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Summary

This thesis focuses on alterations made in 1764 to the Messe des morts by Jean Gilles for performances at memorial services held in Paris to honour Jean-Philippe Rameau. For this commemoration two extracts from Rameau’s opera Castor et Pollux were set to sacred texts and included in the Messe, and a third addition was made, the source of which has been traced to an aria by the Italian composer Domenico Alberti. The suitability of these contrafacta is discussed both from a musical and a liturgical viewpoint.

New parts for muffled drums and for orchestral horns were added to the Messe, and the role of the bassoons was expanded. These and other alterations, such as cuts, rhythmic changes and strengthening of parts, are examined by comparing the 1764 version of the Messe with the published critical edition of an earlier version.

A review of extant manuscripts reveals that ideas for some of the alterations in 1764 may have originated in an arrangement of the Introit of the Messe, made by Joseph-Nicolas-Pancrace Royer, which was first performed in Paris in November 1750. On this occasion only the Introit was performed, and not the complete work, as previously reported.

Discovered with two sets of performing parts for the Messe des morts were parts for a setting of the Dies irae by Louis Homet, suggesting that this piece was performed with Gilles’ composition when required.

In an attempt to show how widely the Messe was used in France, an appendix containing details of performances has been compiled from various sources.

Part II of the thesis contains the first critical edition of the 1764 version of the Messe des morts, together with a section on aspects of performance.
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Foreword

This study of the *Messe des morts* by Jean Gilles and the alterations made to it in 1764 for the memorial services in Paris to honour Jean-Philippe Rameau has adopted certain conventions, details of which are given in the following paragraphs.

French terms which have a particular meaning without a direct equivalent in English have been retained. Explanations for some are given here; others will be explained as they arise. *Maître de musique* usually indicates the Director of Music, or Organist and Choirmaster at a cathedral or large church. It can, though, have other interpretations; for example, it may refer to a composer responsible for the musical tuition and entertainment in the household of an aristocratic or wealthy patron by whom he is employed. At the Académie Royale de Musique in Paris, usually known as the ‘Opéra’, there were two positions with the title *maître de musique*: the holder of one was a voice coach, and the second, from 1763, was in charge of the orchestra and undertook additional editing duties. Another post at the Opéra, the *batteur de mesure*, was held by the person who beat time, but to whom the term ‘conductor’ in the sense that we understand it today could not be applied.

The musical director of the entertainments at Court had the title *Surintendant de la musique de la chambre du roi*. A musician employed there was usually known as an *ordinaire de la musique du roi*, unless he had inherited or had been able to buy his post, in which case he would be an *officier*.

Frequent use has also been made of the French names for instruments and voices, in particular for *haute-contre de violon* and *taille de violon*, whose equivalent is the
modern viola, and for the *haute-contre* voice, a tenor with a high range, greatly admired in France. In the five-part choruses of the time this voice was written below the *dessus* (soprano) and above the *taille* (tenor), with the *basse-taille* (baritone or first bass) and *basse* (second bass) on the two lower lines.

The motet, either *grand* or *petit* (large or small), was a sacred piece for singers and instrumentalists set to a Latin text, and it was used throughout France at churches with the musical forces required for performance. The *grand motet* had varied instrumental, solo and choral passages, including sections of both *grand* and *petit* *chœur* (full and semi-chorus).

Identification of pitch in the narrative has been made in accordance with the Helmholtz method illustrated here.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{C'} & \text{C} & \text{c} & \text{d} & \text{e} & \text{f} & \text{g} & \text{a} & \text{b} & \text{c'} & \text{c''} & \text{c'''}
\end{align*}
\]

References are given in full on first appearance and shortened thereafter. One scholar of French baroque music who has studied Gilles and edited some of his works is John Hajdu Heyer, formerly known as John H. Hajdu. When referring to his published material the name used is that on the publication in question, although in some places, which are suitably annotated, the abbreviation H has been used for his edition of Gilles’ *Messe des morts*. Other abbreviations are explained below.
The library sigla system used is that established by RISM.

Where extracts from foreign language texts have been quoted the original spelling, capital letters and accents have been retained. Translations are mine unless stated otherwise.

The adaptation work on the *Messe des morts* involved sacred texts, including extracts from the psalms; when referring to these the psalm number in the Vulgate Bible is given first, followed by the number in the English Bible in brackets, e.g. Psalm 22 (23).

When the word ‘work’, i.e. composition, is used in this study, it is not intended to mean one which becomes a different work, either when performed, or if it is altered by others, as modern philosophers would argue. In the eighteenth century pieces were often composed for a specific reason, and with a particular group of performers in mind. The composer would usually direct the first performance
himself, and then perhaps adapt the piece for a different combination of singers and instrumentalists, or allow others to do so. As will become clear, the *Messe des morts* by Gilles went through many changes before it was altered again for the 1764 performances in Paris. It was, nevertheless, still known as his work.

I wish to express my thanks for help and advice with this study to all those who, in however small a way, have contributed to its eventual conclusion. It is impossible to name them all here, but I acknowledge with gratitude the help of staff of the Department of Drama and Music and of the Brynmor Jones Library at the University of Hull; I add particular thanks to other members of staff at the University, both current and retired: Dr Gertrud Aub-Buscher for French tuition, Simona Rizzardi for help with tracing ‘Caro Sposo’ and for translating it from Italian, and Fr James O’Brien, Roman Catholic Chaplain, for advice both on liturgical matters and on some Latin translation. I extend my thanks to staff at the libraries of the Universities of London and Cambridge, at the British Library, especially Dr Nicolas Bell, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the Bibliothèque municipale de Bordeaux and to M. Georges Fréchet at the Bibliothèque municipale d’Avignon for their help, and for copies of various documents. I am also grateful to Professor David Charlton of Royal Holloway, University of London for letting me have a copy of parts of his doctoral thesis, and to M. Thomas Leconte of the Centre de Musique Baroque de Versailles for a copy of the *Dies irae* by Louis Homet. My thanks go to Nick and Dr Anthea Smith for advice on technological matters and for accommodation, and to my sister and brother-in-law, Wendy and Derek Harris-Taylor not only for help with translations from German, Dutch and French, but also for support and encouragement in many other ways.
I acknowledge with gratitude permission from the following to reproduce material which is either in their collections, or which has been published:

Archives nationales, Paris,
A-R Editions, Inc., Madison, Wisconsin,
the Bibliothèque nationale de France,
Professor Lois Rosow,
the Société Jean-Philippe Rameau, Bonneuil-Matours, France,
and the University of North Carolina Press.

Finally, and most of all, I thank my supervisor, Professor Graham Sadler, for his unstinting support and sound advice, his seemingly inexhaustible patience, and his encouragement when difficulties have arisen. Without his guidance this project would never have been successfully completed.
Part I
Introduction

The music lover of today takes it for granted that the majority of Western polyphony produced during the past one thousand years or so will be readily available in some form or other, either in published editions (critical or otherwise), in broadcasts and recordings, or in concert performances. This state of affairs is, however, a relatively recent phenomenon.

Attending or organising musical performances in the eighteenth century was the preserve of the nobility or the very wealthy, many of whom employed composers, whose duties would include providing new music for particular occasions. As a result, many new compositions were performed, and very little was heard of those written in previous generations. Some authors commented on the difference between music and the other arts in this respect. In 1770 John Hawkins wrote:

Nothing in music is estimable that is not new. No music tolerable, which has been heard before. In answer to which it may be said, that this kind of reasoning is never applied to other intellectual gratifications; for no man was ever yet so weak as to object to the works of Virgil or Raphael, that the one wrote seventeen hundred, or the other painted 250 years ago.1

Three years later a contributor to the *Journal de musique* posed the question: ‘Why is music more subject than the other arts to the power of fashion, and why are the prejudices regarding music and painting so different that people almost always prefer the oldest paintings but the newest music?’2 Paul Henry Lang sums up the situation in these words: ‘In the late eighteenth century they knew only one style, the

---


2 *Journal de musique, par une société d’amateurs* (Paris, 1773), 6, p. 10 (repr. Geneva: Minkoff, 1972), 2, p. 1890, ‘Pourquoi la musique est-elle plus sujette que les autres arts à l’empire de la mode, & pourquoi les préjugés à l’égard de la musique & de la peinture sont-ils si différents qu’on préfère presque toujours les tableaux les plus anciens & la musique la plus nouvelle?’
contemporary; little if any old music was played, and of course the historical sense and a regard for stylistic propriety had yet to make their appearance’. 3 William Weber also notes that it was rare for any music to be performed much beyond the composer’s lifetime ‘save when a youthful prodigy such as Giovanni Pergolesi died young.’ 4

Howard Mayer Brown, however, considers that the extent to which musicians performed only music of their own time has been exaggerated. 5 Two of the examples he gives are of sacred music. The first concerns manuscripts prepared at the beginning of the sixteenth century for the Sistine Chapel in Rome, which appear to have been of music which had been in the working library of the choir for decades. 6 The second relates to seventeenth-century Spanish manuscripts which provide information on music sung at their Royal Chapel in the previous century, with compositions by Morales, Victoria and Guerrero remaining in the repertoire in the eighteenth century. 7 Similar examples from other countries can also be found; in England some of Handel’s works remained continuously in the repertoire after he died in 1759. 8 The obvious example is Messiah, his most famous composition. Handel’s music was also included in the private concerts held by Baron van Swieten, an Austrian diplomat, at his home in Vienna in the late eighteenth century. It was

---

6 Ibid., p. 31.
7 Ibid., p. 31.
here that Mozart came to know Handel’s works, and indeed it was van Swieten who commissioned Mozart to re-orchestrate them.⁹

In France too, there are examples of both sacred and secular works which remained in the repertoire long after the deaths of their composers. One sacred work which survived is the subject of this study: the *Messe des morts* by Jean Gilles (1668-1705), composed early in the eighteenth century while Gilles was *maître de musique* at Toulouse Cathedral, and first performed at his own funeral. After that sad occasion the work gradually became more widely known and it was performed in many places in France to commemorate distinguished citizens. Further details will be provided in Chapter 3 and Appendix 1. The first known performance in Paris of any part of the *Messe* took place on 1 November 1750 when the Introit was included on the programme at the series of concerts known as the ‘Concert Spirituel’, which was established in 1725 and continued right up to the Revolution. Many sacred works remained in the repertoire through being performed at this series, and the *Messe des morts*, or its Introit, continued to be heard there until 1770.

This thesis will focus on performances of the *Messe* which took place in 1764 at the memorial services in Paris for Jean-Philippe Rameau. The work was greatly altered for this special occasion: some cuts were made, but the instrumental forces were enlarged and there were three additions, two of which were based on extracts from Rameau’s opera *Castor et Pollux*. Although the manuscript sources of this version of the *Messe des morts* survive, no detailed study of them has ever been carried out. The thesis, therefore, has four aims:

---

⁹ Lang, *Handel*, p. 676
to identify the source of the third addition to the work (the source of the other two being known, as already mentioned),

to compare all these additions with their sources,

to examine the many other alterations made in 1764 by comparison with the published edition of an earlier version of the work (details of which will be given at the end of Chapter 1), and

to produce the first critical edition of the 1764 version of the *Messe*.

Two more Requiem Masses had a notable longevity in France, chiefly through performances by the Court musicians at the memorial service held each year on the anniversary of the death of the previous sovereign. During the reign of Louis XIV the work performed annually was the *Missa pro defunctis* by Eustache du Caurroy. This had been composed in about 1590 and sung at the funerals of Henri IV in 1610 and Louis XIII in 1643, as well as the subsequent memorial services.¹⁰ When this Requiem was performed at Louis XIV’s own funeral in 1715 its use had been established, therefore, for over one hundred years. At some point during the reign of Louis XV, Jack Eby maintains, the *Missa pro defunctis* by Charles d’Helfer replaced that by du Caurroy at the annual commemoration of the previous monarch. The d’Helfer work, first published in 1656, and so itself antiquated by that point, had been performed at the funeral service of the former *Surintendant de la musique de la chambre du roi* Michel-Richard de Lalande, which took place in 1726 at Notre-Dame de Versailles, the parish church of the Royal family.¹¹ Originally written for voices alone, it was rescored to include string parts and continuo. If the d’Helfer *Missa pro defunctis* had then been used at the annual memorial services for Louis XIV, this

may be one reason it was chosen for the state funeral of Louis XV, held at the Abbey of Saint-Denis on 27 July 1774.\(^\text{12}\) Thus, the formality and tradition of the Court meant that the use of two settings of the Requiem Mass over a long period had ensured their survival in the repertoire for an exceptional length of time.

Some secular works survived longer in France than happened elsewhere, but, as with sacred compositions, there were particular circumstances which contributed towards this. King Louis XIV, in addition to centralising political control, also ensured that the arts were organised into various ‘Académies’, so that all aspects of cultural life were directed from the centre. According to R. M. Isherwood, the reasons for this were the King’s desire not only to develop and improve the arts, but also to raise his own prestige at home and abroad. His ultimate aim was for France to replace Italy as the dominant cultural nation in Europe.\(^\text{13}\)

The King appointed Jean-Baptiste Lully as *Surintendant et compositeur de la musique de la chambre du roi* in 1661, thus giving Lully absolute charge over the musical entertainments at Court.\(^\text{14}\) In 1672 he also gained control of the newly named ‘Académie Royale de Musique’, commonly known as the ‘Opéra’.\(^\text{15}\) By persuading the King to sign various orders, Lully virtually held a monopoly over productions in Paris, and restricted the activities of any potential rivals. Although Lully himself died in 1687, his influence lived on through his successors; his stage works continued to be performed well into the next century. The opera *Armide*, for example, was

---


\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 33.
performed at various times between 1686 and 1766.\textsuperscript{16} However, the work which survived the longest was *Thésée*, performed for the last time in 1779, one hundred and four years after its first production.\textsuperscript{17}

Early in the nineteenth century the main change to the way in which works from earlier generations were regarded came when compositions by Haydn, Mozart and then Beethoven were called ‘Classical’, a style regarded as the highest musical authority, and, therefore, worthy of study in conservatoires.\textsuperscript{18} As a consequence, past composers’ works were increasingly retained in the repertoire after their deaths.

Another significant factor taking place at around the same time was the growing tendency to reassess the work of earlier composers. A revival of interest in the works of J. S. Bach had begun in 1802 with the publication of a biography of the composer by Johann Forkel. Another Bach enthusiast, Carl Zelter, who was also director of the Berlin Singakademie choir, began rehearsals of Bach’s choral works in private, and it was he who introduced Mendelssohn to the composer’s music. This eventually led to Mendelssohn organising the first public performance since Bach’s death of the *St Matthew Passion*. The event took place in Berlin on 11 March 1829, and brought Bach to the attention of a much wider audience; by 1850 performances of his music were taking place all over Europe.\textsuperscript{19}

As well as showing an interest in the works of J. S. Bach, musicians and scholars had begun to look afresh at the music of other composers. In England, where the Bach


\textsuperscript{17} Weber, ‘*La musique ancienne*’, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{18} Weber, ‘Contemporaneity’, p. 175.

revival was led by Samuel Wesley, the Academy of Ancient Music had been performing works by Palestrina, Victoria, Byrd and Purcell. The French publisher and choral director Alexandre Choron was performing for Paris audiences not only the works of Bach, but also those by Handel, Palestrina, Monteverdi and Josquin.

