slides first appearing in the ritornello (fig.9.7a). Whilst they are not
a significant part of the thematic material, they later reappear more prominently in the solo episodes (fig. 9.44a) and, like those in the ritornello, the *legato* intention is clearly notated on all figures. Likewise, in the opening of the Brussels d minor concerto, we noted the almost consistent *legato* notation of the descending motivic slide figures (fig. 9.2). They reappear immediately in the first solo episode, beginning with a brief statement of the opening two bars (fig. 9.44b). Once again, however, we see a casualness in the notation of subsequent appearances, with the required *legato* in bar 16 missing, although it is clearly understood from the ritornello statement. Similarly, the *legato* intention of the slide in bar 17, whilst taken out of its thematic context, is clarified by the slur notation on its sequential repetition in the following bar. Clearly, this interpretation was simply expected of the performer. In the third movement similar, but un-dotted, slide figures appear in the solo figuration (fig. 9.44c). Only the last two slides remain unmarked with their characteristic *legato*, which surely we can assume by the preceding, consistently slurred figures.

In the first movement of the Brussels e minor concerto, we find a series of ascending lombard slides in the violins as a ‘countermelody’ to the solo figuration (fig. 9.44d). Note here the consistent slurred notation of all such figures, with the exception of violin II in the first four bars. Again, this suggests that such an interpretation was somewhat expected. Earlier in the movement, however, a descending form of the same figures appeared in the string ritornello (fig. 9.44e) without any *legato* indication. Here their role is essentially ornamental, decorating the same harmonic progression that follows in bar 27 and, as such, we might consider a *legato* to be intended.

Similar, unarticulated slides are also found much later in the movement. Previously we noted Mahaut’s fondness for using triplet figures to decorate the approach to a cadence.
The manuscripts also show that he was equally fond of using a descending lombard slide (but for the slight change in rhythm, almost identical to the triplet) in the same way. It is in this role that the remaining slides in the e minor concerto are found (two such examples appear in fig.9.44f). Just as we saw the undeniable legato intention of the triplets, we would expect the same interpretation of the lombard slides. Thus, whilst they remain unarticulated (as did many triplet figures in an equivalent role), a slurred performance is almost certainly expected in the light of their ornamental nature. This decorative ‘formula’ is not confined to the e minor concerto alone, but is found with almost equal frequency in others of the Brussels collection (fig.9.44g and 9.44h). Whilst some are articulated fully with a slur, others are left unmarked but clearly with the same intention.

Finally in the Brussels collection, we note several identical figures that appear in the first movement of the D major concerto (fig.9.44i). Whilst they are not strictly lombard figures as they are undotted, they remain essentially accented slides, filling in a third. The figures are consistently detached, but appear in a passage of figuration that is conspicuously unmarked, much of which is probably not intended to be so. Thus, once again, we suspect an assumption by the copyist of a certain ‘understanding’ on the part of the performer. In the light of the fast cut-time tempo, the ornamental nature of the slides and the overwhelming evidence throughout the manuscripts, we can only but expect a legato intention on such figures.

An even greater abundance of these slide figures is evident amongst the Karlsruhe concerti. As in the Brussels collection, a great number take the form of dotted lombardic figures (\[ \begin{array}{c} \text{\textcopyright} \end{array} \]), although equally, many remain un-dotted whilst retaining the lombardic quality with the accented placement of the slide. Once again, whilst the notated articulation
is almost never entirely consistent, it nevertheless conveys an undeniable *legato* intention for all accented slides (i.e. where the slide begins on the beat rather than between).

Thus, in the first movement of the D major concerto, we see a mixture of both these figures in the solo figuration. Whilst the intended *legato* is clear and consistently marked in bars 55 to 57 (fig. 9.45a), it is less so when they reappear in a later episode (fig. 9.45b). Here only the first and last figures in the flute are slurred, from which we must surely assume the same for the middle two, achieving a consistent articulation for the rising sequence. In addition, each figure is imitated by the violins (although these remain un-dotted) in which both parts are consistently marked with a *legato*. Figure 9.45c and 9.45d show similar accented slides whose slurred articulation is almost invariably notated. The suggestion of an automatic expectation of a *legato* interpretation; however, is illustrated in a later appearance of these figures (fig. 9.45e) where only the repetition of the phrase is articulated correctly.

Two types of accented slides, characterised by slightly different rhythmical structures, appear in the *Adagio* of this concerto. The strong lombardic slide (fig. 9.46a), the more brilliant and virtuosic of the two, is consistently slurred on all figures in both the flute and the bass. The same intended execution of the rhythmically softer figures, first appearing in bar 31 (fig. 9.46b) is, however, less clear. Although the first three accented slides remain unmarked, we note an almost identical figure (with the exception of the dotted quaver, which has been replaced by three semi-quavers) in the following bars 34 to 37, which is clearly marked consistently with a slur on all three occurrences, allowing for the conflicting marking in the second figure (bar 35), which is probably best seen as a ‘misplaced’ slur whose intended articulation was no different from the others. Thus, once again, we can only
but conclude that such a *legato* intention was also assumed for those figures in bars 31 and 32.

The accented slide is also a particularly strong figurative element in the third movement. In a lengthy passage from bar 57 to bar 88 (fig.9.47a) we note the almost complete consistency, in both the flute and the violins, with which the essential *legato* character has been notated. Those figures that remain unmarked (bars 75 and 78) can be interpreted likewise, not only in the light of the slur marked on the third repetition of the sequence (bar 81), but also of the identical figures appearing earlier in bars 57 and 60. Later in the movement, however, these figures reappear with much less consistency in their notated articulation (fig.9.47b-d), although a *legato* intention is clearly implied for all such figures suggesting, once again, an assumed understanding.

As in the *Adagio*, we also find a proportionally slower and smoother slide figure prominent in the figuration, later taken up in the tutti passages. These figures, whilst not obviously written out ornaments, exhibit an ornamental function with their passing note filling in the interval of a third. Such a function would imply a *legato* execution. This is, in fact, notated clearly in a violin accompaniment to the solo (fig.9.47e), with the exception of the first slide in violin II, which we can assume. Immediately preceding this passage, however, similar figures in the solo flute are left unmarked. For the sake of consistency, clearly a *legato* was both intended and assumed by the copyist. Likewise, where a similar passage returns later in the movement, the slides again appear first unarticulated in the solo flute (fig.9.47f) before being taken up by the string tutti. This time, however, not even the string figures are consistently articulated, with a slur appearing only in bar 159 of the first violin. Clearly, such a conflicting articulation cannot have been intended. A more likely conclusion is that of
an expected legato, which must apply likewise to two subsequent appearances of this tutti passage, both of which remain entirely unarticulated.

We have already seen, in the first movement of the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto, a legato accented slide forming part of the dominant motivic material (fig.9.16a). A similar slide figure also appears in the opening of the first solo episode where, again, an expected legato is implied by an isolated slur notated only in the second bar (fig.9.48a). Likewise, in its descending form appearing in a later episode (fig.9.48b), only two out of eight figures are slurred, but clearly with a consistent intention. A second accented slide to appear is the dotted lombardic figure ( ). Again forming part of the solo figuration, only its first and last appearances are clearly marked with its characteristic legato (fig.9.48c).

The Grave of the second movement uses the same slide figuration that we saw in the opening of the first solo in the Allegro (fig.9.48a). Here the essential legato quality of the slide is more consistently notated, missing only in bars 3 and 5 (fig.9.48d) where slurs are clearly intended. Likewise, in both returns of the tutti, the figures are left entirely unmarked (fig.9.48e), surely on the assumption of a legato understanding.

Whilst the accented slide is not a significant feature in the Regensburg concerto, it does occur in a sequential passage of solo figuration in which the articulation of the entire passage has been left unmarked (fig.9.49a). Here the ornamental nature of the figure as a written out onbeat slide is very apparent. Thus, together with the virtuosic speed required of such small values in an Allegro, we can conclude a legato execution as the only possible interpretation. In addition to this passage of figuration, single lombardic slides appear frequently throughout the concerto as a decorative cadential approach. In the first
movement (fig. 9.49b), their legato execution is consistently marked with the exception of bar 122, although even this is implied by the slur in the first violin. The same figures appear in the second and third movements (fig. 9.49c and 9.49d) but remain unarticulated. Clearly the copyist has assumed an understanding of the legato intention. Likewise, many examples are to be found in the Karlsruhe concerti (fig. 9.50a-e), just as we saw Mahaut's fondness for this cadential 'formula' in the Brussels collection. The essential legato quality of these figures is clearly apparent and, in many cases, left to the understanding of the musicians.

In contrast to the conclusions drawn in the preceding lengthy discussion regarding the overwhelming implication of a legato execution of any accented slides filling in a third, we cannot, however, apply this to all such figures without thought and discrimination. I refer particularly to those which are written with proportionately longer values in relation to the tempo. For example, in the Adagio of the Karlsruhe second D major concerto (fig. 9.51), we cannot automatically assume a legato intention for the ascending semiquaver figures in bars 5 to 8, which remain unmarked. In the light of the slow tempo, such figures become less 'ornamental' and would work equally well performed with a broad but detached bow-stroke.

In addition to this onbeat accented slide, we also find in the concerti a slide figure that appears within the beat rather than on it, still filling in a third, but remaining fundamentally unaccented. Mahaut's fondness for 'writing out' such figures is discussed with regard to ornamentation. It is this essential ornamental function, however, that demands in performance, a legato execution, often implied in the notation but again hardly consistent. In the opening of the Brussels D major concerto we see such a figure approaching the cadence at the end of the thematic statement (fig. 9.52a). Here both unison violins are
marked *legato*, as they are in every thematic statement throughout the movement. In the duplicate of this concerto in the Stockholm collection, we again find that every such slide figure has been slurred, in addition to a number of other figures whose ornamental nature would likewise suggest such an interpretation.

It is in the Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti that we find a greater frequency of these written out ornaments. We have already seen such an ornament in the last bar of figure 9.46b from the *Adagio* of the first D major concerto. Similar, but ascending, examples appearing earlier in the movement (fig.9.52b) are also invariably slurred. Likewise, figures appearing in the third movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto (fig.9.52c) are consistently notated with a slur. The *legato* intention of like-figures in the opening *Moderato* of the E-flat major concerto (fig.9.52d) is understood only by the slur notated in the first figure, leaving the remaining three unmarked. Lastly, figure 9.52e shows us one of the numerous passages in which the generally expected *legato* understanding is neither notated or implied, but clearly intended.

Whilst these accented and unaccented figures are a particular characteristic of Mahaut’s writing, they are also frequently extended to create longer slides and upbeat flourishes, usually of the demi-semiquaver variety. Whilst these figures are discussed more fully with regard to Mahaut’s written out ornamentation, we note here the clear indications of their essential *legato* character (which we would otherwise expect due to their ornamental role). Such indications are, for once, entirely consistent within those concerti of the Brussels collection as we can see in figure 9.53. The first two examples show again, Mahaut’s fondness for approaching a cadence with an ornamental slide figure (fig.9.53a and 9.53b), while the third illustrates the frequent use of such figures as an upbeat flourish (fig.9.53c).
The same extended slides are seen with even greater frequency in the Karlsruhe concerti, usually as part of the solo figuration, but often appearing in the ritornello with some motivic significance. Whilst their intended *legato* remains more frequently notated than in the smaller slides, the present collection, however, is considerably less consistent than those we saw in the Brussels concerti. In the opening movement of the G major concerto, upbeat flourishes are invariably slurred in both tutti (fig. 9.54a and 9.54c) and solo passages (fig. 9.54d), with the exception of figure 9.54b. The latter concludes a passage of figuration that is conspicuously devoid of articulation markings, much of which is unlikely to be intended to remain detached as was discussed earlier with regard to the sextuplet figures. Thus we can likewise assume the *legato* intention of these concluding slides.