In the twentieth century there was a renewed interest in the works of unjustly neglected composers such as Marc-Antoine Charpentier and Jean Gilles, whose Messe des morts became a classic in its time. Although certain works by Court composers in France survived longer than usual for the reasons explained, few compositions by those with no link to the capital became so widely known and long-lasting. It is quite remarkable, therefore, that ten years after the Rameau commemoration the Gilles Messe des morts was performed at Notre-Dame de Versailles following the death of Louis XV, demonstrating the very high regard in which the work must have been held.

Chapters 1-4 of this study of the Messe des morts will set out the context for the 1764 performances and provide background on the composer, his works and the various sources of the Messe, before Chapters 5-8 focus on a detailed consideration of the 1764 version, leading to the first critical edition in Part II.

---

21 Ibid., pp. 16-17.
Chapter 1

Rameau’s Memorial Services

As Rameau was the outstanding French composer and theorist of his day it was only to be expected that when he died on 12 September 1764, shortly before his eighty-first birthday, it would not be long before public events were arranged to commemorate him. True, he had become a somewhat controversial figure during the last forty years of his life. His theoretical writings had brought him into conflict with the philosopher and composer Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and with figures such as the writer Denis Diderot and the mathematician and philosopher Jean Le Rond d’Alembert, with whom he had previously been on friendly terms. Charles Collé, his former collaborator, referred to him as ‘the rudest, the coarsest, and the most unsociable mortal of his time’.1 However, despite this, he was held in very high regard as a composer by a broad range of music lovers, while his work in the field of music theory had established his reputation throughout Europe. He broke new ground in expressing harmonic theories in terms of natural and scientific principles and his work laid foundations which were developed by succeeding generations. The writer Jean François Marmontel called him ‘the Newton of sound’.2 The Mercure de France report which announced his death described him as ‘this famous man, to whom the public has accorded, above all others, the name “Great”’.3 Louis Petit de Bachaumont, the diarist, wrote an entry under the date of Rameau’s death which

---

3 Mercure de France, October 1764, I, p. 168, ‘Cet Homme célèbre, auquel le Public a donné avant tous le Titre de GRAND’.
begins ‘Rameau, without doubt one of the most famous musicians in Europe and the
father of the French school, died today’. Other tributes appeared in the *Mercure.*

That from a ‘M. de C***’ read

\begin{quote}
Cy git le célèbre Rameau.
Il fut, par son vaste génie,
De la Musique le flambeau
Et l’objet des traits de l’envie.
Muses, pleurez sur ce tombeau
Le créateur de l’harmonie.
\end{quote}

(Here lies the famous Rameau. He was, through his vast genius, the torch of Music and the object of
evious attacks. Muses, mourn on this tomb for harmony’s creator).

Later a M. D’Abancour wrote ‘…in this tomb lies the God of harmony’. Various
eulogies were subsequently published: that by the writer and violinist Michel Paul
Guy de Chabanon appeared later in the year; that by the politician and diplomat
Hugues Bernard Maret was delivered the following year in Dijon, Rameau’s
birthplace.

The authors of *Sentiment d’un harmoniphile,* in a report on a memorial service in
1756 to mark the first anniversary of the death of the composer Joseph-Nicolas-
Pancrace Royer, tell us that thirty-five or forty years earlier it had been the custom to
hold a service ‘en musique’ for prominent musicians who had died during the year.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[6] Ibid., April 1765, I, p. 27, ‘…dans ce tombeau Cy git le Dieu de l’harmonie’; also quoted in La Laurencie, ‘Quelques documents’, p. 573.
Corroboration of this is provided by the *Mercure de France*, which reports that a decision was made on St Cecilia’s day, 22 November 1731, by musicians in the capital to arrange such a service in December each year. The first one took place on 4 December 1731 at St Germain l’Auxerrois, another the following year on 10 December at St Sulpice, and on 14 December 1733 a third was held at the church of the Pères de l’Oratoire. This custom appears then to have been discontinued, which the authors of *Sentiment* confirm by saying that ‘they satisfy themselves by holding one from time to time on the death of composers who have gained a certain reputation during their lifetime’. Although a service was held for Royer, the violinist Jean-Marie Leclair, whom posterity would consider a more significant musician, and who died only a month after Rameau, does not appear to have been accorded this honour. It is, however, a mark of Rameau’s far higher standing and reputation that, in his case, no fewer than three memorial services were held in Paris alone, and others took place in Orléans, Avignon and Marseille.

The first of the Paris services was held on 27 September 1764 at the Church of the Oratorians, then known as the Pères de l’Oratoire and now as the Temple de l’Oratoire du Louvre. This church is situated on the corner of the Rue St Honoré and the Rue de L’Oratoire, not far from the theatre of the Académie Royale de Musique.
(the Paris Opéra) in the Palais-Royal. In the seventeenth century, before the building of the Rue de Rivoli, which now runs behind the church, the gardens of the Louvre were adjacent to the church, which, from 1623, was used as the Chapelle Royale du Palais du Louvre. Several important funeral or memorial services took place here: those of Cardinal Richelieu in 1642 and of Louis XIII in the following year, and, even after completion of a new chapel at the Louvre in 1659, those of Queen Anne of Austria in 1666 and of Queen Marie-Thérèse in 1683. The *Gazette de France* reports that on 16 June 1659 three beautiful motets by Jean Veillot were included in a public service of prayers held at this church for peace in the Pyrenees. In 1672, we know that Lully’s motet *Miserere mei Deus* was performed here at the funeral of Chancellor Séguier, as Madame de Sévigné mentions it in a letter dated 2 May 1672. The church continued to be used for important events in the eighteenth century: it was here that a *Te Deum* was sung on 6 December 1732 to celebrate the recovery from illness of the duc d’Orléans and his only son, the duc de Chartres. As already noted above, this was the venue for the annual commemoration for deceased

---


musicians in 1733. Royer’s memorial service took place here in 1756, and the church, therefore, was ideally suited for a service to honour Rameau.

The service was organised and paid for by the Opéra directors Rebel and Franceœur and many of the musicians from the Opéra took part. The Mercure reports that:

‘Près de 180 Musiciens tant Symphonistes que Chanteurs, de l’Académie Royale de Musique, de celle du Roi & de plusieurs Eglises de Paris, que le zèle & le respect pour la mémoire du défunt y avoient conduits, occupoient la Jubé & les Tribunes latérales de la façade intérieure de cette Eglise.’

(Nearly 180 musicians, both players and singers, from the Académie Royale, the Musique du Roi and several Paris churches, brought there by their enthusiasm and respect for the deceased, occupied the rood loft and the side galleries on the inside of this church).

In 1762, a service at the church of Saint Jean de Latran to honour the playwright Prosper Jolyot de Crébillon, known as ‘the elder’, had been organised and paid for by the Comédie-Française. A subsequent disagreement in ecclesiastical circles resulted in the officiating priest being disciplined, as actors were officially banned from the Church under an ancient order passed at the First Council of Arles in AD 314. No such restriction applied to those who performed at the Opéra, however.

The Comédie-Française and the Opéra were based at theatres on opposite sides of the Seine, hence the reason for the comment by the German critic and diplomat Friedrich Melchior Grimm that ‘there is neither sin nor excommunication involved in putting on plays on the right bank of the Seine, but it’s the devil’s work if you promote them

---

17 Labbet, Sentiment, p. 16.
18 Mercure, October 1764, I, p. 213.
19 Further details are provided in Chapter 7 on Rites.
20 John McManners, Church and Society in Eighteenth-Century France, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), II, pp. 314, 335 and note 146, citing P-J Guyot, Répertoire universel et raisonné de jurisprudence civile, criminelle, canonique et bénéficiale, 64 vols (1775-1783) and 14 vols supp. (1786), XII, pp. 261-63; he says this ban refers only to the ‘farceurs publics et les baladins’ (public pranksters and second-rate comics) of long ago.
on the left’. The Opéra directors, who were bearing the costs of the first Rameau memorial service, were no doubt anxious to avoid any similar disagreement, and invitations were issued by ticket in the name of Rameau’s widow. Whereas Bachaumont says that sixteen hundred tickets were sent out, the *Mercure* reports that fifteen hundred tickets were issued in the name of his widow and son. The same report also tells us that the music performed at the service consisted of the *Messe des morts* by Jean Gilles and a *De profundis* setting by François Rebel. According to Maret, one of Rameau’s earliest biographers, extracts from Rameau’s operas *Castor et Pollux* and *Dardanus* ‘were adapted to the prayers usually sung on such occasions’, though, as we shall see, this statement requires some qualification.

* * *

The second service took place on 10 October at the Carmelite Church, close to the Luxembourg Palace. This was organised by François-André Danican Philidor, who also composed all the music, which consisted of a Requiem Mass and a *De profundis* setting. Philidor is best known as an opera composer, as well as a chess player, rather than a composer of sacred music. His output of the latter appears to have been

---

22 *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et politique de Grimm et de Diderot depuis 1753 jusqu’en 1790*, new edn, 15 vols (Paris: Furne, 1829), VI, p. 248, 1 October 1769, ‘il n’y a point de péché ni d’excommunication de jouer la comédie sur la rive droite de la Seine, mais on est à tous les diables quand on la joue sur la rive gauche’; translation from McManners, *Church and Society*, II, p. 335.

23 *Bachaumont, Mémoires Secrets*, II, p. 96, 28 September 1764, ‘Comme on voulait éviter les querelles occasionnées lors de celui fait à Saint Jean de Latran pour feu Crébillon, on a fait les invitations, sur le billet, au nom de la veuve : il y avait seize cents billets’.


25 Ibid., pp. 213-14, ‘On y exécuta la Messe de feu M. Gilles… On exécuta pendant l’Offertoire de la Messe, le *De Profundis* de M. REBEL’.

26 Dr Hugues Maret, *Éloge historique de M. Rameau*, (Dijon, 1766), p. 39, note 56, ‘Plusieurs beaux morceaux tirés des opéras de *Castor* & de *Dardanus*, furent adaptés aux prières qu’il est d’usage de chanter dans ces cérémonies’.

27 *L’Avant-coureur*, 22 October 1764, p. 677, ‘Mercredi dix on a exécuté dans l’Eglise des Carmes, près le Luxembourg, une messe, de *Requiem* pour l’illustre M. Rameau. C’est M. Philidor qui est auteur de la musique, ainsi que du *De profundis*’. 

small and none seems to have survived. With regard to the Requiem setting
Bachaumont was very critical, saying ‘Philidor has not set forth anywhere the
majestic and awesome composition which the subject demands. The composer of
*opéra comique* is to be found virtually throughout, and it was regretfully evident that
he had not been able to raise his music to the sublime level’. He goes on:
‘Moreover the performance was very poor, as much through the small number of
players, as through the absence of taste and expression in the majority of the
singers’ Girdlestone claims that Philidor’s *Te Deum* was performed at this
service, but Charles Palissot reported that people ‘had been struck by the majesty of
the Elevation’, which is part of the Requiem Mass, and *L’Avant-coureur* mentions
the performance of a ‘messe de *Requiem*’ and *De profundis* (note 27). No report of
this service appears in the *Mercure* but *L’Avant-coureur* is more complimentary than
Bachaumont. It reports ‘many passages full of sparkle and genius are worthy of a
composer who has acquired an extensive and well earned reputation in his art’; particular mention is made of M. Richer, a well respected singer, charming a large
number of distinguished people with a performance of taste, precision and
elegance.

---

composition majestueuse & terrible qu’exige le sujet. On a retrouvé l’auteur de l’opéra-comique
presque partout, et l’on a vu avec douleur qu’il ne pouvait s’élever au sublime’.
29 Ibid., pp. 102-03, ‘D’ailleurs l’exécution a été des plus mauvaises, tant par le petit nombre
d’acteurs, que par le défaut de goût & d’organe dans la plupart de ceux qui ont chanté’.
30 Girdlestone, *Jean-Philippe Rameau*, p. 513. No documentary evidence is given, however, and this
seems an unlikely work for a memorial service.
p. 108f, ‘On a été frappé de la majesté de l’élévation’.
32 *L’Avant-coureur*, 22 October 1764, p. 678, ‘Beaucoup de morceaux pleins de feu et de génie sont
dignes d’un auteur qui a acquis dans son art une réputation aussi grand que méritée’.
33 *L’Avant-coureur*, 22 October 1764, p. 678, ‘M. Richer, autrefois page de la musique du Roi et si
fêté alors par le public, a chanté plusieurs récits avec un goût, une précision, une prononciation, une
elegance qui ont fait le charme d’une assemblée aussi nombreuse que distinguée’; also quoted in La
The third Paris service took place on 16 December and was also held at the Church of the Oratorians. In many ways this service was similar to the first, although this one was paid for by subscription. Many of the same musicians took part and the Gilles Messe des morts and Rebel De profundis were used again. This time the Mercure report says that the former was performed ‘with some wonderful extracts from the works of the departed [Rameau], adapted to certain parts of this Mass’.  

Also performed at this service was a setting of the Dies irae by Guilleminot Dugué, who was maître de musique at the nearby church of St-Germain-l’Auxerrois and was later to succeed to Notre-Dame, but at this time was not well known.