The *Largo* of this concerto displays a series of descending slides in the solo flute which are marked *legato* only on the first and fourth figures (fig. 9.54e). Clearly we can assume the same intention for the remaining figures in the light of the sequential nature of the passage.12

In the third movement we see first a consistently slurred sequential passage involving ascending upbeat flourishes (fig. 9.54f). Similar, but descending, figures are used in the conclusion to this solo episode (fig. 9.54g). Once again, the isolated placement and illogical implications of the single slur (bar 135) suggests an assumed understanding of the *legato* requirement, for which this random marking serves only to confirm this intention. Such an assumed understanding is evident also in the concluding ritornello passages of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto, third movement (fig. 9.54h). Here, whilst the figures remain

---

12 The un-metrical rhythmical notation of these figures is discussed earlier with regard to *Rhythmic Alteration*. 
detached in all parts, the fast tempo (*Presto*) and technical aspects such as synchronisation would appear to demand a *legato* execution.

In figure 9.55a, we see a passage of solo figuration involving a sequence of ever-lengthening slides, whose fundamental *legato* character is clearly notated. Similar, but more extensive passages dominated by seemingly accelerating slides are found in two other concerti. Those in the first movement of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto (fig.9.55b) are marked with their essential *legato* articulation in all of the twenty figures. In the opening movement of the Karlsruhe E-flat concerto we find, in contrast, almost identical accelerating slide figures which remain unarticulated and seemingly detached (fig.9.55c). Clearly, however, they fulfil the same ornamental function and character as those in figure 9.55b and, as such, demand a *legato* execution.

Likewise, in the second movement (*Grave*) of the same concerto, a single descending slide appears in the opening ritornello entirely detached (fig.9.55d). In the approach to the final ritornello cadence, however, a similar slide is notated with the slur and short dashes indicative of the tongued-*legato* or slurred-*staccato* bowing (fig.9.55e). We saw previously, in the discussion of sextuplet figures, the strong implication of this particular articulation on all scale and repeated-note figures within this movement. That this articulation is also intended for the descending slide in the second bar (*) is confirmed by the notation of a slur over the equivalent slide in the subsequent second tutti (fig.9.55f). We have already concluded in this movement that such a slur could be interpreted as 'shorthand' for the tongued-*legato*. Likewise, we would expect the same intention for the unmarked slides appearing in the solo figuration (fig.9.55g). Thus, whilst we can be sure, at the very least, of a basic *legato* intention, it is apparent that, in a slow movement such as this, the tongued-
*legato* may have been somewhat generally 'expected' in the light of the vague and non-explicit notation found throughout the movement, particularly on the initial unmarked figure.

The final ornamental figure under discussion here is the frequently written out trill suffix \(\text{\textsuperscript{\(\dagger\)}}\), most commonly in the form of a turn. These figures are used not only in the context of a cadential trill, but also frequently as a motivic element in the solo episodes or accompaniment. We note from our previous discussion regarding this ornament that Mahaut, in his *Méthode*, made specific reference to their articulation:

> The trill with turn or double cadence is nothing more than two grace notes added at the end of a regular trill . . . you can either slur or tongue these extra notes depending on your taste and on the expression you want to give the passage.\(^{13}\)

It is, however, clear from the manuscripts that their intended articulation, whether notated or not, is no different from our own *legato* understanding of such figures. Whilst those appearing in the solo flute figuration in the Brussels d minor concerto are consistently slurred (fig.9.56a and 9.56b), similar figures in the violin accompaniment (fig.9.56c) are less consistent in their *legato* markings, but clearly implied by the first violin in the repetition. Likewise, in the first movement of the Brussels D major concerto (fig.9.56d), all twenty-eight figures are consistently slurred in the solo figuration.

These figures also appear with equal frequency in the Karlsruhe concerti, and again we note the same strong implications of an assumed *legato* interpretation. The ornaments, used as a motivic element in the solo passage-work of the opening movement of the first D major

concerto (fig. 9.57a), are invariably slurred in every figure, as they are on the repetition of the passage in the following bars 121 to 130. The difference in the notation of the slur between the two collections (i.e. between a slur that encompasses the whole figure and one that joins only the suffix) is perhaps to be seen more as a difference in the notational ‘style’ of the copyists rather than an actual difference in the articulation. It is unlikely in the present collection that the suffix was intended to be detached from the trill itself.

We note that the same type of figures in the E-flat major concerto is less consistently articulated but still conveys a strong legato intention (fig. 9.57b and 9.57c). That the slurs in figure 9.57c appear on the third and fourth figures, and not on the first two, implies yet again an expected legato execution.

From the same movement, we see two examples in which the trill suffix does not take the form of a turn, but instead, of a slide (fig. 9.57d). Whilst the intended articulation in bar 20 remains un-notated, we might expect an assumed legato in the light of our previous discussion on ornamental slide figures. This assumption is confirmed in bar 100 where the legato is clearly notated.

In the final movement of this concerto, ‘turned’ suffixes once again appear consistently slurred (fig. 9.57e), with the exception of the last figure which must be understood. Note also in this passage, the apparent confusion between slurs which encompass the entire figure (including the trill) and those that join only the suffix. Here there can surely be no difference in the intended articulation, leaving only ‘casual’ notation as an explanation. This supports my previous comment regarding the difference in notation between the Brussels
and Karlsruhe collections, pointing again to a universally understood *legato* articulation regardless of the precision (or lack of) with which they are notated.

Finally, the same fundamental *legato* intention on such figures is likewise implied in the Regensburg concerto (fig.9.58a and b). Note the absence of a slur in the second violin (fig.9.58a) whose intended *legato* execution can be understood, at the very least, by the notation above in violin I.

**Solo Passage-Work**

With the exception of those thematic triplet and ornamental figures already discussed, the remaining content of the solo figuration, dominated by virtuosic running semiquavers, is, to a large extent, left unmarked with articulation. This said, whilst much of the disjunct figuration is probably intended to remain detached, the rather random notation of some isolated *legato* markings in a number of movements begins to imply an expected ‘3+1’ or ‘1+3’ (\[\text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example.png}}\]) articulation where the slurred notes form scale or neighbour-note groupings.\(^{14}\)

In the first movement of the Brussels D major concerto we find several passages where these isolated markings appear. The figuration in bars 17 to 20 (fig.9.59a), built on the sequential repetition of neighbour-note figures, is left unmarked, with the exception of the last such figure in bar 20 where the three neighbour-notes are slurred. The equivalent figure concluding the first sequence (second crotchet, bar 18) is not notated in the same way, and

\(^{14}\) i.e. figures articulated in a ‘three slurred plus one detached’ pattern, or ‘one detached followed by three slurred’.
we can, therefore, surmise that either a seemingly illogical distinction was intended or, as we have seen before, the more likely possibility that the random slur marking serves only as a confirmation of an expected articulation on such figures. Likewise, identical figures used in a descending sequence several bars later (fig. 9.59b), are slurred only on the last repetition. Surely the implication is of a consistent slurred execution from the beginning of the sequence. Such an assumption is confirmed when the passage returns at the end of the movement (fig. 9.59c), where this time only the first bar is notated with slurs.

We find further confirmation of this intended ‘3+1’ (or ‘1+3’) articulation in the Stockholm manuscript which duplicates this concerto. As we have seen a number of times before, here the intended articulation has been notated with much more consistency than is found in the Brussels concerto. Where only isolated legato markings appear in figures 9.59a through 9.59c, we find the same passages in the Stockholm manuscript almost invariably marked with the expected 1+3 articulation, albeit with a rather unconventional wavy-line notation (fig. 9.59d-f). This notation, however, in the first passage (fig. 9.59d) appears to indicate a tie, thus altering the entire rhythmical outline. On the other hand, in the light of similar notations found in later passages (fig. 9.59e-f) in which the 3+1 slurred articulation is clear, these ‘ties’ are possibly no more than misplaced slurs, perhaps due to hasty copying, whose intention is no different from the later appearances.

The Stockholm manuscript also serves to clarify the intended execution of a further passage in the Brussels D major concerto. In bars 71 to 74 (fig. 9.59g) the same neighbour-note figures are articulated (inconsistently) with a longer slur that seems to encompass two crotchet beats. In contrast, the same passage in the Stockholm concerto is notated invariably on every grouping with the 1+3 slurred articulation that we would otherwise
expect (fig. 9.59h). Thus it is likely that the longer slurs in the Brussels manuscript are, as before, hasty imprecise markings intended to imply an already expected articulation.

The intended slurring of three neighbour-notes is also to be found in the Largo of this concerto, although here amongst a group of six semiquavers rather than the usual quadruple grouping (fig. 9.59i). This less frequent context might explain the much greater consistency with which the slur is marked throughout the ten figures, although some still remain fairly ambiguous as to which notes they encompass. The Stockholm manuscript, however, remains entirely unmarked, perhaps suggesting that the slurs found in the Brussels manuscript might have been added as performance markings after the Stockholm copy was made, possibly by Mahaut himself. The same articulation is also found in the third movement of the d minor concerto in violin I although, once again, notated inconsistently (fig. 9.59j).

In addition to these solo passages built on sequential neighbour-note figuration, we also find the same implied 1+3 articulation where the figure includes a three-note scale grouping. Whilst such figures in bars 40 to 42 (fig. 9.60a) remain detached, we find the slurred articulation notated only on the first three of a later passage (fig. 9.60b). Clearly the same interpretation can be assumed for the remaining four groupings: A more consistent notation of this intended articulation appears in the first movement of the Brussels A major concerto (fig. 9.60c). Here the same figures are found beneath the solo flute trills in the first violin accompaniment where the twenty figures are marked with the 1+3 slurred articulation, although, due to the often imprecise notation, a clear differentiation between \[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.05\textwidth]{image1}} \] and \[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.05\textwidth]{image2}} \] remains ambiguous on some figures. We might note the striking contrast between the consistently articulated violin part and the almost non-existent articulation
when like-figures appear in the solo. It is perhaps possible that the copyist might expect this pattern of articulation to be automatically understood to a greater extent by a soloist, and is, therefore, unnecessarily notated, than could be expected of a ritornello violinist. This would be particularly relevant if, as is likely the case in the Brussels collection, the manuscript is in Mahaut’s own hand and he himself intended as the soloist.

The same can be said of two extensive passages in the first movement of both the Brussels e minor and d minor concerti, where such figures frequently appear amongst disjunct passage-work but remain invariably unmarked with any articulation (fig.9.61a and 9.61b). We note, in the d minor excerpt in particular, that only the smaller ornamental and triplet figures have been notated with any legato indications, although we might propose that here these markings serve more to distinguish or highlight their rhythmic groupings (particularly in the case of triplets where their indicative figure ‘3’ is often missing) than to imply a detached execution for all those remaining figures left unmarked. On the contrary, in the light of the implied 1+3/3+1 articulations already seen, we might also assume a like intention for such unmarked figures in these passages.

In the latter movement, we also find amongst the passage-work a sequential series of decorative figures (fig.9.62) whose consistent slur markings encompass not only the three neighbour-notes, but also the downward leap in each group of four demi-semiquavers. This illustrates yet again Mahaut’s tendency to mark (or indeed imply) any figure, conjunct or disjunct and smaller than a semiquaver, as legato, thus highlighting their ornamental function.
Whilst no markings are to be found, our understanding of an expected *legato* execution of three neighbour-notes must also be read into the frequent semiquaver passage-work of the triple-metered finales. Whilst it is common to find any smaller ornamental or triplet figures slurred in these movements, the remaining passage-work remains invariably unmarked. In the light of their lively dance character and detached nature of much of their thematic material, the passage-work was perhaps intended to remain detached and sharply articulated. It is also, however, equally possible that a soloist presented with a passage such as figure 9.63 (one of many such examples), would render the groups of three-neighbour-note figures (\(\text{\textcopyright} \)) *legato*, distinguishing them from the descending stepwise figures and effectively highlighting the different figurative shapes in the passage-work.

In addition to the strongly implied 1+3 slurred articulations in the solo passage-work, a second figurative pattern frequently appears in which every second note is repeated. In its conjunct form (fig.9.64a) we note the consistent slurred pairs in the solo, but omitted entirely in the first violin, doubling at a third below. Once again, we might reasonably view the apparent ties in the initial figure (bar 72) as misplaced slurs in the light of the contrasting but consistent markings on identical figures in the remainder of the passage. We might also logically assume the same intended execution of the unmarked violin part and conclude that such an omission would imply an assumed understanding of the required paired slurring.

Similarly, in the third movement of this concerto (fig.9.64b), whilst the notation is not consistent, nor continues to the end of each ascending and descending line, the intention is clear.
The same implied slurring can be seen in the disjunct form of this figure. The legato pairs of those appearing in the solo passage-work of the opening movement of the Brussels d minor concerto (fig. 9.64c) are consistently notated with the exception of bar 26, which we can assume. The same implication for those figures appearing in the third movement of the Brussels A major concerto is, however, less clear (fig. 9.64d). Used here in imitation between flute and violin 1, the ascending disjunct figure remains unarticulated throughout the passage, with the exception of the first such figure in the violin. Here the single ambiguous slur appears to encompass two pairs of repeated notes which clearly cannot be literally intended. It is only in the light of the similar figures we have already seen that the meaning of this slur becomes clear. Surely its purpose is to imply the legato execution of each ascending leap and once again the notation suffers from haste and the assumed understanding of the performer.

In the majority of other disjunct figures which appear in the solo passage-work, we see much greater consistency and care in the notation of an intended legato, leaving it less open to misinterpretation, particularly where it is essential to the character of the figure. The simplest of these, the repetitive octave leap, appears in the opening movements of both the Brussels d minor and e minor concerti. Although, in the former (fig. 9.65a), the slur is missing in the first leap on both repetitions, the clear notation on the remaining four makes the legato intention unmistakable. The same figures appearing in the e minor concerto (fig. 9.65b) are likewise notated almost consistently with the same legato execution. Here, however, the diminution of the figure that follows in both phrases (bars 83-84 and 90-91) is at first left entirely unmarked and apparently detached. In the light of the legato execution of those preceding them, a sustained, smooth articulation would be almost automatic and expected, for which we find confirmation in the repeat of the phrase. In addition, we might
expect the upper note to be clipped slightly, reflecting the proportions of the original figure. Thus, although the bars 83 and 84 remain unmarked, it is unlikely that a strongly detached, short and sharp articulation was intended.

In addition to the octave leaps, any other disjunct figures with an intended legato execution have been clearly and consistently indicated as such, lest they should be detached in the light of their disjunct nature. Thus such figures appearing in the finale of the Brussels d minor concerto (fig.9.65c) are invariably slurred on every repetition. These are also a reflection of similar figures found in the second movement whose essential legato quality we have discussed with regard to their motivic importance. Likewise, a sequence of disjunct quavers in the Largo of the Brussels D major concerto (fig.9.65d) is consistently slurred within a movement whose conjunct figures suffer greatly from variable articulation markings.

We do, however, find figures in which, whilst the legato is notated precisely on its first appearance, it remains unmarked on subsequent appearances. Thus we find, in the Adagio to the Brussels A major concerto, the descending lombardic leap (fig.9.65e) slurred in bar 7 but not on its rhythmically identical counterpart in bar 21, for which we must assume the same intention. Here the legato execution effectively softens the lombardic rhythm, maintaining the 'flattering' expression of the movement. It does not necessarily, however, suggest Mahaut's preference for such an execution on all his lombardic figures (although this has been shown to be the case with regard to lombardic stepwise slides). Indeed, there are many lombardic disjunct figures which remain unmarked, apparently detached, with no indication that they should be performed otherwise (fig.9.65f).
More telling is the character or 'context' in which such figures appear and which they must reflect. Two opposing qualities are created by the legato and detached execution, particularly when the lombardic figures are disjunct, in that they contrast a gentle, almost lilting, character with a bold and sharply articulated one. Within the same Adagio above, for example, we find a descending sequence of smaller lombards (fig.9.65g) left unmarked. Whilst a sharp detached interpretation may indeed have been intended, it is probably more likely that they would have been performed in a legato manner due to the prominent expression of 'flattery'. Thus no formalised articulation pattern can be assumed for such figures but is, instead, implied by the prevailing passion in the music.

Just as we noted a large amount of the solo figuration in the Brussels collection was left unarticulated, the same can be said of many of the other concerti. Likewise, however, we note again the strong implication of an expected 3+1 or 1+3 legato articulation with regard to figures involving a three neighbour-note or stepwise grouping. The 'expected' nature of this articulation is demonstrated once more by seemingly isolated and random markings often appearing on subsequent figures rather than the initial ones, which would otherwise be used to 'set the pattern'.

For example, in the first movement of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto, whilst numerous like-figures appear in earlier solo episodes, we do not find a notated 1+3 articulation until the passage of figuration beginning in bar 50 (fig.9.66a). Here the articulation is indicated in the initial written out figures before being abbreviated for the rest of the passage, clearly implying the continued use of this articulation. In the two bars immediately preceding this passage, however, almost identical figures are left unmarked.
Such figures are unlikely to have been intended to remain detached (fig.9.66b) but, rather, executed in the same way as is indicated in the following passage.

Also remaining unmarked is a later, almost identical but unabbreviated, solo passage (fig.9.66c). The striking similarity to the earlier figuration makes the intended 1+3 articulation here undeniable. In the light of these indications, a strong argument can be made for a like execution of similar figures in earlier passage-work, such as bars 27 to 32 (fig.9.66d), strengthening our suspicion of an ‘expected’ articulation for these figures. Such an expectation is also likely to apply to the 1+3 stepwise grouping appearing frequently, but unmarked throughout the movement (fig.9.66e and 9.66f). Whilst these 1+3 stepwise groupings remain consistently unarticulated, we do find an ambiguous slur over similar figures that might be read as a 3+1 legato articulation. In the two passages of figure 9.66g (taken from the manuscript), it is unclear whether the slur on each figure is intended to encompass three or four notes. The imprecise notation would in fact suggest an assumed understanding of the required execution, pointing to the probability that a ‘usual’ articulation was intended, which, in the case of these standardised figures, would imply a 3+1 legato articulation rather than extending the slur to include the leap.

Similarly, the equivalent bars 140 and 144 (fig.9.66h), are consistently notated with a 3+1 legato articulation, with the exception of violin I in both bars. The latter’s unison doubling, however, of the flute part would demand an equal execution. Once again, in an earlier appearance, these same figures in the solo flute alone (fig.9.66i) are not articulated, although we can probably assume the same intention. The distinct contrast that we saw in the Brussels collection, between a more consistently notated articulation in the ritornello instruments and the often unmarked articulation of the solo part, is not so apparent in the
remaining concerti. We therefore see inconsistencies in both the flute and string parts with more equal frequency, such as the missing notation in the first violin above (fig. 9.66h). This is perhaps significant in the light of our knowledge that these concerti are not copied in Mahaut’s hand, thus making him unlikely to be the intended soloist.

In the third movement of this Karlsruhe concerto we yet again, do not see any indication of the intended articulation of such figures until their subsequent appearance in the second solo episode (fig. 9.67a). Here the expected 1+3 legato articulation is confirmed, although the notation is missing in bars 108 to 110 concluding the first sequence. This can only be seen as an accidental omission. Thus similar figures appearing earlier in the first solo episode (fig. 9.67b) and later in the third (fig. 9.67c), although remaining unmarked, are likely to have the same intended articulation.

Once again, we note that all figures involving a three-note stepwise grouping (fig. 9.67d) are left unmarked. Whilst this may well imply that they were intended to remain detached as written, it is highly probable in the light of our previous discussion that the expected execution of these standardised figures was unnecessary to notate.

The third movement of the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto is dominated in its passage-work by disjunct, mostly arpeggio-like, semiquaver figuration. The detached articulation of almost all figuration except the triplets and ornaments effectively creates a lively and gay expression. Whilst this apparent execution includes the occasional descending scale (which may or may not be intended), we do find a passage of neighbour-note figures that have been consistently slurred (fig. 9.68a). Almost identical, albeit melodically reversed, figures appear in the first movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig. 9.68b). Here they are without any
notated articulation, although the striking similarity with the Karlsruhe figuration would suggest, likewise, an identical execution.

This is also likely to apply to similar figures appearing later in the Karlsruhe E-flat concerto that remain unmarked (fig.9.68c). Here the probable intended legato execution of the three-stepwise or neighbour-note grouping is also implied by the presence of a trill on the middle note, in that both its preceding note (functioning as the upper auxiliary) and its following note (functioning as the 'suffix') would automatically be slurred to the trill, thus creating a three-note legato.

Whilst we pointed out above, in the first movement of the Regensburg concerto (fig.9.68b), the probable omission of an intended articulation, we find later in the movement an almost consistent confirmation of an intended 3+1 articulation of neighbour-note groupings (fig.9.68d). Those slurs missing, predominantly in the second violin, can surely be seen simply as errors. Once again, we note that this confirmation appears in the ritornello string parts as an accompaniment to the solo, rather than in the solo itself. Thus when similar figures occur unmarked in a later passage of solo figuration (fig.9.68e), we might assume, on behalf of the soloist, an expected understanding of the same articulation.

The third movement of this concerto (Allegro ma non Presto), displaying the expected lively, light-hearted character and generally detached articulation of a finale, also contains an abundance of these 3+1 and 1+3 groupings in its solo passage-work (fig.9.68f-g). They are, however, without exception, left unmarked. Many figurations strikingly resemble those in both the first movement and in other concerti of Mahaut's, in which we have seen a strong implication of the 1+3 or 3+1 legato articulation. Thus we might safely assume an
identical intention in these solo passages. Likewise, in the opening movement of the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, like-figures written in twice the value but in cut-time (fig.9.68h) might also be assumed to be executed in the same way.