The organisers of these services had been faced with something of a dilemma when choosing the music to be performed. As the aim was to commemorate Rameau it would seem obvious to include a piece or pieces which he had composed. Rameau though, despite having been a church or cathedral organist for some twenty-six years, had written very little sacred music. Three complete grands motets survive (In convertendo, Deus noster refugiam and Quam dilecta) but these seem to have been written more for concert performance than for liturgical use. In addition there is a vocal quintet Laboravi, which may have been part of a lost grand motet, and he is known to have written a petit motet, Exultet cœlum laudibus, now lost. Two of the motets which have survived did so as copies in the collection of the Rameau enthusiast J. J. M. Decroix. He went to considerable lengths to search for Rameau’s sacred music, evidence of which can be found in the correspondence he had with members of Rameau’s family. None of the motets was considered suitable for

---

34 Mercure, January 1765, I, p. 191, ‘On exécuta la fameuse Messe de GILLES, avec des morceaux admirables, tirés des ouvrages du défunt, adaptés à quelques parties de cette Messe’.
35 Girdlestone, Jean-Philippe Rameau, p. 74.
performance at a memorial service and an alternative was therefore adopted. That
was to take extracts from Rameau’s operas and adapt them to sacred texts for
inclusion in the services. This idea was not new: the writing of ‘parody’ masses, by
taking an existing polyphonic composition and reworking it to place it within the
liturgical framework of the Mass, was an age-old practice. On an occasion like this,
when a choral piece has had its original text replaced by another, but the music
remains substantially the same, the revision is known as a ‘contrafactum’.37 Even
Rameau’s works had already been subject to such adaptation. In 1744 the Company
of Tax Farmers organised a thanksgiving service for the King’s recovery from a
serious illness. A setting of the Te Deum was preceded by a piece called Paroles
(Words) which consisted of music taken from two of Rameau’s operas and adapted
to new texts. The first extract was the chorus ‘Que tout gémisse’, from Act I, Scene i
of Castor et Pollux, and the second was Huascar’s air ‘Clair flambeau du monde’
from Les Indes galantes.38 The same chorus from Castor et Pollux was used as the
basis for one of the contrafacta at the Rameau commemoration, and this will be
discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

According to Maret in his Eloge (note 26), the first Rameau memorial service had
extracts ‘adapted to the prayers usually sung’, or perhaps a better interpretation of
‘prayers’ would be ‘sacred texts’. The Mercure reports that ‘a great number of those
present were seen not to able to hold back their tears during the Kyrie Eleison of this
Mass, which was adapted to expressive music from one of the most beautiful

37 Robert Falck and Martin Picker, ‘Contrafactum’, in New Grove Dictionary of Music and
367–70 (p. 367); see also Robert Falck, ‘Parody and Contrafactum: A Terminological Clarification’,
38 Georges Cucuel, La Pouplinière et la Musique de Chambre au XVIIIe siècle (Paris: 1913; repr.
passages in M. Rameau’s works’. 39 We also know from the Mercure report for the third service that the contrafacta were included within the Gilles Messe des morts (note 34). The latter work, performed at both the first and third services, was an obvious choice. It had been used at the memorial services for Royer in 1756 and for Crébillon the elder in 1762. The account of the Royer service in Sentiment says of the work ‘There is nowadays seldom a funeral service with music without a performance of Gilles’ Mass’, 40 and ‘Of all Requiem Masses, the one by Gilles has always been regarded as the best’. 41 At Crébillon’s service we are told by the chronicler Barbier that more than one hundred musicians took part, including all those from the Opéra. 42 The Mercure report of the service says about eighty musicians took part. 43 It is interesting to note here that Rebel and Berton, two of the Opéra officers closely involved with the Rameau memorial performances, also directed the musicians on this occasion, Rebel conducting his own De profundis and Berton the Mass. 44 Many of the other participants would probably have been involved in both the 1756 and 1762 services as well as those in honour of Rameau. Later the Messe was used to commemorate the deaths of the exiled King Stanislaw I of Poland in 1766 and of Louis XV in 1774.

39 Mercure, October 1764, I, p. 214, ‘On a vu un grand nombre d’Assistans ne pouvoir retenir leurs pleurs au Kyrie Eleison de cette Messe adapté à la Musique expressive d’un des plus beaux endroits des œuvres de M. Rameau’.
40 Labbet, Sentiment, pp. 15-16, ‘Il ne se fait presque point de Service funèbre en Musique, où l’on n’exécute la Messe de Gilles’.
41 Ibid., p. 14, ‘De toutes les Messes de Requiem, celle de Gilles a toujours été regardée comme la meilleure’.
43 Mercure de France, Juillet 1762, II, p. 146, ‘près de 80 Musiciens’.
44 Ibid., p. 146; ‘on célébra une Messe solennelle, pendant laquelle on exécuta l’admirable Musique de feu M. Gilles, & le De profundis de M. Rebel…don’t il conduisit lui-même l’exécution. M. le Berton…conduisit celle de la Messe.’
The other item common to both the first and third services was the *De profundis* by François Rebel. As a co-director of the Opéra and organiser of the first service it is not surprising to see a work of his performed. The *Mercure* says it is a ‘motet whose beauties are well known’.\(^{45}\) The work had received several performances at the series of concerts known as the Concert Spirituel since 1754, the most recent being in the year before Rameau’s death.\(^{46}\) The *Dies irae* by Dugué in the third service is a less obvious choice and may have been included because it was a contemporary work.

The *Mercure* report describes the *Dies irae* as having ‘plenty of variety and several passages of genius worthy of the great masters’.\(^{47}\) However, the music is lost, as is that of Rebel’s *De profundis*, and we are thus unable to assess the validity of these comments. Nevertheless a *Dies irae* by Dugué was performed at the Concert Spirituel in 1766 and 1767 and it is probable that this was the same work.\(^{48}\)

At first sight Philidor’s choice of his own Requiem Mass and *De profundis* for the second service seems unusual. He appears to have put on the service independently, as there is no record of musicians from the Opéra or the Royal Chapel taking part in their official capacities. In 1771, though, the *Galerie Françoise* informs us that on this occasion his music was applauded, and that the service may have been a personal tribute from Philidor, who felt he owed Rameau a debt of gratitude, both for the respect he had shown him, and for the compliments Rameau made when Philidor’s *Le Maréchal* appeared.\(^{49}\) This is not only of great interest in itself, but it also shows

\(^{45}\) *Mercure*, October 1764, I, p. 214, ‘Motet dont les beautés sont connues’.


\(^{47}\) *Mercure*, January 1765, I, p. 191, ‘…beaucoup de variété, & plusieurs traits de génie dignes des grands Maîtres’.

\(^{48}\) Pierre, *Histoire*, pp. 291 & 293, on 1 November in each year.

\(^{49}\) *Galerie Françoise: ou Portraits des hommes et des femmes célèbres qui ont paru en France* (Paris, 1771), p. 9, ‘M. Philidor avoir composé la Musique qui reçut des applaudissements. Un pareil
that the events of seven years earlier had not faded from the memory, and were still considered worthy of comment.

* * *

Memorial services for Rameau which took place elsewhere are also reported in the *Mercure* in some detail. It is remarkable that so much space was devoted to them, an honour which was rarely accorded to others. In Marseille a service took place on 15 November 1764 at the Church of the Dominicans with a great number of people present, including civic dignitaries. An unnamed correspondent tells us the event was organised by ‘Mr Rey, maître de musique of the Concert [a concert society] at Marseille, with great intelligence, genius and taste regarding both the choice of, and arrangement of, music for the Solemn Mass’. Then follows a detailed description of the scene:

‘L’église étoit entièrement tendue de noir…On a voir placé au milieu du raisseau un fort beau catafalque, sur l’entablement duquel s’élevait une haute pyramide, où l’on voyoit au bas le médaillon du défunt, très-ressemblant, avec cette légende, DILECTÆ MEMORÌÆ J. B. RAMEAU…Les peintures & les figures allégoriques du cénotaphe étoient artistement disposées, d’une très-bonne exécution, & composes avec intelligence.’

(The church was completely dressed in black…In the centre a striking catafalque had been erected. On top of this stood a high pyramid at the base of which could be seen a medallion bearing a lifelike image of the composer, with the inscription IN LOVING MEMORY OF J. B. RAMEAU…Paintings and figures symbolic of mourning, which had been very well made, and thoughtfully put together, were artistically arranged.)

*hommage étoit une dette dont l’Auteur de Tom-Jones s’acquittoit envers Rameau. Celui-ci avoit des droits sur sa reconnoissance par l’estime qu’il lui accordoit, & par les éloges qu’il lui donna lorsque le Maréchal parut*.  

50 *Mercure*, February 1765, p. 197, ‘C’est ce qu’a entrepris & exécuté M. REY, Maître de musique du Concert de cette ville [Marseille], avec beaucoup d’intelligence, de génie & de goût pour le choix & l’arrangement de la musique de la Messe solennel’.  

51 *Mercure*, February 1765, p. 198.
Unfortunately Rameau’s initials were incorrect – a common enough error in the eighteenth century. After some suitable organ music played by the abbé Peyre, the Mass began. Everything which the choir sang during this Mass was ‘entirely made up of different musical extracts from those works by Rameau which had contributed most to his fame’. The writer, however, consciously excludes the details of which Rameau passages were used, one reason given being that ‘it would be of no use to most readers’. So despite having so much information about the event itself, and knowing that all the music consisted of contrafacta from Rameau’s works, we are not told on which extracts they were based.

In Orléans a service was held on 15 January 1765 at the Church of the Dames Religieuses de la Visitation ‘where the town’s musicians and enthusiasts gathered in great numbers to honour the famous Rameau’. The Gilles Messe des morts was again chosen, together with a Dies irae by François Giroust, maître de musique at the Cathedral. This latter work can be identified, as the Bibliothèque nationale de France holds the autograph manuscript, which is dated January 1765. It may therefore have been specially written for the occasion. The service concluded with a De profundis ‘the verses of which were filled with pieces chosen, and extracted, from the most distinguished of Rameau’s musical works, by an enthusiast’. Unfortunately, this report also omits to identify the extracts which are used as a basis for the contrafacta.

---

52 Ibid., p. 199, “Tout ce qui se chanta au chœur, dans cette Messe, étoit entièrement composé de différents morceaux de musique extraits des ouvrages de M. RAMEAU, & qui ont le plus contribué à sa célébrité”.
53 Ibid., p. 199, “On a cru devoir supprimer de cette lettre les détails indicatifs de tous les morceaux adaptés aux paroles de la messe;…il seroit inutile au plus grand nombre des lecteurs”.
54 Ibid., March 1765, p. 147, “…le Concert, les Amateurs, & tous les Musiciens de la ville d’Orléans, réunis, formant un corps nombreux de musique, ont fait célébrer un Service pour l’illustre RAMEAU”.
55 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, F-Pc Rés H.620.
56 Mercure, March 1765, p. 148, ‘Le Service a fini par le De Profundis, dont les versets ont été remplis par des morceaux choisis & extraits des ouvrages de musique les plus distingués de M. RAMEAU par un Amateur’. 
However, it does include a great deal about the individual sections of Giroust’s *Dies irae* and it lists motets of his which had been performed at the Concert Spirituel. Dates of performances are given and in one case, that of *Exaudi Deus orationem meam*, we are told that on Whitsunday 1764 Rameau heard the work and thought very favourably of it.\(^{57}\) A footnote which repeats this information calls Giroust ‘this prolific, hard working young composer’.\(^{58}\) This report contains so much on Giroust and his works that it is difficult to believe that anyone other than the composer himself submitted it to the *Mercure*. Perhaps he was also the enthusiast who chose and arranged the Rameau extracts. He was very ambitious and may have seen that this event would have some publicity value for him. He did later become *sous-maître* at the Royal Chapel and wrote a Coronation Mass for Louis XVI as well as a *Missa pro defunctis*, which may have been intended to honour the memory of Louis XV.\(^{59}\)

A Requiem Mass for the repose of Rameau’s soul was celebrated at the church of the Métropole, Avignon on 20 October 1764.\(^{60}\) The Gilles *Messe des morts* was sung followed by a *De profundis* said to be by Pergolesi,\(^{61}\) although he is not now credited with such a work. As in Marseille, the organisers here went to considerable lengths to set the scene. A catafalque was erected on which was placed a violin covered in

---

\(^{57}\) Ibid., p. 149, *‘Exaudi Deus orationem meam,… le jour de la Pentecôte 1764. C’est ce dernier que M. RAMEAU a entendu, & dont il a porté un jugement très-avantageux’*.  
\(^{58}\) Ibid., p. 147, *‘Ce jeune Compositeur fécond & laborieux’*.  
\(^{59}\) Eby, *‘A Requiem Mass for Louis XV’*, pp. 228-30.  
\(^{60}\) Jacques Rodriguez, ‘La musique et les musiciens à la cathédrale d’Avignon au XVIIIe siècle’, *RMFC*, 13 (1973), 64-101 (p. 96), citing J.-F. Arnavon, chanoine de N.-D. la Principale, 1761-1792, 1799-1816, *Journal sur la ville d’Avignon*, Musée Calvet d’Avignon, MS 1520, p.76, *‘On a célébré aujourd’hui dans cette ville et dans l’église de la Métropole une grande messe de Requiem pour le repos de l’ame de M. Rameau’*; see also Henri Quittard, ‘Les Années de Jeunesse de J.-P. Rameau’, *Revue d’histoire et de critique musicales*, 2e Année (1902), in *La Revue Musicale: Revue d’Histoire et de Critique* (repr. Scarsdale NY: Schnase 1968), 100-14, (p. 110, n. 3). (Quittard gives the date as 20 November but the Bibliothèque municipale d’Avignon, who now hold Arnavon’s *Journal*, have kindly checked the original and confirmed that the correct date is 20 October).  

black gauze. On the church door a black carpet was hung, to which was nailed an open music book. The reason the cathedral authorities and the musicians paid their respects to Rameau in this way was that the composer had been maître de musique there, although only for a short period in 1702. In this context it is interesting to note that in 1701 the Cathedral Chapter invited Gilles, who was then in Toulouse, to take up that position in Avignon, and appointed Rameau temporarily, pending Gilles’ arrival. Gilles does appear to have visited Avignon but there is no record of the two composers ever meeting and Gilles never took up the appointment.

* * *

The version of the Gilles Requiem used at the third and possibly the first of the Paris services survives in the Bibliothèque national de France as manuscript number F-Pc D.11135. It is marked ‘This score is the one used for the performance of this Mass at Rameau’s funeral service in 1764’. As the funeral service had taken place the day after Rameau’s death at his parish church of St Eustache in the presence of only his son and a friend, the score would certainly not have been used on that occasion. The writer of this comment must, therefore, have been referring to one of the memorial services. We have noted that, according to the Mercure, at the first service the Kyrie was adapted to a passage from one of Rameau’s works while the report of

---


63 Ibid., p. 96, citing Arnavon, Journal, p. 76, ‘Ce qui a excité les musiciens…à donner aux manes de Mons Rameau cette marque de leur affection et ce qui a engagé M de la metropole a y contribuer c’est que Mr Rameau a été autrefois maître de musique à la métropole…’.

64 ‘Cette partition est celle qui a servi pour l’exécution de cette Messe au Service funèbre de Rameau en 1764.’

65 Girdlestone, Jean-Philippe Rameau, p. 512.
the third service says that extracts from Rameau’s works were adapted to some parts of the Mass (notes 39 and 34). There may have been differences therefore between the two performances or they may have been the same; it is impossible to come to a definite conclusion on the evidence available.

What is certain is that the version of the Mass used at the memorial services differs from Gilles’ supposed original in many ways. There is no surviving autograph score. This may have been in the library of Toulouse Cathedral until as recently as the early years of the twentieth century when, according to M. Louis Ollier, it could have disappeared during civil disorders surrounding the separation of the Church and the State.\(^{66}\) Ollier became maître de musique at the cathedral in 1924 and told John Hajdu that none of Gilles’ music was held there when he took up his appointment.