Whilst the solo episodes in the first movement of the Karlsruhe G major concerto are dominated, not by passages of quadruple semiquavers, but by triplets and sextuplets, we find an indication of a related 1+3 legato articulation as an upbeat figure in which the first semiquaver is replaced by a rest. We note again that only the first occurrence has been articulated (fig.9.69a), whilst subsequent appearances, such as figure 9.69b, have been left unmarked though the intention is clear. Also, as a related pattern, we might mention the same implied articulation with regard to a triple grouping rather than a quadruple one. I refer to a 1+2 (or 2+1) articulation in which again, the stepwise notes are slurred, leaving the leap distinctly detached. Such a pattern can be seen in figure 9.69c, in which the like-interpretation of the last figure is without doubt.

Thus, as we saw in the Brussels collection, the articulation pattern of 1+3 or vice-versa is strongly implied, although not always notated, wherever these groupings occur in the figuration. Having noted the often random and inconsistent markings that do occur, we can only conclude that this articulation was not only expected, but of which an understanding was assumed by the copyist, particularly with respect to the soloist. This assumed understanding is also apparent with regard to solo figurations of smaller values. As seen before, these figures are usually characterised by a conjunct, ornamental nature, and as such demand a legato interpretation. Thus the demi-semiquaver figures appearing in a descending sequence of solo figuration (fig.9.70a) in the Karlsruhe G major concerto are no more than written out ‘turned’ ornaments. They remain, however, unarticulated until the final figure
which is slurred, thus clarifying their essential *legato* quality. Once again, this random, isolated notation confirms an expected articulation that the soloist is assumed to have understood. Likewise, the written out 'turned' figures appearing in the last solo episode (fig.9.70b) should be viewed in the same light despite their total omission of a *legato* notation. In fact, in view of the incredible speed of such figures, a detached articulation would probably be beyond the reach of all but a master virtuoso.

In the light of identical figures seen in the Brussels collection, we might also assume an expected articulation pattern for those figures which naturally invite a two-by-two slurring in pairs. I refer specifically to figures 9.70c and 9.70d, whose probable articulation is notated in brackets.

Unlike the Brussels collection, however, we find in the remaining concerti a greater occurrence of *legato* markings in the solo passage-work on figures other than those groupings already discussed. These remain predominantly stepwise, although some disjunct figures occur and are discussed later. They are not necessarily more *legato* in nature than the Brussels concerti, but point more significantly to a difference in copyist, in which the former chose to notate more of the articulation than the latter who, in turn, had left much to the understanding of the musicians.

Thus, in addition to the *legato* notation of those figures already discussed, we can see, in the final episode of the opening movement of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto, the consistent slurring of rising scale figures (fig.9.71a), with the exception of the last crotchet beat (bar 145) which is clearly intended to be slurred. Previously, however, a similar but descending scale sequence occurs twice in the solo figuration (fig.9.71b) but remains
detached. Are we to conclude, based on its notation in a later episode, that the legato interpretation was in fact intended but not marked here? (i.e. that it was an expected articulation, unnecessary to notate?). Likewise, in the third movement of the Regensburg concerto, featuring an abundance of small ascending and descending detached scale figures, we find a single ascending figure slurred in a sequence that is otherwise unmarked (fig.9.71c). Might this suggest that the intended legato (surely applying likewise to the ascending scale in bar 119) is somewhat assumed and whose notation is not necessary for its performance. If so, then are we to consider the many other scale figures in the same light? We have already noted the predominantly detached notation of the figuration throughout the movement, but previously concluded that this is not necessarily intended, principally due to the number of neighbour-note groupings that clearly suggest otherwise.

Unlike the stylised figurative 1+3 groupings, however, the articulation of ascending and descending scale figures is less likely to conform to a constant or expected pattern. Whilst a legato execution may work in one context, a show of virtuosic solo tonguing may work to better advantage in another, such as in a sprightly finale, highlighting the prevailing character of the passage. Thus, in movements such as those under discussion and others containing unmarked scale figures, we cannot assume a single ‘expected’ articulation, but must rather look to the context for the implied execution, a concept that was probably understood by every musician of the time.

This variable articulation is illustrated in the opening movement of the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, where the matter is also confused by the inconsistency of the notation. Aside from the already discussed motivic descending legato scale (fig.9.11a) of the ritornello, the first scale figure appears in the solo, bar 61 (fig.9.72a). Here the ascending
stepwise portion (i.e. beginning on the second quaver) is slurred, but not the two subsequent appearances (fig. 9.72b) in which the figure is identical and clearly demands the same execution. Later in the movement we find the descending form, although concluding rather than beginning with a leap (fig. 9.72c); like its predecessor, it is marked *legato*, with the exception of two figures in a later, almost identical passage. Thus the *legato* intention of both these descending scales is clearly established. However, at the beginning of this solo episode, seven bars prior to the first appearance of the descending form, we find two identical, apparently detached descending scales in the solo flute (fig. 9.72d). Although they differ in their figuration from those preceding and those that follow, the two-bar phrase as a whole, beginning with the leaping crotchets, can be read as the same phrase found in the following passage, split between the flute and the violins, in which the descending scale is slurred (fig. 9.72c). Whilst we have concluded in many places that the conflicting omission of a slur is often to be seen as an error, here the difference in context and texture may point to a probable detached intention in figure 9.72d. Whilst a *legato* execution might work equally well, a detached articulation, as written, may have been intended to heighten the contrast between the sparser texture of the flute and bass and the denser *legato* passage that follows, produced by notated slurs and *portato* bowing.

We likewise find variable articulation of stepwise figures in the first movement of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto. Here the opening ritornello is concluded by an octave unison string passage, combining an oscillating neighbour-note figure and a descending scale (fig. 9.73a). Like all Mahaut’s unison string passages (frequently occurring at the end of a ritornello), it remains unarticulated, and, in view of their bold character, we can assume that a short detached bow-stroke was intended. The passage returns at the end of the first
solo episode, first introduced in the flute, before being taken up by the strings in the following tutti (fig.9.73b). Clearly, the same detached articulation is required.

Later, however, as we have already seen, ascending and descending scale figures appear out of this context (fig.9.71a-b), implying a variable articulation in which a legato execution is understood in the ascending passage of figure 9.71a. In addition, the oscillating neighbour-note figure later appears separately in the solo passage-work (fig.9.73c). In reflection of its new context and character they are now notated consistently with a legato, although this is missing in the first violin doubling the flute a third below. This change in articulation is either an error made in copying the solo part or, more probably, a casual omission in the string part, the copyist having assumed that its notation in the flute was enough to convey the legato intention.

The slurred execution of these figures can also be seen in the third movement of the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto, where they form a continuation of the neighbour-note 1+3 figures that precede them (fig.9.73d), making their legato execution essential. Despite our acknowledgement of a variable articulation for such figures, it is likely that a legato execution was intended when they formed part of the solo passage-work in the light of their decorative nature, but they may be treated differently as a motivic or ritornello figure.

One particular figure, appearing several times in these concerti whose articulation remains apparently invariable, is that of a rising chromatic solo line. In these passages, usually set in a sparse two-part texture, the intended legato is marked with almost complete consistency, as we see in figure 9.74a, appearing at the end of the last solo episode. The legato execution of the descending answering line in the violins, marked only in violin I, is surely
intended also in the second violin. Likewise, almost identical figures appear in the Regensburg (fig.9.74b) and the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerti (fig.9.74c). Whilst they both show a clear legato intention, the E-flat major example differs in its paired slurring and additional tenuto marks, strongly implying a tongued-legateo. As we have seen before, however, the tongued-legato is a particular feature of this concerto, marked (inconsistently) where a plain legato might normally have been found. Thus the common element evident in all these examples is Mahaut’s clear legato conception of a chromatic line.

Such an intention is not so apparent in the Karlsruhe collection, however, with regard to the interpretation of single stepwise lombardic figures. Appearing solely in the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto is a contradiction in both articulation and rhythm (fig.9.75a). Whilst the latter has been previously mentioned with regard to the possible rhythmical alteration of the second bar, making it consistent with that preceding and following it, it is highly probable that both elements were used to contrast the bold and sharply detached nature of the bars before and after. The dots which appear above the notes in bar 49 are, as we have already discussed, in fact short dashes suggesting sustained note lengths, an evenness in the rhythm and soft smooth tonguing, all conflicting strongly with the sharply detached and jerky rhythm of a possible lombardic interpretation. As such, the bar would create something like an echo effect, sandwiched between the two ‘lombardic’ bars preceding and following it. In these, there is no indication that they should be executed with anything other than a sharply detached articulation which, in the light of the potential contrast with bar 49, is probably intended.

Likewise, the ascending, single lombardic figures appearing at the end of this movement (fig.9.75b) also remain apparently detached. Whilst we have previously concluded the
essential *legato* quality of all Mahaut’s stepwise lombardic ‘slides’, we cannot necessarily assume the same intention for these single lombardic figures and must look again to the context in which, as here, a *legato* execution is probably preferable.

There are, however, strong indications and implications of a *legato* intention with regard to the *disjunct* lombardic figures that appear in these concerti. Thus, again in the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto (fig. 9.76a), we see the slurred intention of the descending lombardic figures. Whilst the *legato* is missing on the identical figures in the following bar, it is likely that they were viewed here as an unnecessary notation in which the intention was clear. In the third movement (fig. 9.76b) the *legato* is likewise clearly marked over the abbreviated lombardic figuration on all but the last bar. In the Regensburg concerto (fig. 9.76c), however, the notation is less consistent, with the *legato* not appearing until the third and fourth figures in the sequence and not at all in the following, almost identical, repetition. It does, however, reappear several bars later (bar 32), confirming the intended execution. Once again, the inconsistent notation, particularly its omission on the first lombardic figures, begins strongly to suggest an ‘expected’ articulation.

Thus where, in the Brussels collection, we saw some disjunct lombardic figures slurred but many more apparently detached without any indication otherwise, many in the other concerti are consistently slurred or, at least, with a consistent *legato* implication. As has been suggested previously, it is possible that the copyist of these concerti (known not to be Mahaut himself) has simply notated much more of the expected articulation than the Brussels copyist, who assumed an understanding of such articulation. In this light, perhaps a consistent *legato* execution of disjunct lombardic figures was likewise intended in the Brussels concerti. On the whole, we note, at least, the greater care with which the
articulation of disjunct figures are notated, in striking contrast to the rather haphazard, almost careless markings found in the predominantly stepwise 'formalised' figures, for which clearly there had been an expected pattern of articulation.

In addition to the legato notations of disjunct lombardic figures, we also see, in the Regensburg concerto, other disjunct figures in the solo passage-work that are almost consistently slurred two-by-two. For example, in figure 9.77a, the sequential nature of the passage demands that the figures in the third and fourth bar also be slurred in a like manner. In bar 63 (fig.9.77b) the same two-by-two slurring articulates a rising sequence of descending thirds. Thus the implied execution of such figures is established, making the notation unnecessary in bar 87 and 100 (fig.9.77c) where the intention is clear.

Finally in this section, we turn to look at the patterns of articulation evident in the solo passage-work of the middle slow movements of this collection. Whilst much of this passage-work is made up of the motivic legato triplet and ornamental figuration that we have already discussed at length, we also find that most of the remaining ordinary and rhythmically uncomplicated figuration is left unmarked. Such passages, however, contain similar standard figures, and hence implied patterns of articulation, that occurred in the outer movements. Thus, whilst many of these figures remain unmarked, it is likely that such implied patterns of articulation are, likewise, applicable here although in proportionally smaller values and in a slower tempo.