One copy of the Messe now in Paris was signed in 1731 by ‘Duprat copiste’. Duprat was a scribe in Toulouse where Gilles was employed, and where the Messe was first performed after his death in 1705. It is possible, therefore, that the 1731 copy was made from the original, which is one reason this copy was used by Hajdu as the primary source for his modern edition of the work.\(^{67}\) A detailed comparison of this edition with the version performed at the Rameau memorial services will be carried out in Chapter 8.


\(^{67}\) Ibid., pp. xiv and xv.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Many studies of French baroque music focus either on the life and work of one composer, like that on André Campra,\(^1\) or on one particular feature of the period, such as the stage works in France known as *tragédies en musique*.\(^2\) Broader surveys of baroque music, such as those by Claude Palisca\(^3\) and Manfred Bukofzer,\(^4\) by their very nature do not have the space to provide detail about every facet of any one country’s musical history. The amount of material to be reviewed here, therefore, is relatively small, but it begins with what is available on Gilles, before moving on to his music.

The principal eighteenth-century source on the composer is *Memoires pour servir a l’histoire de plusieurs hommes illustres de Provence* by Père Bougerel. This book contains details of the lives of various famous Provençal men, and in the case of Gilles, the author’s sources are from Aix-en-Provence, where Gilles and Campra studied together, and from Toulouse, where they were both employed at different times, and where Gilles spent his final years.\(^5\) Bougerel also tells us that Campra commended Gilles to him one day and asked him not to omit Gilles from his work.\(^6\) Fortunately, Bougerel acted on this request and, as a result, we have some details of the composer’s life, together with a list of his works. There is, though, one detail

---

6. Ibid., p. 306, ‘M. Campra me fit un jour son éloge, et me pria ensuite de ne pas l’oublier dans mon ouvrage’.
which we now know is incorrect: Bougerel gives the year of Gilles’ birth as 1669, but it was actually 1668.\(^7\)

Another eighteenth-century writer had words of praise for Gilles: Pierre-Louis D’Aquin in *Lettres sur les Hommes Célèbres* says:

‘victime de la mort dans la fleur de son âge, nous fait regretter sa perte, par les morceaux qui nous reste de lui. Doué du génie le plus facile, peut-être aurait-il remplacé le fameux Lalande. Le *Diligam* de Gilles et sa *Messe des morts*, sont deux chef-d’œuvres.’

(the victim of death at the height of his talents, the works by him which are left to us make his loss regrettable. Endowed with the most effortless genius, perhaps he would have replaced the famous Lalande. His *Diligam* te and *Messe des morts* are two masterpieces.)\(^8\)

The music historian Sir John Hawkins wrote in his *General History of the Science and Practice of Music*, published originally in London in 1776, that there were many fine motets by Gilles, particularly *Diligam te*, and he refers to the *Messe des morts* as ‘his capital work’.\(^9\) However, Hawkins reports that the composer sang at the first performance; this would have been impossible, as the work was not performed until Gilles’ own funeral service! Hawkins may, though, have meant the rehearsal of the *Messe* mentioned in the story of the work’s commissioning, which will be related in Chapter 3, but as he does not give any source for his comment it is impossible to tell.

More recently two scholars have undertaken detailed studies of the composer. The first is John H. Hajdu, whose dissertation on the composer’s life and works not only contains biographical information, but also gives a complete list of Gilles’ works,

---

\(^7\) Bougerel, *Memoires*, p. 299, ‘Gilles naquit à Tarascon l’an 1669’.


both lost and surviving, together with details of the various manuscript sources.\textsuperscript{10} There is a comprehensive survey of the extant works, which includes considerations of form, harmony, rhythms and text settings. Many musical examples are provided, particularly from those works not published, and the final section comprises a transcription of the motet \textit{Diligam te, Domine}, an edition of which, edited by John Hajdu Heyer, as he is now known, has recently been published.\textsuperscript{11}

The second twentieth-century scholar to have studied Gilles is Michel Prada. His book, the only modern source in French, has the latest and most authoritative information on the composer’s life and works.\textsuperscript{12} It includes details of surviving manuscripts and the libraries which hold them, a thematic catalogue, the relationship between the music and the texts Gilles set, and a discussion of the compositions which ensured his posthumous fame, in particular \textit{Diligam te, Domine} and the \textit{Messe des morts}.

References to Gilles are also found in other modern sources. James Anthony’s well known study of baroque music in France mentions Gilles and his motets: Anthony attributes the success of the \textit{Messe des morts} to the melodic freshness and dance-like rhythms arising from the composer’s Provençal roots.\textsuperscript{13} Denise Launay’s book \textit{La musique religieuse en France du Concile de Trente à 1804}, is a study of composers, their works, form and style, all set against the religious and political background of the day. The references it contains to Gilles and his works are only brief, although

\textsuperscript{12} Michel Prada, \textit{Un maître de musique en Provence & en Languedoc: Jean GILLES (1668-1705), L’homme et l’œuvre} (Béziers: Société de Musicologie de Languedoc, 1986).
Launay includes the *Messe des morts* amongst works by several composers which she considers to be very skilfully written and full of inspiration.\(^{14}\)

Performances of Gilles’ works at the Concert Spirituel are listed by Constant Pierre in his history of this concert series, the final part of which comprises his reconstruction of the programmes from contemporary reports;\(^{15}\) many of those who performed at these concerts came either from the Opéra, the Royal Chapel or the main Paris churches.\(^{16}\) Pierre includes, where available, the names of soloists in addition to the works performed. His book also contains comprehensive information on those who directed the organisation, the performers and the development of the repertoire. The pieces most regularly programmed were motets by Michel-Richard de Lalande and Gilles: Lalande was a Court composer whose works were heard from the inaugural concert until 1770; two motets by Gilles, *Beatus quem elegisti* and *Diligam te, Domine*, were performed between 1726 and 1771. Development of the motet at Court, starting from Perrin’s texts, written in the 1660s, through to the compositions of Lalande has been charted by Lionel Sawkins in his contribution to the essays on Lully and the French baroque.\(^{17}\) Sawkins has also published a catalogue of the works of Lalande, whose motets continued to be performed in the Royal Chapel until 1792.\(^{18}\) Gilles’ motets will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The only composition by Gilles to be published in the eighteenth century was his *Messe des morts* in an edition by Michel Corrette, who added a *Carillon des morts* of


\(^{16}\) Anthony, *French Baroque Music*, pp. 36-37.

\(^{17}\) Lionel Sawkins, ‘Chronology and evolution of the *grand motet* at the court of Louis XIV: evidence from the *Livres du Roi* and the works of Perrin, the sous-maîtres and Lully’, in *Lully: Essays*, ed. by Hajdu Heyer, pp. 41-79.

his own.\textsuperscript{19} This addition is intended to imitate the bells at Rouen which are tolled for the dead, and which are ‘the saddest and most mournful in all Christendom’\textsuperscript{20}. The preface to the edition, though, contains inaccuracies; it gives Gilles’ date of death as 1689 (altered from 1680), at age 33, instead of the correct date of 1705, at age 37.\textsuperscript{21} Corrette also states that the Mass was often performed in Paris after the death of a notable person and had just been given in honour of Rameau; he concludes by claiming this edition is ‘as the composer wrote it’\textsuperscript{22}. This version is close to, but not identical to, the supposed original, so clearly it cannot be the same as that performed to honour Rameau, which was much altered for the occasion. The writer may, though, simply be saying that the work had recently been performed, but not necessarily that this was the version used.

As already noted in Chapter 1 (page 24), the edition of the \textit{Messe des morts} which does come as close as it can to the original composition, as far as it is possible to say in the absence of an autograph score, is one by John Hajdu, published complete with performing parts in 1984. This version is based principally on an early manuscript which may have been copied from the original, as it is dated at Toulouse in 1731.\textsuperscript{23} Further discussion of this will take place in the review of manuscripts in Chapter 4.

At one time it was thought that Campra and Gilles had collaborated on the composition of a \textit{Messe des morts}. This never was the case, however, as H.-A.

\textsuperscript{19} Gilles, \textit{Messe des morts: Avec un Carillon ajouté pour la fin de la Messe}, ed. by Michel Corrette (Paris, 1764).
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., title page, ‘Le sujet de ce Carillon est a l’imitation de la Sonnerie de Rouën, en usage pour les Trepassés, qui est la plus triste et la plus lugubre de toute la Chretienté’.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., preface, ‘...son décès...arriva vers l’an 1689, agé de 33 ans’.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., ‘Cette Messe s’est très souvent exécutée à Paris après la Mort de quelque grand personnage. On vient de l’entendre tout récemment aux Prestres de l’Oratoire, pour l’illustre M’. Rameau... On donne Cette Messe telle que l’Auteur la Composée’.
\textsuperscript{23} Gilles, \textit{Requiem}, ed. by Hajdu, pp. xiv and xv.
Durand makes clear in an article published in 1960. The author does, though, provide details of occasions when performances took place of a combination of some movements from the *Messe de Requiem* by Campra and some from the *Messe des morts* by Gilles. In the version performed at Aix-en-Provence on 24 April 1805 the Introit, the first part of the Graduel (‘Requiem’) and the Offertoire were by Gilles, and the Kyrie, the second part of the Graduel (from ‘In memoria’), the Sanctus, Agnus Dei and Post Communion were by Campra. On this occasion the instruments were ‘augmentée de Cors, Clarinettes, Bassons et Timbales’ (augmented by horns, clarinets, bassoons and kettledrums). This is especially interesting because the 1764 performances of the Gilles *Messe des morts* in Paris at the memorial services for Rameau had new parts for horns and kettledrums, and parts for bassoons which were more independent than those in earlier versions.

There are several modern recordings of Gilles’ *Messe des morts*: the two mentioned here are based on the manuscript thought to be closest to the composer’s original intentions. The first CD, issued by Polydor, also includes the *Carillon* by Corrette, which he had added to the *Messe* on publishing his edition mentioned above. The second, produced by Erato, includes parts for ‘tambours’ or drums. In the explanatory notes to the latter, Joel Cohen states that there was a tradition of drum participation in eighteenth-century performances of this work which is well documented. There was certainly a muffled drum part in the performances at the Rameau memorial services, and Corrette’s edition includes an instruction to sound

---

25 Ibid., p. 87. See also Prada, *Un maître de musique*, p. 63.
28 Joel Cohen, Sleeve notes for CD 2292-45989-2, p. 16.
the drum before starting the Introit. Cohen also refers to an ancient Provençal custom which involved the coffin of a notable person being carried around the town, accompanied by music, before being buried. Michel Vovelle mentions the custom in his book *Piété baroque et déchristianisation en Provence au XVIIIe siècle*, and we shall return to this question in the section on instruments in Part II.

Cohen believes that the rhythm of Gilles’ Introit gives the image of just such a funeral procession, and that the way the drums are used on the recording prolongs that effect. The disc also intersperses Gregorian chants with movements of the *Messe* according to their place in the liturgy; Cohen claims this gives an added dimension of spaciousness to the music. This may be how the *Messe* was performed on occasion, but there is no evidence to suggest the composer intended it to be heard in this way.

The Mass for the Dead, or Requiem Mass, has changed considerably over the centuries in form and content, and two historical studies describing this evolution have proved useful in the context of this research. The first, *Requiem: Music of Mourning and Consolation* by Alec Robertson, examines various compositions from the earliest times up to the twentieth century; the book also contains the full text of the Requiem, and a translation. The second is John Harper’s *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Analysis*.  

---

31 Cohen, Sleeve notes, p. 16.
32 Ibid., p. 16.
Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians, which fulfils exactly what is expected from its sub-title, and is a very useful reference work.\(^{34}\)

As already explained in the introduction to this thesis, through the traditional and conservative nature of the Court authorities only two Requiem settings, those by Eustache du Caurroy and Charles d’Helfer, had been used at royal funerals or commemorations over a period of one hundred and sixty-four years.\(^{35}\) Launay confirms that the Missa pro defunctis by du Caurroy was customarily used on such occasions;\(^{36}\) Sébastian de Brossard also annotated his collection, which went to the Royal library between 1724 and 1726, to the effect that this Mass was always used because it was the best.\(^{37}\) The Missa pro defunctis by Charles d’Helfer was first published in 1656, but Brossard added instrumental parts in 1688 and an unnamed editor made further alterations in 1729.\(^{38}\) An edition of the 1656 version was published in Paris by J.-C. Léon in 1991.\(^{39}\) More recently, however, a study of the work and its sources has been undertaken by Caroline Downs, whose thesis includes scholarly editions of all three versions; she has also examined the use of Roman and Parisian traditions.\(^{40}\) The question of differences between the Roman and Parisian missals in the wording of the Requiem Mass is the subject of an article by Michel Huglo;\(^{41}\) this matter will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.

\(^{36}\) Launay, *La musique religieuse*, p. 320, ‘la Missa pro defunctis de Du Caurroy... est, de tradition, chantée lors des obsèques royales’.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., p. 321, n. 82.
\(^{40}\) Downs, ‘Charles d’Helfer’s Missa pro defunctis’, pp. 16-19.
Chapter 3

Gilles’ life and works

As we have seen in the previous chapter, much valuable research on the life and works of Jean Gilles has already been carried out by John Hajdu Heyer\(^1\) and Michel Prada.\(^2\) Although this thesis will not add anything new to what is already known of the composer’s biography, a summary, based mainly on the work of these two scholars, is given below.

Jean Gilles was born in Tarascon, near Avignon, on 8 January 1668. He was the son of an illiterate labourer, but despite his humble origin he was sent to the choir school at the cathedral in Aix-en-Provence at the age of 7. His official enrolment did not take place until 6 May 1679, as there had been some doubts over his health when he first arrived. Gilles was taught by the *maître de musique* at the cathedral, Guillaume Poitevin, amongst whose other pupils at the time was André Campra. Poitevin also later taught Esprit-Joseph-Antoine Blanchard; all three pupils became famous, with both Campra and Blanchard eventually holding the position of *maître de la chapelle du Roy* at Versailles. Félix Raugel, in an article on the choir school at Aix-en-Provence, informs us that Italian motets by composers such as Cavalli, Carissimi and Alessandro Scarlatti were sung during Guillaume Poitevin’s time as *maître de musique*.\(^3\) Gilles would, therefore, have sung these in his time as a chorister there, so it is no surprise that his works have certain Italian characteristics.

Gilles was obviously talented and well taught because on 5 November 1688, at the request of his teacher, he and his fellow student Jacques Cabassol were appointed

\(^1\) Hajdu, ‘Life and Works’, pp. 20-63.
\(^2\) Prada, *Un maître de musique*, pp. 11-70.
jointly to the position of *sous-maître de musique* at Aix. When Poitevin retired on 4 May 1693 Gilles succeeded him. In April 1695, however, he suddenly left Aix to take up the position of *maître de musique* at Agde Cathedral.

Through his motet *Deus venerunt gentes*, composed for the opening of the Estates of Languedoc in 1697, Gilles came to the attention of the Bishop of Rieux, who wanted him to become *maître de musique* at the Cathedral of St Etienne in Toulouse. This post had been held by Campra between 1683 and 1694, when he left to go to Paris to take up a similar position at Notre-Dame. The post at Toulouse was filled temporarily until a successor to Campra, named Farinel, was appointed early in 1697. He, however, had vacated the post by November and Gilles became *maître de musique* on 18 December 1697. Roberte Machard informs us in her article on the musicians at Toulouse Cathedral that Gilles was asked to compose a motet before he was appointed to this post; we are not told, though, which motet it was.

In 1701 the duc de Bourgogne and the duc de Berry, grandsons of Louis XIV, visited Toulouse and attended a service at the cathedral, during which some music by Gilles was performed. The following morning the Princes returned to the cathedral and the *Mercure* report on the occasion states ‘They asked Gilles, the *maître de musique*, whose music they had already found to their liking, to provide singing during the Mass. Before their departure he received generous tokens of their appreciation’. It is not clear exactly how appreciation was shown but we do know that the Princes were pleased. They went on to visit other places, including Avignon, and their opinions,

---


5 *Mercure de France*, March 1701, p. 294. ‘Ils voulurent que Mr. Gillet, maître de musique de cette cathédrale, dont la musique avait déjà eu le bonheur de leur plaire, fist chanter pendant la messe. Il eut avant leur départ des marques de leur libéralitez.’
together with the *Mercure* report, must have helped the composer’s reputation to spread further afield. Officials of the Cathedral Chapter at Avignon were sufficiently persuaded by what they heard to invite Gilles to become maître de musique there. As noted on page 23, Gilles was not immediately available to take up the position and the Chapter appointed temporarily Jean-Philippe Rameau, then aged 19. Gilles did visit Avignon but whether he and Rameau ever met is not known, though this appears to be the only point in their lives at which they may have come into contact with one another. It would be interesting to know what their reactions would have been had they known that, years later, in Paris, Gilles’ *Messe* would be performed at public tributes for Rameau. If Gilles accepted the position in Avignon he later changed his mind, for he remained in Toulouse until his death on 5 February 1705 after a short illness.

Gilles, as far as we are aware, composed only sacred works. His best known are the motet *Diligam te, Domine*, and the *Messe des morts*. The first of the composer’s works known to have been performed in Paris, however, was *Beatus quem elegisti*; how this and the two previous compositions came to be heard in the capital is discussed later in this chapter. Other notable works, apart from the motet *Deus venerunt gentes* mentioned above, which is now lost, include a setting of the *Te Deum*, thought to have been written in 1697, and three settings of *Lamentations* for use in Holy Week. There are also two known Mass settings, one in D, which survives, and one in G, which is lost. Another setting in B flat, recently discovered in Brussels, may also be by Gilles.

---

8 I am grateful to Professor Graham Sadler for making me aware of this.
A complete list of both extant and lost works is given in Hajdu Heyer’s article on Gilles in the New Grove Dictionary.  

Through the posts Gilles had held at Aix-en-Provence, Agde and Toulouse, and through his compositions, he became well known and respected in the South of France. The invitation he received to go to Avignon gives us firm evidence of this. Even before his early death his reputation had begun to spread beyond the region, and the royal visit to Toulouse would have helped considerably in this respect, as the Dukes would, no doubt, have recounted the details of their progress to those at Court, including mention of Gilles, on their return to Versailles. In 1708, only three years after Gilles’ death, the _Mercure_ carries a report on the arrival of the Dowager Queen of Spain at Bayonne and this gives more details of the royal visit to Toulouse seven years earlier. We are told not only that Gilles’ _Diligam te_ was performed at Bayonne, but also that ‘this was one of the four works this well-known master had the honour of performing at Toulouse during the visit of the Duke of Burgundy and the Duke of Berry.’ We therefore know _Diligam te_ was performed on the earlier occasion and that it was considered worthy of repeating in the presence of royalty. It is also significant that Gilles is described as ‘this well-known master’; we can infer from this that his reputation had already spread to other parts of France, and in particular to Paris.

However, as far as we are aware, it was not until 1726 that a work by Gilles was performed in Paris. There are several factors which may help to explain why it took so long for this to happen. The most important of these is the influence of the Court, with its deeply rooted traditions and the regulations it imposed through institutions such as

---


10 _Mercure_, February 1708, p. 167. ‘Ce motet était un des quatre que ce maître fameux eut l’honneur de faire chanter à Toulouse, lorsque Monseigneur le duc de Bourgogne, et le duc de Berry y passèrent…’. Also cited by Prada, _Un maître de musique_, p. 41.
the Académie Royale de Musique, which was based at the Palais-Royal in Paris. Most of the works performed there, at Court, or in the Royal Chapel, were written by musicians either currently or previously in the service of the royal household. Gilles, of course, was not in this circle as his working life had been spent entirely in the South of France. To our knowledge he never even visited Paris, let alone worked there. It would, therefore, be highly unlikely for one of his compositions to be performed at a service in the Royal Chapel, or even in Paris. Yet we know that Gilles and his motets had found favour with the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry. Unfortunately, however, they both died young, in 1712 and 1714 respectively. Their grandfather, Louis XIV, died in 1715 and it is no surprise that changes to long established practices, such as selection of music for church services, continued in accordance with tradition as long as the King was still alive. Had the Duke of Burgundy lived long enough he would have succeeded to the throne on the death of his grandfather, and would then have been able to request works for performance in the Royal chapel. This would have opened the way for Gilles’ compositions but the opportunity was lost when the Duke died first, his young son then succeeding Louis XIV with Philip, duc d’Orléans, as Regent. The Regency continued until 1723, when Louis XV reached his majority.

A new development took place, however, in 1725. Anne Danican Philidor, son of André-Danican Philidor the elder, the music librarian at Versailles, obtained permission from the Académie Royale de Musique to establish the Concert Spirituel, already mentioned in Chapter 2 (page 28). This series was directed by Anne Danican Philidor in the Tuileries palace and concerts took place on days of religious observance when the Paris Opéra was closed; initially at least, music set to French words and
extracts from operas were not allowed in the programmes.\footnote{11} The choral items were therefore exclusively Latin motets on sacred texts, and these were interspersed with instrumental music to ensure some variety. This was a significant step for the development of orchestral music in France during the eighteenth century. It also provided an opportunity to select for performance works by composers such as Gilles which had not yet been heard in Paris. Philidor included the Gilles motet \textit{Beatus quem elegisti} on the programme for 2 February 1726.\footnote{12} It is not clear, though, why this particular motet was chosen, as we do not know how he knew the work or where he obtained a copy. Philidor had, however, been an \textit{ordinaire de la musique du roi} since 1698\footnote{13} and he may have heard and remembered what the Princes had reported following their visit to Toulouse. He had also assisted his father in the latter’s duties as Court music librarian and perhaps saw a copy of this motet whilst doing so. It may be, as Prada suggests,\footnote{14} that the Princes returned to Versailles with copies of the music they had heard on their travels. Prada does admit, however, that this is unlikely, as the copy of \textit{Beatus quem elegisti} which survives in Paris bears the later date of 1734. Moreover, the Versailles music library catalogue of 1765 does not include this motet, although \textit{Diligam te, Domine} and the \textit{Messe des morts} are listed.\footnote{15}

Another factor to consider is André Campra. He had known Gilles at Aix-en-Provence and had been invited to Toulouse whilst Gilles was there to take part in a rehearsal of the newly written \textit{Messe des morts}.\footnote{16} If he went, did he return to Paris with copies of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Ibid., p. 232 (no. 14).
\item[14] Prada, \textit{Un maître de musique}, p. 42.
\item[16] Labbet, \textit{Sentiment}, p. 15; for the French and a translation see the History of the \textit{Messe} below.
\end{footnotes}
Gilles’ works and pass one of Beatus quem elegisti to Philidor? Unfortunately there is no evidence to substantiate this. However, we must not forget that, although Campra had been concentrating on his theatrical career since 1700, in 1723 he was appointed sous-maître at the Royal Chapel. This would mean that he and Philidor would come into regular contact with one another in their daily working lives. We have already seen in Chapter 2 (page 25) that it was Campra who told Bougerel about Gilles and persuaded him not to omit Gilles from the book he was writing. This is today one of the principal sources of our information on Gilles. It is quite possible, then, that Campra persuaded Philidor to include one of Gilles’ compositions in a programme for one of his newly established series of concerts.

The next work of Gilles to be included in a Concert Spirituel programme was Diligam te, Domine on 1 November 1731. It then remained in the repertory there until 1771, making it the work which was performed over the longest period of time, with the exception of the motets of Lalande. When the first Paris performance took place the Concert Spirituel’s director was Jean-Joseph Mouret, who had taken over from Philidor in 1728. Mouret was born in Avignon and had been trained at the Cathedral there. It is almost certain, therefore, that he would have been familiar with Gilles and his work. He may even have met or seen Gilles when the latter was in Avignon. Prada suggests that Mouret asked for a copy of Diligam te, Domine to broaden the repertoire of the Concert Spirituel. Two pieces of evidence provide strong support for this suggestion. Firstly, according to Élisabeth Lebeau, a copy of this motet now at the Bibliothèque nationale under shelf mark F-Pn Vm1. 1345 was formerly in the library

---

17 Bougerel, Memoires, p. 306; for the French see Chapter 2, note 6.
18 Pierre, Histoire, p. 241 (no. 162).
19 Ibid., p. 299 (no. 881).
20 Prada, Un maître de musique, p. 58.
of the Concert Spirituel; and secondly, Hajdu reports that the same copy was completed by the scribe Duprat in Toulouse at 2.00am on 17 May 1731, six months before the Concert Spirituel performance. The reason for making the copy may, therefore, have been a request from Mouret. Even more interesting in this connection is that this copy of Diligam te, Domine and one of the early copies of the Messe des morts at the Bibliothèque nationale are bound together, the Messe being numbered F-Pn Vm1. 1345 bis; moreover, this copy of the Messe was completed at 10.00pm four days after the copy of the motet had been finished. It is highly likely, therefore, that these two compositions arrived in Paris at the same time, a point which will be considered further towards the end of this chapter.

History of Gilles’ Messe des morts to 1764

The information in Sentiment d’un Harmoniphile about the regular use of the Messe has already been mentioned in Chapter 1. The book’s author, now thought to be Marc-Antoine Laugier, also reveals how the Messe was commissioned:

‘Deux Conseillers au Parlement de cette Ville [Toulouse] moururent à peu de distance l’un de l’autre. Ils laissèrent chacun un fils....ils [les fils] convinrent entr’eux de se joindre pour faire à leur peres un superbe Service....ils allèrent trouver Gilles...ils l’engagerent à composer une nouvelle Messe de Requiem...Gilles demanda six mois; ce tems lui fut accordé...

Gilles ayant fini de composer sa Messe, rassembla tous les Musiciens de la Ville, pour en faire la répétition; il y invita les meilleurs Maîtres de Musique des environs, entr’autres Campra, et l’Abbé Madin....Ceux qui l’avoient commandée ne furent pas oubliés....Mais...les deux jeunes Conseillers...changerent d’avis et se dédirent. Gilles en fut si piqué, qu’il sécria Eh bien! Elle ne sera execute pour personne, et j’en veux avoir l’étrenne.’

---

22 Gilles, Requiem, ed. by Hajdu, p. xiv.
23 Ibid., p. xiv.
Two Parliamentary Councillors in Toulouse died within a short space of time, each leaving a son. The sons asked Gilles to write a work for an impressive service to commemorate their fathers, and it was agreed that he would be allowed six months to complete it. Gilles, having completed the *Messe*, assembled all of the town’s musicians for a rehearsal; the best Maîtres de Musique from the district were invited, including Campra and the Abbé Madin. Those who had commissioned the work were not forgotten, but... the young men changed their minds and backed out. Gilles was so upset that he exclaimed ‘Very well! It will not be performed for anyone else, and I wish to have first use of it.’

After the composer’s early death in 1705, when the *Messe* was indeed used for the first time, the next performance of which we are aware took place in Bordeaux in 1716 to commemorate Louis XIV, whose death had occurred the previous autumn. The manuscript of the *Messe des morts* in the library there contains a *Libera me, Domine* section to which is added the note ‘fait pour le service de Louis-le-Grand, par l’Académie royale des Belles-Lettres... Sciences et Arts à Bourdeaux, le 28 janvier 1716’ (prepared for the service for Louis the Great by the Royal Academy of Literature, Science and the Arts at Bordeaux on 28 January 1716). Whether this means that just the *Libera me* was performed or that the *Messe* and this additional section received a performance is not clear. Hajdu Heyer, in his preface to the new edition of *Diligam te, Domine* goes so far as to say that the *Messe* was performed. One possibility is that the *Libera me* section was specially composed for the occasion, or it may have been a contrafactum of another work, even a hitherto unrecognised work by Gilles himself which is now lost. Whichever of these is the case the most likely explanation would seem to be that the *Libera me* was included with the *Messe* for that specific performance. If that is so, it gives another composition by Gilles a link to royalty, and the first such link for the *Messe des morts* of which we are aware. Indeed,

---

this would be the first known performance of the work after its use at Gilles’ own funeral in 1705. It also provides a further example of the high regard in which his works were held.

The next performance of the *Messe des morts* of which we have a record took place in Grenoble, capital of the Dauphiné region, whose governor was the duc d’Orléans,26 son of the former Regent who had died in 1723. Grenoble was one of many towns and cities which were beginning to bring together musicians to form an organisation called the ‘concert’ or ‘académie’. The performers were paid from subscriptions or public funds to give regular concerts and to celebrate special occasions, both local and national. The origins of the ‘concert’ in Grenoble can be traced to 1724, when two concerts a week were being held in the Town Hall and ‘the musicians of the Académie played for the ball held in the public gardens during the festivities organised to celebrate the marriage of the duc d’Orléans’.27 Unfortunately, the marriage only lasted until 8 August 1726, when the duchesse d’Orléans died, a few days after giving birth to a daughter.28 The Gazette d’Amsterdam later reported that a performance of Gilles’ *Messe des morts* took place on 23 August. Mattheson, quoting from this source, says ‘the Royal Academy of Music … performed the funeral music or Mass for the Dead composed by M. Gilly, which is considered to be one of the most beautiful works of music, and performed it to the utmost perfection as part of the obsequies to commemorate the most blessed Duchess of Orleans.’29 The sad occasion gives another

---

27 Ibid., p. 8, citing Archives communales Grenoble, BB124, ‘…les musiciens de l’Académie jouent pendant le bal donné dans le jardin de ville à l’occasion des fêtes organisées pour célébrer le mariage du Duc d’Orléans.’
example of the use of the *Messe des morts* in connection with a member of the royal family, although in both instances the performances took place away from Paris. The reports of the events also provide the first documentary evidence that Gilles’ reputation had spread beyond France.