Thus in the Regensburg concerto (fig.9.78a) short, hastily written legato markings are surely intended to encompass each group of eight predominantly stepwise demi-semiquavers, in the light of their ornamental nature. Whilst the slurred notation of ascending
scale figures seen later in the same movement (fig.9.78b) is hardly consistent, the essential
legato quality of these figures is clearly implied in the solo flute and can likewise be applied
throughout the orchestra. In the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, we find passages of
apparently detached figuration (fig.9.78c) that clearly invites the expected 1+3 legato
articulation on the descending groups and a slurred execution of the descending lombardic
slide figures.

In the opening of the third solo episode we find, in the flute, a disjunct group of four
semiquavers that, whilst they appear detached, suggest a different execution when played
against the slurred pairs of octave leaps in the accompanying viola (fig.9.79a).

We noted, in the opening Allegro of the Regensburg concerto, the strong implication of the
same two-by-two articulation with regard to ascending sequential passages of descending
thirds (fig.9.77). The same figurative pattern appears in the Adagio (fig.9.79b), although the
notation (occurring only on one pair in the violin) is convincing only in the light of the like
figures found in the first movement. The random nature of the legato marking implies,
again, an assumed understanding. Such an assumption, with regard to similar but
unarticulated figures, is also evident in the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto (fig.9.79c). Here
the solo passage-work as a whole remains generally unmarked, with the exception of some
inconsistent legato sextuplet figures, pointing likewise to an assumed legato understanding
of its many demi-semiquaver scale and slide figures. In this light we might, later in the
movement, consider the paired slurring of some disjunct figuration involving a rising
sequence of descending leaps (fig.9.79d). This possible execution, although not essential,
would reflect the pattern of articulation already seen in the faster movements for similar
disjunct figures.
Rather than suggesting an expected articulation, some isolated *legato* patterns intended to articulate disjunct figures (such as longer slurs over more than one leap), can leave the intended interpretation of similar but not identical, figures rather ambiguous. For example, in the *Adagio* of the second Karlsruhe D major concerto (fig. 9.79e), we are left wondering: is the slur in bar 28, covering two disjunct figures, intended to imply a like interpretation of the leaping quavers in the following bars, although they remain unmarked? Indeed, we have seen before the tendency to indicate an intended articulation only on the first appearance. What is at least apparent from this single slur is the required *general legato* character, which can be achieved equally by sustained note-lengths and soft tonguing. The choice can only be left to the judgement of the soloist.

In the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, we note the notated *legato* execution of a descending stepwise dotted figure in the solo flute (fig. 9.80a). This is in line with earlier conjunct dotted figures appearing in the tutti (discussed with regard to thematic articulations) which were, likewise, slurred in four or two (fig. 9.19), clearly conveying a softer dotted intention and certainly preventing a misinterpreted, over-dotted interpretation. The intended articulation of other dotted solo figuration in these concerti, both stepwise and disjunct, is however less clear where no formalised pattern can be assumed or expected, implying again, a variable execution.

In addition, the intention can be confused by isolated, inconsistent markings. As we have seen in our previous discussion, the *Adagio* of the Regensburg concerto is dominated motivically by a strong dotted rhythm with the convincing potential for an over-dotted execution, and thus a sharply detached articulation (fig. 9.20b). This dotted figuration, not appearing in the solo passage-work until near the end of the final episode, if viewed in the
same light, might, therefore, be executed with the same ‘majestic’, strongly articulated quality (fig.9.80b). This interpretation, however, is somewhat confused by two factors. The first, as we have already discovered, is the isolated single legato markings appearing in two earlier tutti (fig.9.20c and 9.20d) and the more consistent markings appearing in the first violin part of the final tutti (fig.9.20e). Together, they might imply an expected paired legato execution of the dotted figures. This of course conflicts with an over-dotted interpretation suggesting on the contrary, a softening of the rhythm, perhaps as far as to produce the ‘lilting’ quality of a triplet figure. This soft lilting character is, in fact, implied by the second factor in the conflicting articulation: the continuous repeated-note sextuplet accompaniment in the violins. Not only does the character of this accompaniment, with its implied slurred-staccato bowing, suggest a gentler quality, but its rhythmical sextuplet construction requires a softer triplet rhythm in the solo flute for synchronisation. Whether this is articulated with the paired legatos already suggested on these figures, or simply a slight detachment and gentle tonguing, the effect contrasts strongly with the sharp tonguing of a majestic interpretation.

Finally, we note the strong implication of a slurred-staccato articulation of repeated notes in the solo passage-work which is particularly evident in the slow movements. In the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, we have already seen, in our discussion of motivic articulations (fig.9.12a-d), such implications in both the flute and string parts. We also noted the apparent assumed understanding of this interpretation evident by the inconsistent and, most often, incomplete notation of the articulation. Such incomplete notation is also evident in the solo figuration. In bars 16 and 17 (fig.9.81a), for example, the prominent rhythmical repeated-note figures demand some degree of detachment and the conflicting long legato marking that encompasses these figures can be understood in the light of the slurred-
staccato implications already seen in the ritornello passages. Likewise, in the Grave of the Karlsruhe E-flat major concerto (and indeed, in the opening Moderato), we have previously established the same intended execution of repeated notes (fig. 9.16i), although here the notation is much more complete.

In the Regensburg concerto we have noted this articulation as a prominent feature of the string parts in both the ritornello and the accompaniment to the solo (fig. 9.17). This will itself receive greater discussion in the following section. Whilst it remains, however, incompletely notated, the same intended articulation is also evident in the solo where clearly an element of understanding is assumed. The short, ambiguous and inconsistent slurs seen in bars 16 and 17 over sextuplet groupings (fig. 9.81b) immediately imply a smooth but necessarily detached articulation in the light of the repeated notes present. Even today, the tongued-legato intention would be immediately understood by any wind player, and hence quite unnecessary to notate. This understanding, however, would not be so immediate today with regard to the repeated semiquavers in bar 33 (fig. 9.81c) which remain entirely unmarked. Here their legato element does not become clear until put against the slurred-staccato bowing of the violins, notated only in violin II. Once again, these isolated markings suggest the articulation to be both expected and understood in Mahaut’s own time.

In his short but concise Méthode, Mahaut has, not surprisingly, devoted only a small amount of space to the subject of articulation. Bearing in mind the fairly advanced nature of its content, this is perhaps a reflection of the substantial bearing that the performer’s judgement is expected to have on this aspect, as we have seen frequently in the concerti. Mahaut does, however, provide a comprehensive musical example, demonstrating the many
possible patterns of articulation appropriate at his time, including a number of unusual and technically difficult possibilities (fig. 9.82).

We have already noted in the concerti the frequent slurred pairs with which this example opens, perhaps the most common articulation of the mid-eighteenth century, and indeed, its application to the much larger intervals that appear in lines two and three. We have also seen the many ‘3+1’ articulations (line 6 and 7), along with its many variants, and the ‘2+1’ execution of triplet figures in which the second note is repeated (line 7 to 9). In both these patterns the detached notes are consistently notated with a vertical dash or wedge (▼), for which Mahaut states they should not only be tongued separately, but each tongue stroke must be crisp and precise. Those in the concerti, however, remain invariably unmarked, and hence this Exemple serves to confirm their expected short and sharp articulation. Indeed, we do not find any such markings throughout Mahaut’s surviving manuscripts, suggesting perhaps that this was a notation employed by Mahaut solely for instructional purposes in his Méthode. In addition, Mahaut clearly equates their meaning with that of the dot, defining them together within the same sentence:

>Notes marked with small dashes or dots should not only be tongued separately, but each tongue stroke must be crisp and precise.\(^{15}\)

Despite this implied equality, however, between the two notations, it is interesting to observe that Mahaut chose to use the vertical dash in notating the detached notes of the Allegro assai portion of the example, but switched to dots to mark the triplet quavers in the slower Gratiioso section. In the latter, one would normally have expected such a detached passage to be executed with a smooth, more sustained articulation in the manner of a

\(^{15}\) Mahaut, A. Méthode, p.21.
slurred-staccato, rather than a short and crisp one implied by the dots. Indeed, in the concerti, we likewise do not find dots marking the detached notes of articulation patterns in Allegro passages either. They do, however, frequently articulate repeated-note or stepwise figures, either in combination with a slur or on their own, but, as we have previously concluded, strongly implying this combined articulation. Whilst the precise nature of these notations already discussed remain somewhat ambiguous, it is possible that Mahaut’s concept of a staccato notation in a slower piece of gentler character is closer to a slurred-staccato articulation than to the unvarying short and sharp one that we know today. Whether this distinction between the vertical dashes in the Allegro assai and the dots in the Gratioso above, is intended by Mahaut remains unclear.

Whilst many of the articulations in Mahaut’s Exemple are to be found in the solo passage-work of the concerti themselves, there are a number which do not. This is not to negate that they may be applicable, particularly to the many long unmarked passages of solo figuration, but merely demonstrates the breadth of possibilities open to the performer, all of which he was expected to master. Two articulations in particular invite some comment. The first is the slurring of pairs across the beat, from a weak count to a strong count (illustrated in lines 4 and 14 of fig.9.82). In the first half of the eighteenth century notes were more commonly slurred from a strong to a weak count, and this variation, a Vivaldi characteristic, was one of many imitated by Mahaut. The second was a new articulation, consisting of a two slurred plus two tongued pattern (see fig.9.82, line 11 and 12), that was to become a favourite articulation of the classical period. Again, this highlights the galant and early classical nature of Mahaut’s work.
Finally, Mahaut's comments with regard to articulation demonstrate a stylistic difference that existed between the German *galant* style of flute playing in Quantz's background and the early-classical *mixed* style of the Netherlands, strongly influenced by French flute playing of the mid-eighteenth century. This has been briefly mentioned previously with regard to Mahaut's *Méthode* and also subsequently in our discussion of *inégalité*, but is equally significant here with regard to articulation. In 1707, Hotteterre described the use of tonguing syllables *tu* and *ru* to articulate pairs of notes that were consecutive. This was naturally associated with the French practice of *notes inégales*. Over thirty years later Corrette claims that *tu* and *ru* were no longer widely used, and indeed it was around this time that French flautists abandoned the use of tonguing syllables. However, they were adopted and practised widely in Germany, and Quantz presents a very comprehensive chapter on articulation with a variety of tonguing syllables, both single and double. Mahaut, however, opens his much shorter discussion of tonguing by explaining that whilst *tu* and *ru* were "sufficient for the music of earlier times," with "modern music the player should attempt to develop the most precise articulation possible according to his natural ability and not worry too much about various syllables". 16 He does, however, mention the syllables *di-del* for use with double tonguing, which is very close to *did'll* used by Quantz.

Mahaut's String Articulation Of Repeated-Note Accompaniment Figures

We have seen in the previous discussions regarding articulation, numerous examples of repeated-note figures, both in the solo flute and in the string accompaniment. Our discussion would not be complete if we were not to consider the confusing and often somewhat conflicting articulations (particularly with respect to the accompanying string parts) notated on such figures. It will be remembered that many of these notations are that of the slurred-staccato, using dots beneath a slur. We have already discussed the interpretation of such an articulation with respect to the solo flute (referred to as tongued-legato or 'pearl-stroke'), itself reflecting the string interpretation of slurred-staccato, performed in a single bow stroke.

Studies of eighteenth-century string bowing have revealed that dots were generally used beneath a slur in a slow tempo and is often indicative of a portato bowing, to be discussed later. Strokes, on the other hand (\(\text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}\)), were generally used instead of dots in a faster tempo and implied a more 'lifted' style in which the bow was lifted from the string between notes.\(^\text{17}\) This reflected the general difference in eighteenth-century interpretation between dots and strokes and is clearly explained by Quantz:

\begin{quote}
But if strokes are used instead of dots ... the notes must be attacked sharply, in a single stroke of the bow. For just as a distinction is made between strokes and dots without slurs above them, that is, the notes with strokes must be played with completely detached strokes, and those with dots simply with short strokes and in a
\end{quote}

sustained manner, so a similar distinction is required when there are slurs above the notes. Strokes, however, appear more often in the Allegro than in the Adagio.\textsuperscript{18}

When the notes beneath the slurred-staccato remain the same (i.e. repeated), the articulation might be known as slurred-tremolo.\textsuperscript{19}

The \textit{balancement}, which the Italians call \textit{tremolo}, produces the tremulous effect of the organ; it is several notes of the same value, on the same degree, tied together, which one takes in a single bow stroke without leaving the string.\textsuperscript{20} [see fig. 9.83]

Here dots, or sometimes strokes, beneath the slur would commonly indicate a \textit{staccato} interpretation, while a slur alone would imply a \textit{legato} performance in which the bow was not lifted from the string, again resembling a \textit{portato} bowing with only a slight separation between the notes.\textsuperscript{21}

Thus the implied performance of \textit{staccato} dots alone generally remained distinct from that of the slurred-staccato (or slurred-tremolo), notated with both dots and slurs. We noted, however, in our earlier discussion, that the Adagio of the first Karlsruhe D major concerto contains many repeated-note figures notated only with dots, later to be clarified as an intended slurred-tremolo (\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet) (see figure 9.12 and its related discussion). Thus we

\textsuperscript{18} Quantz, J.J. \textit{Versuch}, chap.XVII, sect.II, par.12, p.223.

\textsuperscript{19} Stowell points out that in the eighteenth century, the term \textit{tremolo} may also refer to trills, \textit{vibrato} and a "rapid oscillation of the bow." [Stowell, \textit{R. Violin Technique}, p.176, n.16].

\textsuperscript{20} Bailleux, A. \textit{Méthode raisonné pour apprendre à jouer du violon} (Paris, 1779; 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 1798), p.11.

\textsuperscript{21} See Boyden, \textit{The History of Violin Playing}, for a more detailed discussion of this bowing.
concluded that the *staccato* markings were, in fact, an intended slurred-*staccato* notation.\(^{22}\)

Interestingly, later in the movement, we find a passage of similar repeated-note figures, this time notated with only a *legato* (fig. 9.84a), although inconsistently, throughout the accompanying strings. In the light of our discussion above, we might conclude perhaps that a more 'lifted' style was intended in the first passage than in the second. We have, however, also noted, in other concerti of the Karlsruhe/Regensburg collections, the apparent equivalence in intention between an 'incomplete' *staccato* notation (i.e. without the slur) and a *legato* notation over repeated notes, both appearing to imply a slurred-*tremolo* with no apparent distinction between them with regard to the degree of separation (see fig. 9.41d-f and 9.55d-g and their related discussions). Likewise, in the third movement of the Brussels A major concerto, several repeated-note or *tremolo* passages in the accompanying strings use both *legato* notations and isolated *staccato* notations to indicate the combination (\(\cdots\)), with clearly no implied difference of interpretation (fig. 9.84b(i)-(iii)). This conclusion is also supported by musical observations regarding the tempo and character of the movement, both of which require a lighter or more 'lifted' style than the *legato* notations might otherwise imply.

That said, it is worth noting again that, in many of the manuscripts, the notation of the *staccato* 'dots' (either on their own or beneath a slur), frequently appear as short dashes, almost resembling *tenuto* markings. As such, they suggest a longer stroke with less

---

\(^{22}\) The careful examination of all Mahaut's concerto manuscripts reveals that a *staccato* notation is used only in an implied slurred-*staccato* context, whether or not it is accompanied by a slur and does not appear to ever imply a standard *staccato* meaning. Significantly, the use of 'strokes' is also not a feature of any of Mahaut's concerto manuscripts, either alone or beneath a slur, and, therefore, excludes the usual distinction in interpretation between dots and slurs. The dot, on the other hand, represents a more 'universal' notation, as we shall shortly see, rather than a specific length of bow-stroke, other than implying some degree of detachment.
separation between the notes and thus, point towards a *portato* interpretation rather than a more ‘lifted’ one (see the manuscript examples in fig.9.84c(i)-(v)). The *portato* bowing of the eighteenth century included not only repeated-note figures but also figures of varying pitches and was essentially a slurred-*staccato* articulation in which there is little interruption or separation between the notes. As a *tremolo* (or repeated-note) bowing, it was commonly used in an accompanying role and generally indicated by dots or lines beneath the slur. 23

Whilst few writers discuss the *portato*, it is described by Galeazzi towards the end of the century:

159. *Note portate*, so-called, are those which are neither separate nor slurred but almost dragged. They are all played in one stroke without lifting the bow from the string, but each note is given a slight articulation with the bow, which is not done in slurring. 24

Most importantly, however, the *portato* was largely limited to moderate or slower tempos for obvious practical reasons. Thus where suggestive notations such as those seen in figure 9.84c appear in faster movements, particularly in *finales*, one must nevertheless adjust the bowing to a lighter style with more separation between the notes. It is therefore apparent that, with regard to Mahaut’s manuscripts, the type of notation does not in itself indicate the particular ‘species’ of slurred-*tremolo* to be used, but is instead indicative of slurred-*tremolo* in general, perhaps with a tendency towards a *portato* interpretation in slower movements. Instead, the degree of separation is determined by the tempo and character of the music and is left to the judgement of the performers.


Interestingly, an additional type of notation appears in two of the concerto manuscripts, although originating from two different collections. In the third movement of the Brussels d minor concerto, we find, in the first bar of violin I, a series of ‘squiggles’ ( ~ ) beneath the slur instead of dots or dashes (fig.9.85a(i)-(ii)). Beneath it, in the other parts, however, and throughout the remainder of the passage in both violins and viola, ‘like’ figures are marked with the more usual dot/dash and slur combination, thus implying the equivalent execution of the first bar in violin I.

This notation is possibly a hangover from an earlier one consisting simply of a wavy line ( ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ) and can be found in the works of Walther, Purcell and Lully. Such a method was later still used by Leclair to indicate the slurred-tremolo. A much clearer example in Mahaut’s manuscripts is found in both the first and second movements of the Regensburg concerto (fig.9.85b and 9.85c). In both movements, however, it appears simultaneously with the newer type of notation found in another part, thus clarifying its equivalent intended interpretation. Such a notation cannot of course distinguish between a legato and staccato type of slurred-tremolo, and the two tempi in figure 9.85b and 9.85c would necessarily require a slightly different execution with regard to the separation between the notes.

As was briefly mentioned earlier and confirmed by Galeazzi, the slurred-tremolo appeared frequently in the accompaniment and it is in this role that we find the majority of Mahaut’s tremolo notations. In particular, it appears in those contexts in which the textural density is

---

25 See Boyden’s discussion in his The History of Violin Playing, pp.266-7.

considerably reduced (often with the omission of the basso continuo), and specifically over a reiterated pedal. Thus, in figure 9.86a, we see the slurred-tremolo intention of the quaver pedal in the viola. Likewise, in figure 9.86b, the articulation is found over the viola pedal beginning in bar seven, thus heightening the contrast of both texture and character with the preceding passage. Despite containing many repeated-note figures in the bass-line, this preceding passage is clearly intended to remain detached.

Whilst we have discussed the various notations of Mahaut’s slurred-tremolo and have seen a number of examples, a certain amount of ‘understanding’ is clearly required on the part of the musicians, in the many places in which such an articulation is not notated though clearly implied by the context. For example, in figure 9.86c, the slurred-tremolo intention is clear in the viola of bar 62 to 64 but is not notated in the identical passage four bars later. Similarly, in an earlier passage (fig.9.86d), whilst the repeated sextuplet semiquaver figures in the violins are notated with the slurred-tremolo, the viola pedal remains unmarked. In order to conform to the character of the passage it is likely that the pedal was also intended as a slurred-tremolo. Likewise, in the first Karlsruhe D major concerto, the slurred-tremolo is marked in a contrasting section of the ritornello (fig.9.86d(i)) but not in a similar passage later in the movement (fig.9.86e(ii)). Similar inconsistent notation, but implied slurred-tremolo, can be seen in the three examples of figure 9.86f.

All the examples seen in figure 9.86 would, of course, require not a portato type of slurred-tremolo, but a lighter, more ‘lifted’ style that might be called a staccato slurred-tremolo, in the light of the faster tempi. In contrast, passages such as those seen in figure 9.87, whilst
remaining unmarked, might reasonably be considered as an intended *legato slurred-tremolo*, taken in groups of two and four respectively.

Finally in our discussion here we will consider slurred-*staccato* figures that appear as groups of two or three repeated notes and begin off the beat. Such figures can be seen in figure 9.88a, consistently marked in the first appearance but not in the second. Equivalent figures appear in common time (C), in the second Karlsruhe D major concerto, but are likewise not articulated, although probably intended as slurred-*staccatos* (fig.9.88b).

In the same way, such figures as those seen in figure 9.88c are to be interpreted as slurred-*tremolo* although consisting of only two repeated notes. In the light of the *finale* tempo, the notation cannot be interpreted as a *legato slurred-tremolo*, but rather in a more 'lifted' style as if it were also notated with dots or strokes. Such a manner of playing these figures is described by L'Abbé le Fils, although he refers here, not only to pairs of repeated notes, but to slurred-*staccato* pairs in general:

When one finds two notes tied with the ordinary sign, and also separated by a little stroke; example: \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash{}}} \), the slur indicates that the two notes should be taken in the same bow and the little stroke that the bow should be lifted after the first note, which in this case should be played with a full tone; then the short note can be attacked with greater or less force according to the expression one wishes to give it.\(^27\)

Similar figures in figure 9.88d are also likely to have been intended to be performed in this way.

FINAL REMARKS

Throughout this study we have looked closely at Mahaut’s life and historical context, and have extensively examined his concerti with particular emphasis on aspects of interpretation and performance. In so doing, we have made certain remarks and have come to a number of conclusions with regard to the relevance and appropriate use of Quantz’s Versuch as an interpretative tool or reference for the performance of Mahaut’s music and, more specifically, of his concerti.

This issue is of particular significance to the ‘modern-day’ flautist, as much of what we learn in our education as musicians regarding late-baroque flute playing comes largely from Quantz’s writing. This applies not only to aspects of playing the flute, but also to many other issues of mid-eighteenth century performance style, and Quantz is often the first (and sadly, often the last) point of reference for many flautists today. It must be remembered, however, that Quantz’s writing reflected a style that existed in a particular place at a particular time, principally that of Dresden in the 1730s and 1740s. Such was the diversity of the national (and often regional) styles and the speed of stylistic change, that not all Quantz’s ideals were necessarily relevant to music written outside this time or place. Thus, whilst we have indeed concluded in many places throughout this study, the relevance of Quantz’s writing to many aspects of Mahaut’s concerti, it cannot, however, be taken as an all-encompassing set of rules and must be used with due thought and consideration.