Further performances of the *Requiem* are reported in 1727, 1730 and 1731, the first in Bordeaux and the other two in Lyon. The performance in Bordeaux was to honour a member of the nobility, the duc de la Force. The first of the Lyon performances was for an individual who had been in high office, the maréchal de Villeroy, and the second may have been in connection with the closure of a church. Outside Paris, therefore, the *Messe des morts* had been used on several occasions in the twenty-five or so years since Gilles’ death. A list of these and other performances can be seen in Appendix 1.

The *Messe des morts* did not receive its first performance at the Concert Spirituel until 1 November 1750.  

---

31 Ibid., p. 101, ‘Ils [Royer et Capperan] choisirent le Beatus quem elegisti et la célèbre Messe des morts (1749)’, (They chose *Beatus quem elegisti* and the well known *Messe des morts* (1749)). Although *Beatus quem elegisti* is listed in the programmes twice in 1749 (p. 256, nos. 386 & 388) the *Messe des morts* was not performed until the following year. See also note 50.
34 Prada, *Un maître de musique*, p. 173, ‘…la première exécution de cette œuvre au Concert Spirituel, le 1er novembre 1750’.
performed there [the Concert Spirituel] on 1 November 1750’. From all this information we gain the impression that the complete work was performed. However, Prada does refer to performances of extracts of the *Messe des morts* in the key to his table of Gilles’ works performed at the Concert Spirituel, and there is evidence to suggest that only the Introit was performed on 1 November 1750.

The *Mercure* report of the concert tells us that the first item in the programme was ‘followed by *Requiem aeternam*, the famous ‘motet à grand chœur’ by the late M. Gilles, to which M. Royer had made a large number of agreeable changes; M. Daquin, organiste du Roi, then added a solo carillon’. This shows that, even by this date, the work had been edited and a carillon added. It also suggests, by using the first words of the Introit, ‘Requiem aeternam’, that only this section was performed. A later example helps to shed a little more light on this. After the performance on 11 April 1754 the *Mercure* report describes the work as ‘*Requiem aeternam*…tiré de la *Messe des morts* de M. Gilles’ (*Requiem aeternam*…taken from the *Messe des morts* by M. Gilles). There seems no room to doubt that, on this occasion, only the Introit was performed.

As the words ‘Requiem aeternam’ are used in both reports it adds weight to the possibility that the performance on 1 November 1750 also consisted of the Introit only.

The *Mercure* report of the performance on 2 November 1750 again calls the work *Requiem aeternam*, so it seems likely that on this day too just the Introit was performed.

---

36 Prada, *Un maître de musique*, p. 177, ‘Exécution de la *Messe des morts* (ou d’exraits)’.
37 *Mercure*, December 1750, I, p. 164. ‘ensuite *Requiem aeternam*, célèbre motet à grand chœur de feu M. Gilles, dans lequel M. Royer avoit fait grand nombre de changements agréables : M. Daquin, organiste du Roi, y joua seul un carillon’.
38 Ibid., May 1754, p. 184.
39 Ibid., December 1750, I, p. 165, ‘Le concert finit par *Requiem aeternam* de feu M. Gilles’ (The concert finished with the *Requiem aeternam* by the late M. Gilles).
There are two further instances when the work is described in the same way. The first occurs in the report of the concert on 1 November 1757 when the *Mercure* refers to ‘*Requiem aeternam, Messe* de Gilles, où Mademoiselle Sixte chanta’\(^{40}\) (*Requiem aeternam*, Mass by Gilles, in which Mlle Sixte sang). Although this does not quite say that the Introit, taken from Gilles’ mass, was sung, that is the most likely interpretation. The naming of one soloist may also suggest only an extract was performed, as the complete *Messe*, in its earliest known form, includes four solo parts, although even the Introit has parts for three solo voices. On the other hand, it may be that more soloists took part, but only Mlle Sixte was mentioned because she was the most famous. The next occasion on which the *Mercure* reports a performance of *Requiem aeternam* is for the concert which took place on 1 November 1770. In this case the report adds ‘tiré de la messe de Gilles’ (taken from Gilles’ mass), which again leaves us in no doubt that only the Introit was performed. It is particularly interesting here that Pierre, in his programme listings for this date, simply says ‘*Requiem de la Messe*, Gilles’ (*Requiem* from the *Mass*, Gilles), rather than *Requiem aeternam*, as in the *Mercure*.\(^{41}\) This is also the case for the performance on 2 November 1750.\(^{42}\) Does this indicate that when he and the *Mercure* refer on other occasions to *Requiem*, for example 8 April 1751\(^{43}\) and 1 November 1755,\(^{44}\) they mean *Requiem aeternam*, i.e. Introit only? It seems very likely. When the description *Messe des morts* is used, as on 8 April 1757\(^{45}\) or *Messe* on 4 April 1762,\(^{46}\) a performance of the complete work is suggested. The difference between these terms may, therefore, be significant, as

\(^{40}\) *Mercure*, December 1757, p. 188.


Requiem probably indicates a performance of just the Introit, and Messe des morts, or Messe, a performance of the whole work. One more clue in this respect is provided by Pierre and the Mercure.

The concert on 9 May 1751, which incidentally included Beatus quem elegisti by Gilles, concluded with the De profundis by Mondonville ‘auquel on a ajouté le Gloria Patri du meme à la place du Requiem’ (to which had been added the same composer’s Glory be to the Father in place of the Requiem).\textsuperscript{47} De profundis (Out of the deep) is a setting of Psalm 129 (130) to which was added at a burial or memorial service, in place of the Gloria, the sentence ‘Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine; et lux perpetua luceat eis’ (Grant unto them, O Lord, eternal rest; and let light perpetual shine upon them). When Pierre and the Mercure say in this case ‘the Requiem’ they mean this sentence and, therefore, when they use the word Requiem in connection with Gilles’ composition they probably mean the Introit, which contains these words, rather than the complete work.

There is one final point to bear in mind. The term Requiem today tends to be used to refer to a complete work because we know compositions by Brahms, Verdi and Fauré which use that title. Gilles’ composition is called Messe des morts and the story of the commissioning of the work in Sentiment d’un Harmoniphile quoted above refers to it as that, or as Messe de Requiem, or Messe, but never simply Requiem.\textsuperscript{48} Marc-Antoine Charpentier wrote two Masses for the dead called Messe des morts as well as one entitled Messe pour les Trépassés. Campra called his work Messe de Requiem and composers such as du Caurroy, d’Helfer and Giroust used the Latin title Missa pro defunctis. Taking all this evidence into account it seems likely that when contemporary reports mention Requiem they refer to the words Requiem aeternam and, therefore, the

\textsuperscript{47} Pierre, Histoire, p. 260 (no. 444), Mercure, June 1751, I, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{48} Labbet, Sentiment, pp. 14-15.
Introit of a Mass and not the complete work. If that is so, it would mean that the first full performance of Gilles’ *Messe des morts* at the Concert Spirituel did not take place until 8 April 1757. This of course was after the performance at Royer’s memorial service on 14 January 1756 and yet, in describing this event *Sentiment* says, as already stated in Chapter 1, ‘Of all Requiem Masses, that by Gilles has always been regarded as the best’, and ‘There is now hardly any funeral service with music at which the Gilles Mass is not performed’. ⁴⁹ Both these comments would suggest that the *Messe des morts* had been heard regularly in Paris, in full, before January 1756. The details of when and where performances took place however are not available to us. We do know though that, in addition to the Concert Spirituel performances, the *Messe* was used at a memorial service for the writer Crébillon on 6 July 1762 before being selected for Rameau’s commemoration in 1764.

In order to establish whether or not the complete work was performed on 1 November 1750 the manuscript probably used on that occasion, which is still held at the Bibliothèque nationale under catalogue number *F-Pc* D.10449, has been consulted, and it does comprise the Introit only. Royer’s changes will be discussed in the next chapter.

If the theory mentioned above, that a copy of the *Messe des morts* had been in the Concert Spirituel library since the second half of 1731, is correct, it seems strange that, despite performances elsewhere, no part of it was performed in Paris until 1750. Perhaps the *Messe* was overlooked because it was the second item in the manuscript, behind the motet *Diligam te, Domine*. Pierre tells us, though, that in 1749 the directors of the Concert Spirituel, Royer and Gabriel Capperan, looked for other works by Gilles to perform, and chose *Beatus quem elegisti* and the well known *Messe des morts*. ⁵⁰ The

---

⁴⁹ Labbet, *Sentiment*, p. 14 and pp. 15-16; the French for these comments is given in Chapter 1, notes 41 and 40.

motet *Beatus quem elegisti* was then performed in that year (twice) for the first time since 1726, and Royer adapted the Introit of the *Messe* for the performances in 1750. This decision to bring these compositions out of the library may, therefore, have been prompted by Gilles’ growing reputation, or the directors may have heard about the *Messe* or attended a performance of it.

After the death of Royer in 1755, his widow became joint director of the Concert Spirituel with Capperan, but they brought in Jean-Joseph Cassanéa de Mondonville to supervise musical matters. Mondonville was another musician who had been brought up and trained in the South of France, and he would no doubt have known of Gilles and his works, which continued to appear on the programmes of the Concert Spirituel. It is conceivable, therefore, that Mondonville suggested to Royer’s widow that it would be appropriate to use Gilles’ *Messe des morts*, including her late husband’s arrangement of the Introit, at the memorial service for Royer in 1756; it was, of course, Mondonville who directed the performers on that occasion. In the following year, with Mondonville still in charge at the Concert Spirituel, the *Messe* was performed again on 8 April; this may have been, as already suggested, the first occasion on which the work had been heard complete at that series.

The influence which Royer and Mondonville had on the continuing use of the *Messe des morts* may, therefore, have been significant.

---


32 Prada, *Un maître de musique*, p. 172, ‘...en 1755, Jean-Joseph Cassanea de Mondonville, autre occitan, ...décida de ne point les [des œuvres de notre compositeur] enlever de l’affiche’.

33 Labbet, *Sentiment*, p. 19, ‘Les Musiciens de la Chapelle du Roi se sont joints à ceux de l’Opera, pour rendre à Royer les honneurs funèbres. M. Mondonville...étoit à leur tête’.
Chapter 4

Manuscripts

Several eighteenth-century manuscript copies of Gilles’ *Messe des morts* survive; a summary of them is given here, even though not all are directly relevant to the present study. Those at the Bibliothèque nationale de France (henceforward BnF) in Paris are listed below in table 4.1; there is also one copy at each of the following libraries (with shelf marks quoted, where known): the Bibliothèque Méjanes in Aix-en-Provence, the Bibliothèque municipale in Bordeaux (fonds patrimoniaux, Ms. 628/1, MIC 318/319), the Bibliothèque Inguimbertine in Carpentras (Ms. 1022), the Library of Congress, Washington D.C. (M 2020. M 65. Case), and the Staatsbibliothek Preussische Kulturbesitz in Berlin. Both Hajdu and Prada provide brief details of most of these manuscripts.\(^1\) Prada also indicates that there are copies of the edition published by Corrette, discussed in Chapter 2, at both the Bibliothèque municipale in Avignon (fol. 2034) and the British Library in London.\(^2\) However, there are two manuscripts now catalogued at the BnF which neither author mentions. These are *F-Pn Rés Vma ms 1282* and *F-Pc L. 17986 (A-B)*, both included in table 4.1, the second of which proved unexpectedly interesting in the context of the present research, as we shall see.

Another copy of the *Messe* on which Hajdu and Prada make no comment is at the Royal Music Conservatoire in Brussels, numbered *B-Bc Litt D no 34,017*. Although this manuscript does not have any direct bearing on the Rameau commemorations it is discussed below because it casts light on liturgical matters that are relevant to this study.

---

\(^1\) Hajdu, *Life and Works*, pp. 43-58; Prada, *Un maître de musique*, pp. 61-64.

\(^2\) Prada, *Un maître de musique*, p. 64. The British Library shelf mark (not quoted by Prada) is K.5.c.15.
Table 4.1 - Copies of the *Messe des morts* by Gilles held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pn</em> Vm1.1345 bis</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Primary source of Hajdu’s edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> Rés Ms 8337</td>
<td>[1710-1730]</td>
<td>Early copy in a binding showing the Arms of Brancas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> D. 4651</td>
<td>[1720-1740]</td>
<td>An early copy with additional concluding sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pn</em> Rés Vma ms 1282</td>
<td>[1746-1755]</td>
<td>A set of parts, including muffled drums, not mentioned by Hajdu or Prada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> D. 10449</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Introit of the <em>Messe</em> with revisions by Royer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pn</em> Vm1.950</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Secondary source consulted by Hajdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> L. 4311</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Score which may have been used at the Concert Spirituel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> H. 486 (a-u)</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Set of parts for the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> L. 4310</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Score possibly used at Crébillon’s memorial service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> D. 11135</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Score used at Rameau’s memorial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> H. 494 (A-B)</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Set of parts for the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> L. 17986 (A-B)</td>
<td>1762-1764</td>
<td>Set of parts not mentioned by Hajdu or Prada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> Rés F. 1033</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Corrette’s published edition, also consulted by Hajdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pc</em> D. 10448</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Copy of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pn</em> Vmg 6922</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Choral score edited by Abbé Jean Prim and Laurence Boulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F-Pn</em> G. 10640</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Copy of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the Paris manuscripts has been carried out here because, by 1764, the revision of works by the Opéra editors, who were in charge of the Rameau commemoration, was not an isolated phenomenon. In Lois Rosow’s article on this practice, she states that what began in a modest way in the first half of the eighteenth century became more extensive from the mid-1750s.\(^3\) In order to establish whether or not the *Messe* was subjected to successive revisions at each performance, in the same way that contemporary operas were treated at each revival, pre-1764 manuscripts have been examined to ascertain whether, and to what extent, alterations made to them were carried forward to *F-Pc* D. 11135, the score used at Rameau’s memorial services.

---

Vm1.1345 bis and Vm1.950

These are the principal sources Hajdu used for his edition of the *Messe des morts.*

Both manuscripts were copied in Toulouse, the first possibly from the autograph score which, as already noted in Chapters 1 and 2, no longer survives. Hajdu’s aim was to produce a version as close as possible to Gilles’ original, and he therefore took no account of later, altered versions, although he did consult *F*-Pc Rés F. 1033, which will be discussed below. His other sources were the copies in Aix-en-Provence and Washington, D.C. Hajdu’s desire for authenticity makes his edition of the *Messe* the most reliable version available. It is, therefore, the reference point which has been used when comparing later scores with the ‘original’ composition.