We have no evidence that Mahaut was personally associated with Quantz. Previously, however, we established a strong likelihood that Mahaut did visit Dresden, probably in the
early 1740s, where he is likely to have composed two concerti and a set of six trio sonatas dedicated to Pierre Buffardin, the French-born flautist and teacher of Quantz who was active in the Dresden court from 1715 to 1750. Likewise, Mahaut was clearly familiar with Buffardin’s method to improve the intonation of the flute, crediting Buffardin with the innovation in his *Méthode*, despite Quantz’s own claim to it in his *Versuch*.

Although the latter was published seven years prior to Mahaut’s *Méthode*, it is interesting that Mahaut makes no mention of Quantz’s treatise except to credit him with the addition of the second key to the footjoint of the flute, referring to him only as “M. Buffardin’s student”.¹ It is unlikely, however, that Mahaut would not have been both familiar with and perhaps influenced by Quantz’s *Versuch*, as it is Holland that shows most evidence, outside Germany, of familiarity with Quantz’s writing, in the form of two local editions of this work.²

More significant, perhaps, than Mahaut’s possible acquaintance with either Quantz or his treatise, are the parallels that we have drawn between the essential background and influences of both Quantz’s *Versuch* and Mahaut’s musical style. It will be remembered that, whilst the *Versuch* was written in Berlin in 1752, it reflected not the changing style of the 1750s, but the musical style of the 1730s and 1740s, established in Dresden, later to be preserved under Frederick the Great in Berlin. Such a style represented a mixture of both French and Italian ideals due to the strong influence of both in the Dresden Hofkapelle. French musicians had been active there since the late-seventeenth century, regularly forming over half the ensemble and led by the French concertmaster Volumier until 1728. Quantz

---


² See chapter 2, regarding Mahaut’s *Méthode*. 
himself studied under the French flautist Buffardin and, along with other Dresden musicians, learnt the style first hand during visits to Paris.

With Volumier's successor, Georg Pisendel, the Italian style also became a significant influence. As a student of both Torelli and Vivaldi, and as perhaps the most well-known German violin virtuoso of his time, he was responsible for the spread and influence of the Venetian solo concerto in Germany. Quantz's knowledge of the Italian concerto was strengthened by his own visits to Italy. In his autobiography he describes the impression that this genre made on him in Pirna of 1714, and comments: "Henceforth, the magnificent ritornellos of Vivaldi served me as excellent models".³

Likewise, Mahaut's concerti are significantly influenced by the style and ritornello structure of the Venetian solo concerto. Vivaldi's concerti had been published in Amsterdam by Roger and Le Cène since 1711, where the Italian concerto grew in popularity through such publication and travelling virtuosi. As a developing centre of music publishing, Amsterdam welcomed numerous foreign musicians including the Italian violin virtuoso Locatelli, who settled there after 1729 and whose influence can be seen in Mahaut's writing.⁴

In addition to such Italian influences to which Mahaut was exposed, we also noted the 'mixed' influences in Amsterdam due to the number of visiting French musicians, and more specifically, Mahaut's considerable French background and musical education.⁵ As a result,

⁴ See the discussion in chapter 3.
⁵ See chapter 1.
Mahaut’s concerti are strongly indebted to the Venetian solo concerto in their ritornello structure and driving rhythm of the outer movements, whilst his middle movements in particular use certain characteristic ornaments, rhythms, melodic lines and often structure, that owe more to French dance music.

Thus we note a significant element in common between the musical styles of Mahaut and Quantz: the absorption and integration of both the Italian and French performance styles.

Significantly, the outer movements of Mahaut’s concerti closely resemble the structure of those found in Quantz’s own concerti, specifically in the number of alternations between solo and tutti and in the tonal structures of such movements. They are also remarkably similar in their use of thematic material in the ritornelli and the exploitation of this material in the solo. Like Mahaut, Quantz will often interrupt the solo with tutti passages, and references to the ritornello motives will frequently appear in the accompaniment to the solo. Reilly, however, comments that the basic design features found in Quantz’s movements were well established and were “common to practically the whole of Quantz’s generation, all over Europe”. He also believes that Quantz’s dependence on Vivaldi in his concerto structures makes his one of the surest guides to the performance of Vivaldi’s compositions, except in respect of certain French graces and matters of bowing. In addition, such movements in Mahaut’s concerti fall almost totally in line with Quantz’s own

---

6 With the exception that, unlike Mahaut’s, Quantz’s second ritornello seldom remained in the tonic, but inevitably moved to the dominant.

7 See Edward Reilly’s discussion of Quantz’s concerti in his *Three Studies . . .*, pp.23-5.


compositional guidelines given in his *Versuch*, not least in the necessary contrast between first and final movements. In Mahaut’s opening movements, we find a predominance of the metre C and, in line with Quantz’s discussion, these display a much greater majestic or serious element than those in 2/4 or triple metres, often with the use of strong dotted rhythms. By contrast, Mahaut’s third movements display a lighter character and, according to Quantz, are more suitable for a *finale* movement.

In our previous discussion regarding tempo, we noted that Quantz’s attempt to relate tempo markings to a specific pulse rate has today provided us with a much clearer idea of the intended tempi in mid-eighteenth century music. We also observed, however, that the use of Quantz’s specific directions with regard to the music of other composers are not entirely reliable in the light of the differing interpretation of tempo words in different parts of Europe, together with their changing meaning over the course of the eighteenth century. With regard to Mahaut, it is, therefore, perhaps Quantz’s discussion of the *character* inherent in the tempo words that remains, for us, more significant and, together with the time signature, gives us a closer idea of the intended tempi.

It is apparent that, whilst Quantz, like Mahaut, indicates only the plain *forte* and *piano* dynamics in his music, in line with the vast majority of baroque manuscripts, what he in fact expected from the performer was an expressive style that utilises all the subtle dynamic levels and nuances described at length in his *Versuch*. Mahaut himself described the use of *crescendo* and *diminuendo* in performing the *messa di voce* associated with the long appoggiatura. Quantz’s continued emphasis throughout the *Versuch* on the necessity to study the art of singing suggests that such extensive dynamic shading were commonly part
of the expressive style of an Italian singer, no doubt adopted by Italian instrumental music. Thus we concluded that Quantz’s directives were not new or innovative, but one of the first attempts to describe such detailed nuances that were likely to have been common practice, although seldom written in the music itself. As such, we must admit the highly probable relevance of Quantz’s discussion to Mahaut’s music, not only with regard to the infinite variety and subtlety of Quantz’s dynamics, but also to his general ideas of dynamic balance within the orchestra.

Perhaps one of the most significant issues, discussed in Quantz’s *Versuch*, that we have considered extensively with regard to Mahaut, is that of rhythmic alteration, encompassing the conventions of inequality, overdotting and rhythmic assimilation, that had their roots in French baroque music, but which became increasingly fashionable and stylised in the *galant* era to reach beyond French borders.

Whilst it has been well established that *notes inégales* was an essential expressive element of French musical style, there is little to document its use in the music of other nations. Indeed, only three sources existed outside of France that discuss the convention, including Quantz’s *Versuch*. Here Quantz unmistakably describes the long-short alternation in the traditional French metre relationships. His discussion clearly implies that he is in favour of *descending* inequality and confirms that it is generally of a mild degree. He does not, however, identify the practice as French, although there can be no doubt that he speaks of the French custom.

---

10 See the discussion in chapter 7, regarding *Rhythmic Alteration; The Use of Inequality*.

11 Quantz, J.J., *Versuch* (1752), chap.11, par.12, p.123.
As such, we must consider the probable application of this convention in Mahaut’s concerti. Whilst Mahaut lived and worked for the better part of his musical career in Amsterdam, under the significant influence of the strongly popular Italian style, we must also bear in mind his fundamentally French musical education and environment, which undoubtedly would have remained a significant factor in his taste and style. Whilst the concerto itself was Italian in origin, it was by 1730 an international form, and in the hands of a French-educated composer must surely be subject to French practices to some degree. This is particularly evident in many of Mahaut’s middle movements which display a significant French character and style.

Returning to Quantz’s discussion, whilst the convention of notes inégales is understood to apply only to conjunct figures, we also noted the inclusion of unequal thirds in Quantz’s accompanying examples. We discovered, however, that it was not entirely unknown in the French tradition, and likewise noted a number of implied examples in Mahaut’s concerti. Quantz’s comment, on the other hand, suggesting the need only to lengthen the first of every four notes in a faster tempo, is not confirmed in French sources and may have been a galant characteristic of the German school. As such, we concluded that it must not be applied without consideration to Mahaut’s music, although to some extent such alteration may occur naturally.

With regard to the more controversial issue of overdotting, we noted, contrary to popular thought, that again the sources do not support a sweeping advocation outside France. It is, however, clear from French sources that overdotting resulted directly from the use of

---

12 For an explanation of these issues, refer to chapter 7 regarding Rhythmic Alteration; The Use of Inequality.
inequality, and hence we concluded that, where the use of the latter was appropriate, so too was the use of overdotting. In this light, we have seen a number of examples in Mahaut's concerti in which overdotting was necessary to coincide with the use of inequality.

From about 1730 onwards, overdotting seems to have become an independent custom outside France, itself unrelated to French inequality. The essential element of its use outside France lay in its effect upon the character of the music. Hence, Quantz associates it with the majestic, and his thoughts are reflected in the writings of other contemporaries.

Whilst, in the context of Mahaut's concerti, we are not particularly concerned with the controversial application of the so-called French Overture Style, we have noted in Mahaut's music the favourable lengthening of the dot in figures involving a dotted crotchet and a quaver beneath semiquaver passage-work. Together with Mahaut's tendency to insert rests between the two notes, it becomes strongly suggestive of Quantz's description of French bowing with regard to these figures.14

Of far greater concern to us is the galant type of overdotting involving small-scaled dotted figures comprising a value less than a crotchet. Discussed extensively by Quantz and endorsed by other German galant authors, it is not derived from notes inégales, and thus is not specifically associated with French music. Instead, it was a practice that became fashionable in galant music of the mid-eighteenth century, and we have seen much of Mahaut's thematic material, particularly in his middle movements, dominated by such figures.

13 A rhythmical element of French dance music described by Quantz, usually involving the strong overdotting of a dotted crotchet followed by a quaver.

14 See the previous discussion with regard to Dotting.
figures. Here the use of overdotting enlivens or energises those potentially sluggish rhythmic figures, heightening their *majestic* expression, and thus reflecting the essential element of Quantz’s discussion.

Likewise, the implied overdotting of abundant figures in Mahaut’s music, involving a dotted quaver followed by two demi-semiquavers, reflects both Quantz’s and Agricola’s directions, as does the overdotting of Lombard, or ‘reverse-dotted’ figures. Quantz’s directive to play three or more demi-semiquaver notes following a dot or a rest “at the extreme end of the time allotted to them and with the greatest possible speed” is similarly implied in Mahaut’s own notation. Other contexts described by Quantz, and likewise implied in Mahaut’s concerti, include the dotting of a rest and subsequent shortening of the following note if such a rest is placed on the downbeat and followed by dotted figures.