Rés Ms 8337

This is an early eighteenth-century copy in a binding displaying the coat of arms of Louis de Brancas de Forcalquier, marquis de Céreste, known as de Brancas (1672-1750). He was the father of Archbishop de Brancas, at whose funeral in Aix-en-Provence in 1770 Gilles’ *Messe* was sung. The score used on that occasion is probably the one preserved in the Aix Cathedral collection now housed at the Bibliothèque Méjanes, the municipal library in Aix-en-Provence.

D. 4651

This manuscript, headed ‘Messe de Gilles’, appears to be an early copy, the dates suggested by the BnF being 1720-1740. The noticeable differences between this and other scores come towards the end of the work. In the Communion section, after the *basse* solo, this copy marks as ‘Quinque’ the five-voice ‘Requiem aeternam’ section, which in other copies is marked ‘Chœur’. Then, to conclude, there are two additional

---

5 Prada, *Un maître de musique*, pp. 58 and 63.
short sections, *O Christe* by Mr. Affrodise and *De profundis*, which is anonymous. This provides an early example of Gilles’ *Messe* being performed with other items.⁶

**Rés Vma ms 1282**

This is one of the sources not mentioned by either Hajdu or Prada. It is a set of parts, most of which are headed *Messe de feu M. gille*, and the date estimated for them by the BnF is between 1746 and 1755. The set includes a part for ‘Tambours Voilé’ [sic] (muffled drums) which has only thirty-four bars for the Introit, and as a result it appears to be incomplete. It is, though, the same length as the orchestral passage which opens the *Messe* and leads to the first vocal solo entry at bar 35. Curiously, although the part is headed ‘Tambours’ (side drums), written pitches of *f* and *c* are shown, suggesting that tuned drums are required. This would provide a considerably earlier example of the use of ‘Timbales’ (kettledrums) than that for the Rameau commemoration in 1764. However, a comparison of the part with Hajdu’s edition of the Introit reveals one or two pitch clashes between part and score; for example a *c* is written in the part at bar 11, and again at bar 26, where there is a B flat major triad in the score. If *timbales* had been used, therefore, alterations to the part would have been necessary. Perhaps, then, the heading ‘Tambours’ (in the plural) indicates the need for two side drums, but each one a different size, with the larger one producing a deeper tone. In that case the pitches specified in the part would simply have been a convenient way of indicating which drum should be struck. The written rhythm would not have been out of place, particularly as the second beat of the bar often has the sequence of dotted quaver and semiquaver which is such a feature of the Introit. In all likelihood, therefore, this part was intended for side drums and must have been written specially for the opening bars of the *Messe*. Perhaps it was added to the set after Rameau’s first

---

⁶ Further examples are given later in this chapter, and the *Libera me* performed in Bordeaux is discussed in Chapter 7.
use of ‘tambours voilés’ in his overtures to Zaïs and Naïs in 1748 and 1749 respectively (see also page 249). This would support the suggested dating of the parts by the BnF and it provides another example of the early use of side drums in an orchestral setting.

**D. 10449**

This manuscript contains revisions thought to have been carried out by the composer Joseph-Nicolas-Pancrace Royer. It is believed to have been used for the performance at the Concert Spirituel, of which Royer was a director, on 1 November 1750.

The title page reads:

*Requiem*

*tiré de la messe*

*des morts de gilles.*

On page 1, reproduced as figure 4.1 below, is the fuller heading *Requiem Æternam / Motet a Grand Chœur / Tiré De La Messe Des morts de M. Gilles* (Requiem Æternam, *Motet à Grand Chœur*, Taken from the Messe des morts by Gilles). The title, the description ‘motet’, and the additional information tell us that this must be the Introit only, as noted earlier (page 47). Royer’s considerable number of alterations include cuts, revisions of the existing composition and insertions of new material; some of the ideas used appear again in manuscript F-Pc D. 11135, the 1764 score. It is significant,

---

7 *Mercure*, December 1750, I, p. 164. ‘*Requiem aeternam*, célèbre motet à grand chœur de feu M. Gilles, dans lequel M. Royer a voit fait grand nombre de changements agréables’ (*Requiem aeternam*, the famous *motet à grand chœur* by the late M. Gilles, to which M. Royer has made a large number of agreeable changes).

therefore, that the editors of this later version have adopted some features which can be traced back as far as 1750. This is not altogether surprising, perhaps, as Royer’s version may have been performed at the Concert Spirituel on at least two occasions between these dates, i.e. 11 April 1754 and 1 November 1757. The Opéra directors and many of the performers would, therefore, have been familiar with it. This version must also have been used at Royer’s own memorial service in 1756, when musicians from both the Royal chapel and the Paris Opéra took part. If Royer made alterations to other movements of the Messe they have not survived, but if he altered only the Introit the other movements may have been performed at his memorial service in their original version.

Michel Brenet believes that, as Royer made alterations to the Requiem, he may have been the famous composer who, the previous year, had enriched part of Gilles’ Te decet with ‘several excellent additions’. Brenet must be referring to Beatus quem elegisti which, Pierre confirms, was performed twice at the Concert Spirituel in 1749: on 11 April it is described as a ‘motet taken from the psalm Te decet’, and on 15 May the phrase ‘enriched with several extracts by some famous composers’ appears after the title.

Royer’s alterations to the Messe begin at the very outset of the work (shown in figure 4.1 below) with an opening in unison, which contrasts with the harmony of the earlier manuscripts. Then, in the sixth bar, the theme in the violins has been reduced to only

---

9 See Appendix 1, and Pierre, Histoire, p. 267 (no. 513) and p. 274 (no. 599).
one semibreve where in earlier versions there are two bars with semibreves tied
together above the same accompaniment in each bar. This cut of one bar is also found
later in the soloist’s part, which Royer has scored for basse-taille instead of taille.

Figure 4.1 - Manuscript F-Pc D. 10449, page 1 (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)

There are two possible reasons for the cut. At the point where it is made in the voice
part the soloist is singing the syllable ‘ter’ from ‘æternam’ (eternal). As we shall see in
Chapter 8, the composer probably intended the tied semibreves to signify eternity, but
perhaps Royer disliked such word-painting. Alternatively, Royer may have seen the opportunity to make a straightforward cut knowing that he would take opportunities to add his own music at various points later in the movement.

The next alteration is on the middle stave of page 1 (figure 4.1, system 2). At bars 13 and 14 the passage in C major, marked ‘Doux’, with the same rhythm as that of the opening bars, is a replacement for bars 14-24 of Gilles’ Introit. Royer also replaces bars 52-54 of the original with a one bar insert of similar rhythm, and at bar 66 he inserts a repeat of the opening rhythm which is also absent from Gilles’ original. The chorus ‘Et lux perpetua’, which consists of 55 bars in Hajdu’s edition, is more than doubled in length by Royer to 117 bars, through further development of the existing material.

The ‘Te decet’ section of the Royer manuscript begins with a new eleven-bar passage for violins and flutes, then the dessus soloist enters, unaccompanied for one bar, but continues with string and flute accompaniment. In the version presented by Hajdu the soloist begins this section alone and the continuo enters after one bar, but with no other accompanying instruments. Royer later adds four new bars between Hajdu’s bars 173 and 174 and he goes on to vary and extend the solo by nine bars. Subsequently nine bars are cut from the prelude to ‘Et tibi redetur’. The real interest of this prelude, though, lies in Royer’s rearrangement of the instruments. He allocates the theme, previously played by the violins, to the bassoons, or, according to an annotation on the manuscript, to the ‘B^on. Recitant’, which suggests a solo player. The customary role of the bassoons was to double other basse continue instruments, but here the role is more independent. Two further cuts and replacements are made by Royer in the ‘Et tibi’ section; he substitutes Gilles’ interlude between the solo and duo with four bars of his own and replaces the last 16 bars of the duo with a 40 bar extension. The following
chorus ‘Exaudi’ is then shortened by two cuts totalling 21 bars and insertions of a total of five bars, details of which appear below in table 4.2.

The repeat of the opening begins with only two bars, not four (see figure 4.2). Royer then converts what had originally been the repeat of the solo ‘Requiem aeternam’ into a strikingly powerful unison line for the *hautes-contre, tailles* and *basses-tailles* of the choir, at the same time reducing the length of the passage from thirty bars to eight.

Royer also cuts from the repeat the Duo, ‘Et lux perpetua’, and its instrumental prelude, which were bars 66-106 in the Hajdu edition of the Gilles. Meanwhile, the long extension which Royer added to the following chorus is repeated in full.

**Figure 4.2 - Manuscript F-Pc D. 10449, page 34** (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
An annotation written on page 32 of the Royer manuscript at the end of the chorus ‘Exaudi’, and immediately before the repeat of the opening, reads:

Quand on execute ce motet en concert on fait entrer icy un carillon des morts en fa qui se dit par l’orgue ou par la simphonie, il y en a un dans le messe de gilles imprimée

Mais si, c’est a une basse messe qu’on execute ce motet, on n’y fait entrer le carillon qu’autant que le motet seroit trop court.

(When this motet is performed at a concert a ‘carillon des morts’ in F can be added here; this may be played either on the organ or by the instruments. There is one of these in the published Gilles Messe. However, if this motet is being performed at a low Mass, the carillon should be inserted only if the motet would otherwise be too short.)

The reference to a published copy of the Gilles Messe must be to the edition produced by Michel Corrette in 1764, the only version of the work published in the eighteenth century. It follows that this annotation must have been added to the Royer manuscript after publication of the Corrette edition, and perhaps before 1 November 1770, when the manuscript was probably used again for the performance at the Concert Spirituel.13

The annotation may also indicate that this is the point at which the carillon performed on 1 November 1750 was played (see page 44). Corrette, though, has placed his carillon at the end of his 1764 edition. For the Rameau commemoration no carillon is known to have been played.

Through all the alterations described, Royer cut nearly 150 bars from the original Introit and added just over 200 bars of his own music. Full details are given below in table 4.2. This also shows the 1750 revisions which were carried forward to the 1764 manuscript; where Royer’s alterations were not used again in 1764 no comment is made in the right hand column. Remarks on differences between the two manuscripts follow the table.

13 Pierre, Histoire, p. 298 (no. 875).
Table 4.2 - Comparison of the Introit in three versions of Gilles’ *Messe des morts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time signature</td>
<td>(\text{c})</td>
<td>(\text{c})</td>
<td>(\text{c})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 1 Harmony</td>
<td>Bar 1 Unison</td>
<td>Bar 1 Timbales solo, Bar 2 other instruments Unison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic line</td>
<td>Bars 6–7 two semibreves</td>
<td>One semibreve (bar 6)</td>
<td>One semibreve (bar 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo ‘Requiem’</td>
<td>C4 clef, Taille Bars 36–37 two semibreves</td>
<td>Bass clef, BT, with first and fourth bars unaccompanied One semibreve (bar 26) Bars 52–54 of H replaced by one-bar insert New two-bar insert after bar 65 of H</td>
<td>Treble clef, Dessus, but solo part written for BT One semibreve (bar 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>55 bars (107-161)</td>
<td>Varied and extended to 117 bars</td>
<td>55 bars (95-149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Te decet’</td>
<td>Begins with Dessus solo, first bar unaccompanied, then with continuo</td>
<td>Begins with new 11 bar introduction for violons and flûtes, then Dessus soloist is accompanied after one bar by those instruments New four-bar insert between bars 173 and 174 of H From bar 180 of H solo varied and extended by nine bars</td>
<td>Begins with five-bar hautbois solo with continuo, then Dessus soloist is accompanied by those instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude to ‘Et tibi’</td>
<td>Melody in Violon</td>
<td>Melody in Basson Bars 190-198 of H cut</td>
<td>Melody in Basson Bars 190-202 of H replaced by four-bar insert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Et tibi’</td>
<td>Instrumental interlude between Solo and Duo (bars 226-244)</td>
<td>Bars 226-244 of H replaced with four-bar introduction to Duo Bars 251-266 of H replaced by extending Duo by 40 bars</td>
<td>Bars 226-244 of H cut Bars 264-265 of H cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus ‘Exaudi’</td>
<td>Bars 274-277 of H replaced by two new instrumental bars Bars 282-298 of H replaced by three bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>Bars 305-306 of H cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo ‘Requiem’</td>
<td>C4 clef, Taille</td>
<td>Chœur HC, T and BT, but cut from thirty to eight bars (Bars 44–65 of H omitted) Bars 66-106 of H cut</td>
<td>Treble clef, Dessus, but part for BT cut to twelve bars (Bars 44–60 of H omitted) Bars 66-106 of H cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>55 bars (107-161)</td>
<td>117 bars repeated in full</td>
<td>55 bars (95-149)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first three of Royer’s 1750 revisions shown in table 4.2 were all included in the 1764 score. With the second revision, though, another feature was added, an extra bar for *timbales voilées* at the beginning. Royer’s cut of bars 14-24 of the Hajdu edition made in 1750 is not adopted in its entirety in 1764, nor is his two bar replacement used again, but it is noticeable that part of the same passage was cut on both occasions. The change of the ‘Requiem’ solo from *taille* to *basse-taille* in 1750 led to revision of the melodic line at two points where the original pitch would have been too high for the lower voice. In 1764 the score reverts to the original line, although now in the treble clef, and the soloist’s part shows not only the original line, transposed up one octave, but also alternative lines very similar to those from 1750. It would appear, though, that the alternatives were sung by a *basse-taille* in 1764, a point considered in greater detail when discussing the solo parts later in this chapter.

The chorus ‘Et lux’ which Royer had doubled in length in 1750 reverted to the original in 1764. This is also the case at the repeat, resulting in Royer’s revision of the chorus being excluded completely.

Royer’s idea of an instrumental introduction to the ‘Te decet’ section is adopted by the editors in 1764, but not his music. The later version has a new five-bar oboe solo, accompanied by continuo, before the soloist enters, whereas Royer wrote eleven bars for violins and flutes. His insert and extension to this section in 1750 were also omitted in 1764.

In the prelude to ‘Et tibi’ Royer’s innovation of giving the melody to the bassoon is adopted in 1764, and the cut which he makes there is even extended by four bars, but is replaced with a new four-bar insert. The instrumental interlude between the ‘Et tibi’ solo and duo is cut both in 1750 and 1764, but Royer’s four-bar replacement is not
used again. His next cut, of Hajdu’s bars 251-266, is shortened to a cut of only bars 264-265 in 1764 and his extension of the duo has disappeared. The result is that passages omitted in 1750 are restored in 1764; these are the second phrase of the duo for *dessus* and *basse* and two instrumental passages, the first between the duo phrases and the second leading to the following chorus. Interestingly, the editors in 1764 have arranged both these instrumental passages for two bassoons instead of violins and flutes. Perhaps this development comes from Royer’s idea of allocating the melody of the ‘Et tibi’ prelude to the bassoon. In the chorus ‘Exaudi’ the substitutions made by Royer in 1750 are ignored in 1764.