Such was the enormous influence of *galant*-style overdotting described by Quantz, particularly in Germany and in the Netherlands that J.S. Bach himself is known to have revised a keyboard overture (BWV 831) with regard to such rhythmic alterations, reflecting the emerging *galant* style that he encountered during a visit to Dresden.

In his *Méthode*, Mahaut describes the *long* and *overlong* execution of the one-note grace, an execution that became prominent with the emergence of the *galant*. In his distinction between the French and the Italian use of the grace, Mahaut states that the French use the *long* execution principally as a *port de voix* (i.e. ascending grace), implying that the

---

15 See the previous discussion with regard to Dotting.

descending grace fundamentally remained anticipated. In his concerti, the grace is almost consistently notated with a small quaver-note which might represent any length or placement in its execution. In this way, it is apparent that Mahaut was unaffected by the 'modern’ Berlin galant composers who attempted to formalise a more literal representation of the graces' intended length. Interestingly, the German copyists of his Karlsruhe and Regensburg concerti also clearly remained unaffected, continuing to use only the small quaver notation. In addition, like the Italians, Mahaut occasionally uses an unmetrical semiquaver notation to indicate a prebeat execution.

In our earlier discussion, we established that the Italians demonstrated only the use of a short prebeat and a long onbeat execution of the one-note grace; an invariably short, onbeat interpretation did not appear to be part of their musical language. This was reflected by German writers at the beginning of the galant era and later by Leopold Mozart, who was essentially indebted to Tartini with regard to his ornamentation. Like Mozart, Quantz stands apart from the inflexible 'onbeat’ doctrine, established by his ‘modern’ Berlin colleagues (principally C.P.E. Bach and his followers), in endorsing only the Italian and French models (i.e. the short anticipated and the long onbeat execution), and does not speak of the invariably short onbeat interpretation. In line with these models and indeed with Mahaut’s concerti, Quantz’s notation is limited to the use of the unmetrical quaver and in some contexts, a semiquaver used specifically to indicate a prebeat execution.

Significantly, Quantz acknowledges the Italian origin of the long appoggiatura and clarifies the description of their performance given by Tartini and Geminiani, describing the swelling

---

17 The unmetrical quaver-grace remained the most common notation in French music throughout the first half of the eighteenth century and was adopted by Italian composers around 1710.
and diminishing of the sound through the appoggiatura in the manner of the *messa di voce*. Such an execution is also described by Mahaut with regard to the long appoggiatura in his *Méthode*.

The many and varied contexts throughout Mahaut’s concerti, in which a short execution of the grace is implied, show a strong bias towards anticipation in line with French and Italian models, themselves reflected in Quantz’s discussion. In particular, we observed the context in which the grace precedes an already written-out appoggiatura. Both Quantz and Leopold Mozart state that the grace must anticipate the beat so that the written dissonance is not replaced with a consonance by performing the grace on the downbeat against the bass. This likewise applies to such written-out appoggiatura adorned by a trill. In our examination we discovered a multitude of examples in Mahaut’s concerti which imply such an execution in order to retain the dissonance and expressive element of the written appoggiatura.

In addition, we noted the relevance in Mahaut’s music, of Quantz’s anticipation of graces falling between descending thirds. Quantz’s testimony as to the French nature of such an execution\(^\text{18}\) reflects the predominantly anticipated nature of the descending grace in French music. This prebeat interpretation continued past the mid-century despite the growing influence of *galant* fashion for the long appoggiatura. Quantz’s insistence on an anticipated execution includes the figure in which a grace precedes a quaver followed by two semiquavers, which he describes as a typically French model. To perform such a grace on

\(^{18}\) See the earlier discussion with regard to *The Prebeat, Descending Grace*.
the beat is to "be contrary not only to the intention of the composer, but to the French style of playing to which these appoggiaturas owe their origin".\textsuperscript{19}

Thus Quantz's execution, endorsed by Leopold Mozart, stands in direct conflict with the onbeat directives of C.P.E. Bach and his followers. Whilst we discovered that the latter can claim a precedent in the music of French keyboard masters including Boivin and Couperin, the conflict perhaps reflects the distinction between the interpretation of keyboard and non-keyboard French music. Quantz's directives are likely to represent the execution of such figures given by French flute players during his visit to Paris in the 1720s. We concluded, therefore, that the onbeat interpretation of the descending \textit{short} appoggiatura outside Germany was largely confined to the keyboard medium.

Thus we find indeed that Quantz's discussion parallels the context of Mahaut's concerti in a number of factors regarding the one-note grace. Such factors include their non-keyboard nature; Mahaut's French background and musical education; a total lack of evidence to suggest Mahaut's contact with, or influence drawn from, the Berlin school; and lastly, the considerable influence of the Italian \textit{galant} which, as we have seen, did not include the short onbeat execution of the one-note grace.

With regard to the execution of the trill, Mahaut describes only the standard onbeat, upper auxiliary start in his \textit{Méthode}, although he distinguishes between a French and Italian execution.\textsuperscript{20} Whilst the theoretical works of both the French and the Italians

\textsuperscript{19} Quantz, J.J. \textit{Versuch} (1752), chap.XVIII, sect.II, par.20.

\textsuperscript{20} See the earlier discussion regarding \textit{The Interpretation and Execution of the Trill}.
likewise describe Mahaut's basic models, they include in addition an enormous variety and flexibility in their executions, from an anticipated upper auxiliary to a main-note start. Although such executions are not included in Mahaut's Méthode, the varied contexts found throughout his concerti suggest, on the contrary, a much broader approach than he gives in his theoretical work and which actually demand the flexibility described by the French and the Italians.

The German galant trill, on the other hand, had formalised into a rigid, much less flexible style, fundamentally embracing only the accented upper-note start. Likewise, Quantz's discussion focuses principally on this one type of trill, preferring the quick and even execution, and does not reflect the variety seen in the French and Italian sources. Quantz's discussion does, however, suggest a slightly more flexible approach not seen in those of his Berlin colleagues. Whilst Quantz does not describe the main-note start, he does admit an anticipated upper auxiliary start when preceding an already written-out appoggiatura and between descending thirds. Such contexts show a considerable French influence. In addition, Quantz allows the anticipation of the trill itself, inserted between the appoggiatura and the principal note, in contexts where time is limited. Here he again refers to the French character of such an execution. Thus, in using Quantz as an interpretative tool in Mahaut's concerti, one must be careful not to apply Quantz's accented upper-note trill too rigidly, but to take note of his more flexible 'exceptions', reflecting the even greater variety found in French and Italian sources, which are closer to Mahaut's own style.

Whilst Mahaut does not indicate symbolically the use of the mordent in his concerti, we concluded earlier that this was an ornament left to the performer to insert according to his own judgement. Mahaut does, however, describe two types of mordent and their executions
in his *Méthode*. Thus we might compare these with similar models described by Quantz. Whilst we encountered an enormous confusion of terminology with regard to Mahaut's use of the terms *battement* and *marcellement*, we were able to draw certain conclusions. Mahaut's *marcellement* was essentially that of the French *port de voix* (i.e. beginning on the lower auxiliary) concluded by a single or multiple *pincé* and a sustained principal. Whilst the *port de voix* was of variable length and may have been anticipated, it is unlikely that the entire ornament, including the *pincé*, was placed before the beat. Quantz does not speak of a *marcellement*, but does discuss the *port de voix* extensively.

Mahaut's *battement*, on the other hand, is clearly the basic design described by the French as the single or multiple *pincé*, and by the Italians as the *mordente*. The ornament began on the principal note and showed a clear tendency towards anticipation, although this was subject to some flexibility. Such an execution appears to be the same as that described as a *battement* by Quantz and *battement* by Leopold Mozart. Both the latter, however, also include models beginning on the lower auxiliary. Whilst such models may be confused with Mahaut's *marcellement*, Quantz intends their use "in leaps where an appoggiatura is not permitted to enliven the note". Hence, the ornament is a purely melodic decoration in which the lower auxiliary must not be given the accent and, together with their unvarying speed, points to a probable anticipated execution in line with Mahaut's *battement*. Thus we can conclude, that whilst Quantz and Mahaut differ slightly in their use of terminology and include small variants in their models, it is apparent that these executions formed part of the musical language of both men.

---

21 See the earlier discussion in *The Use of Mordents In the Concerti*.

22 Quantz, J.J. Versuch (1752), chap.VIII, par.15, p.98.
We have, therefore, seen considerable similarities and parallels between the discussions and music of both Quantz and Mahaut. In one or two areas, however, we do find some conflicting opinions and directives. Whilst such differences remain minor, they are worth noting in this discussion.

First, with regard to rhythmic alteration, Quantz reflects the mid-eighteenth century fashion to set triple and dotted-duple rhythms deliberately against each other, in which they were to be performed exactly as written and not rhythmically assimilated to conform with one another. In addition, Quantz suggests that one might exaggerate the dotted rhythm to heighten the contrast. Although Mahaut does not speak of such rhythmic alteration in his *Méthode*, it becomes clear from many messy contexts in his concerti that he did not intend such conflict, which might be eliminated simply by softening the dotted figure and assimilating it to a triplet rhythm. This is, perhaps, not a fashionable interpretation but one which eliminates meaningless rhythmical confusion.

Our second difference of opinion lies in the accepted range of the flute at this time. Quantz is somewhat conservative in this regard, frequently limiting his upper register to $e^3$, which is confirmed in his *Versuch*. Mahaut, on the other hand, frequently extends the passage-work in his concerti to include $f^3$, $g^3$ and $a^3$, and in his *Méthode* states that the highest usable note is $b^3$. It is unknown whether Mahaut possessed a better instrument than Quantz or was indeed a better player. It is nevertheless clear that Mahaut pushed the upper range of the flute beyond the accepted limit, reflecting of course the fashionable pursuit of virtuosity.

Finally, the most significant difference perhaps to be noted between Mahaut and Quantz is their use of tonguing syllables with regard to articulation. Whilst Quantz devotes a
comprehensive chapter to their use, Mahaut writes, seven years later, that whilst they were “sufficient for the music of earlier times” with “modern music the player should . . . not worry too much about various syllables”. 23 Mahaut does, however, mention the use of the syllables di-del with double tonguing, which is very close to did'll, used by Quantz. We must remember that, whilst Quantz reflects French custom in his use of tonguing syllables, naturally associated with notes inégales, he represents not the changing musical taste evident elsewhere in the 1750s but a style based on French and Italian influences, established in Dresden in the 1730s and later preserved under Frederick the Great. Even Corrette, in the early 1740s, claimed that tu and ru were no longer widely used in French music. Thus, whilst the practice of notes inégales lingered on, the use of tonguing syllables clearly did not and is one aspect of Quantz’s Versuch that is not applicable to Mahaut’s concerti.

We can conclude, therefore, that in many respects Quantz’s Versuch may be used as a legitimate reference for the interpretation of Mahaut’s music. There remain, however, some specific differences, and hence the Versuch must only be used with due thought and consideration rather than as a set of ‘blanket’ rules.

As a postscript to this study, it is worth noting that an extensive examination of Mahaut’s concerti is not particularly useful to the modern flautist without access to the music itself, which is currently not an easy task. Therefore, it is my intention and sincere wish to publish a scholarly edition of at least some of Mahaut’s concerti in the near future, thus making

23 Mahaut, Méthode (1759), chap.VIII, p.21.
available music that has never before been published and perhaps not heard since the late-eighteenth century.
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