The repeat begins in 1750 with only two bars of the opening rhythm, instead of four, but in 1764 this cut too is ignored. The ‘Requiem’ solo is retained in 1764; Royer’s idea of changing it into a chorus line is not utilised at this point, but is put into effect later in the work, where *basse* solos in both the Offertoire and Communion sections are marked for all *basse* and *basse-taille* singers (see table 4.3, which shows that this feature is also found in manuscripts L. 4311 and L. 4310). Royer’s new chorus line in 1750 was 22 bars shorter than the original solo through the omission of bars 44-65 in Hajdu’s version. In 1764 there is also a cut in the solo part but it is shorter, since Hajdu’s bars 61-65 were retained. The remainder of the cut from the repeat in 1750, bars 66-106 of Hajdu’s edition, is followed exactly by the editors in 1764.

Although these changes result in the loss of all Royer’s music added to the Introit in 1750, some of his ideas are still there. The editorial cuts in 1764 are the same as, or similar to, those Royer made in 1750. In particular the cut from two semibreves to one in the first few bars of the Introit, and in the other places where this theme recurs, is retained in 1764. Royer’s amended *basse-taille* ‘Requiem’ solo is also closely followed in 1764, and innovations such as the instrumental introduction to ‘Te decet’,
the prominent role given to the bassoon, and the changes from solo to choral lines all survive.

**L. 4311, L. 4310 and Rés H. 486 (a-u)**

The score numbered L. 4311, entitled ‘Messe de Mr. Gilles’, together with its associated performing parts, Rés H. 486 (a-u), headed ‘Messe des morts’, is thought to have been used for the Concert Spirituel performances in 1762, the first of which took place in April during Holy Week.\(^{14}\) This conclusion arises from the names ‘Albanese’, ‘Bazire cadet’ and ‘Joly’ which are written on the solo parts for *dessus*, *haute-contre* and *taille* respectively.\(^{15}\) Antoine Albanèse appeared at the Concert Spirituel between 1753 and 1764,\(^{16}\) Bazir first appeared in 1757\(^{17}\) and l’Abbé Joly sang solos between 1759 and 1763.\(^{18}\) It is Joly’s time of service there which helps to narrow down the possible performance dates, because during his years the *Messe des morts* was heard at those concerts only in 1762 and 1763.\(^{19}\) Perhaps this score was the one used at the memorial service for the playwright Crébillon, which took place on 6 July 1762, as there are two annotations which show it must have been used in a liturgical setting. On page 23 of the manuscript there is a note indicating that here ‘on chante la prose’ (the Prose is sung).\(^{20}\) The Prose is a Latin verse for the Sequence, a section of the Mass included on certain occasions;\(^{21}\) at a Requiem Mass it follows the Tract and the set text

---


\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 123.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 123.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 282 (no. 683) and p. 283 (no. 694).


is ‘Dies irae’ (Day of wrath). Later, on page 35, there is a suggestion, written in the same hand as that of the score, which reads ‘on pourroit ajouter a cet endroit le Pie jesu Domine, de Del fer’ (the *Pie Jesu* by d’Helfer could be added at this point).

Although a number of cuts are marked in the score there is none of the detailed reworking contained in the 1764 score. The ‘Hostias et Preces’ section in the Offertoire is absent but, apart from that, the music is unaltered and, therefore, must be much as Gilles wrote it. At the end of the manuscript though there is a list of the parts required and the number of performers is mentioned. This is reproduced in the right hand column of figure 4.3 below, which shows layout and spelling as in the manuscript. The list, which corresponds to the parts of Rés H. 486 (a-u), though not the number of performers, includes oboes, which were not in Gilles’ score. At some point the number of participants has been increased (shown in the left hand column of figure 4.3), indicating that the score may have been used to prepare for a big occasion such as the Crébillon memorial service. The final item, ‘La partition’ (the score), probably refers to manuscript L. 4310, which is called ‘Partition de la messe des morts de Mr Gilles’. This appears to have been copied out omitting altogether the cuts marked in L. 4311, but including other alterations which are pencilled in the latter. For example, the first solo in the Introit in L. 4311 is written in the C4 clef, showing probably that it is intended for a *taille* voice, but the marking ‘dessus’ has been added in red crayon. This solo has been written in the treble clef in L. 4310 and marked ‘Recit de dessus’. Exactly the same circumstances apply to the solo which opens the Kyrie. A *basse* solo in the Introit at ‘Et lux perpetua’ in L. 4311 is marked in red crayon ‘toutes les basses tailles et basses’ and appears in L. 4310 as *basses-tailles* and *basses*, with the marking ‘tous’. Similarly, in the Offertoire, what is a *basse* solo in L.

---

22 Robertson, *Requiem*, p. 15.
4311 at ‘Representet’ becomes a passage for basses-tailles and basses marked ‘tous’ in L. 4310. In the Post Communion another basse solo at ‘Et lux perpetua’ is treated in the same way as it was in the Introit and becomes a choral passage for all basses.

Figure 4.3 – Manuscript F-Pc L. 4311, copy of page [48]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of performers later altered to</th>
<th>Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.  per. dessus de Recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. haute contre de Recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Taille de Recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Basse Taille de Recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Basse de Recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.  pers. dessus des chœurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3. second dessus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>6. haute contre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Taille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>6. Basse Taille (figure indistinct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5. Basse contre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.  per. hautbois et flutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. 2e. hautbois et flutes (altered from 2 dessus de violons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. pers. violons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2. second violons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. 3e. violons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. haute contre de violon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1. Basson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. contre Basse et Bassons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Basse continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La partition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is of greater significance in relation to this thesis, though, is that, with the exception of the cuts mentioned above and of the opening Kyrie solo, the other alterations which were marked in L. 4311 and written out in L. 4310 were all included in D. 11135, the score used at Rameau’s memorial services. For ease of reference, and in order to make the comparisons clearer, this information is summarised in table 4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3 - Treatment of features mentioned above</th>
<th>F-Pc L. 4311</th>
<th>F-Pc L. 4310</th>
<th>F-Pc D.11135 (1764)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introit, ‘Requiem’ solo</td>
<td>C4 clef, Taille</td>
<td>Treble clef, Dessus</td>
<td>Treble clef, Dessus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introit, ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>Basse solo</td>
<td>Cheur (B &amp; BT)</td>
<td>Cheur (B &amp; BT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie, solo</td>
<td>C4 clef, Taille</td>
<td>Treble clef, Dessus</td>
<td>C4 clef, Taille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertorie, ‘Representat’</td>
<td>Basse solo</td>
<td>Cheur (B &amp; BT)</td>
<td>Cheur (B &amp; BT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion, ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>Basse solo</td>
<td>Cheur (B &amp; BT)</td>
<td>Cheur (B &amp; BT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various cuts</td>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>Music omitted</td>
<td>Music restored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two notational features in L. 4311 indicate that it is an earlier score than L. 4310. The first is the use of the French violin clef (G1) in L. 4311 for the *dessus de violons* whereas L. 4310 adopts the more modern treble clef (G2). The second feature in L. 4311 is its use of flats and sharps rather than naturals to cancel accidentals in the key signature. Again, L. 4310 adopts the more modern notation involving naturals. For example in the Introit, which is in F major, when a $b$ natural is required a sharp sign is written in L. 4311 but the natural sign is used in L. 4310. Similarly, in the Agnus Dei, with a G major key signature, when $f$ natural is needed a flat sign is written in L. 4311, but a natural in L. 4310.

It would appear from examining these scores that the earlier of the two, L. 4311, was marked with cuts and revisions when a performance of the *Messe* was being planned. Using the list at the end of the score, the associated set of performing parts, Rés H. 486 (a-u), was amended where necessary and fresh parts written out where required. For example, the part for ‘P. ét hautbois et flutes’, Rés H. 486 h, must have been freshly copied as it is written on 12 stave paper, whereas the others, with one exception mentioned below, are on 10 stave; moreover the $b$ naturals are marked with a natural sign. In addition the passages cut from L. 4311 do not appear at all in this part, whereas in other parts they are deleted but still visible. There are two copies of the ‘per. dessus de Recit’ part, Rés H. 486 j, one of which is in the treble clef and must have
been newly written, as it too is on 12 stave paper, whereas the older copy, on 10 stave paper, has the French violin clef. What must also have been written out afresh is the score L. 4310. This too has pencil notes about the Prose and Pie Jesu, plus a further note on page 31 at the end of the Offertoire saying ‘on dit La Preface ensuite le choeur enton le Sanctus’ (the Preface is said, after which the choir intones the Sanctus). It is quite possible, therefore, that this is the score actually used at the Crébillon memorial service.

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 above show that alterations found in certain copies of Gilles’ *Messe* have been used again in the 1764 version prepared for the Rameau memorial services. Table 4.4 below combines some of this information and looks back from the 1764 manuscript to see where the alterations made then may have originated. The results show clearly that they came from different sources. We have also noted that many of Royer’s 1750 alterations were ignored in 1764, and that cuts from the scores used at the Concert Spirituel in 1762 were restored two years later.

The editors in 1764 did not, therefore, accept all the changes previously made to the *Messe*, but reverted to a version of the work which was closer to Gilles’ original before making their own alterations, which included ideas from earlier manuscripts. The score used for the Rameau memorial performances was not, then, a result of cumulative editings made prior to 1764, with more alterations added for the occasion. It does, however, clearly demonstrate that all the manuscripts were part of an evolving performance tradition.
Table 4.4 - Possible origins of alterations found in manuscript *F-Pc* D. 11135

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Hajdu edition</strong></th>
<th><strong>F-Pc</strong> D. 11135 (1764)</th>
<th><strong>Possible origin of alteration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>F-Pc</strong> D. 10449, Royer (1750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time signature</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td><strong>§</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbales</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>First bar</td>
<td>Ancient custom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestral entry</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Unison</td>
<td>Royer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 6 and 7</td>
<td>Two semibreves</td>
<td>One semibreve (bar 7)</td>
<td>Royer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental prelude</td>
<td>Bars 20-24</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Royer cut bars 14-24 of H and added a two-bar replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo ‘Requiem’</td>
<td>In C4 clef for Taille</td>
<td>In Treble clef for Dessus (but part for BT)</td>
<td><strong>F-Pc</strong> L. 4310 (1762) (Royer arranged solo for BT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 36 and 37</td>
<td>Two semibreves</td>
<td>One semibreve (bar 30)</td>
<td>Royer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>Basse solo, bar 139</td>
<td>Chœur (B &amp; BT)</td>
<td><strong>F-Pc</strong> L. 4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te decet</td>
<td>Begins with Dessus solo</td>
<td>Begins with five-bar hautbois solo</td>
<td>Idea based on Royer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude to ‘Et tibi’</td>
<td>Melody in violon</td>
<td>Melody in Basson Bars 190-202 of H replaced by four-bar insert</td>
<td>Royer Rayer cut bars 190-198 of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlude between ‘Et tibi’ Solo and Duo</td>
<td>Bars 226-244</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Royer cut the same bars but added a four-bar replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link between ‘Et tibi’ Duo and chorus ‘Exaudi’</td>
<td>Bars 264-265</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Royer cut sixteen bars but added his own extension to the Duo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat of Solo ‘Requiem’</td>
<td>In C4 clef for Taille</td>
<td>In Treble clef for Dessus (but part for BT)</td>
<td><strong>F-Pc</strong> L. 4310 (Royer arranged for BT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Solo ‘Requiem’ and Duo ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>Bars 44-106</td>
<td>Bars 44-60 and 66-106 of H cut</td>
<td>Royer cut bars 44-106 of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offertoire</strong> ‘Representat’</td>
<td>Basse solo, bar 179</td>
<td>Chœur (B &amp; BT)</td>
<td><strong>F-Pc</strong> L. 4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communion</strong> ‘Et lux’</td>
<td>Basse solo, bar 78</td>
<td>Chœur (B &amp; BT)</td>
<td><strong>F-Pc</strong> L. 4310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. 11135

As already mentioned, this is the score used for the Rameau memorial services, and it is the principal source for the transcription in Part II of this thesis. It consists of the following sections: Introit, Kyrie, Graduel (a), Graduel (b)*, Offertoire, Sanctus, Elévation*, Benedictus, Agnus Dei, and Communion. Those marked * were added in 1764. The possible origins of some of the alterations made to the score have been demonstrated above, and detailed consideration of other alterations will take place in subsequent chapters.

H. 494 (A-B)

This is the set of performing parts associated with D. 11135 and a full list is given in table 4.5 for reference purposes. The set consists of one copy per part, with the exception of the haute-contre, taille and basse voices of the choir, which have one additional copy each, and only minor differences between the two copies of the respective parts. Those discrepancies, one in the Introit and two in the Sanctus, are detailed in the critical commentary in Part II; the different scribal hands will be set out in chapter 5. Further copies of many of the parts in H. 494 (A-B) were found in the collection numbered L. 17986 (A-B), a point to which we shall return in the discussion of that set.

After table 4.5, changes made to the allocation of vocal solos for the Rameau commemoration are discussed, and information about the named soloists, which has been gathered from various sources, is presented in one place for the first time.
Table 4.5 - List of individual parts in *F-Pc* H. 494 (A-B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part number</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. a</td>
<td>Premier violon</td>
<td>First violins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. b</td>
<td>2.\textsuperscript{e} violon</td>
<td>Second violins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. c</td>
<td>P.\textsuperscript{e} alto</td>
<td>First violas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. d</td>
<td>2.\textsuperscript{h} alto</td>
<td>Second violas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. e</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Violoncellos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. f</td>
<td>Contrebasse</td>
<td>Double-Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. g</td>
<td>Premier hautbois et flutes</td>
<td>First oboes and flutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. h</td>
<td>Second hautbois et flutes</td>
<td>Second oboes and flutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. i</td>
<td>P.\textsuperscript{e} cor</td>
<td>First horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. j</td>
<td>2.\textsuperscript{c} cor</td>
<td>Second horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. k</td>
<td>1.\textsuperscript{e} et 2.\textsuperscript{h} Bassons</td>
<td>First and second bassoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. l</td>
<td>Timbale Voilée</td>
<td>Muffled kettledrums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. m</td>
<td>1.\textsuperscript{e} Dessus des chœurs</td>
<td>First sopranos of the choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. n</td>
<td>2.\textsuperscript{c} Dessus des chœurs</td>
<td>Second sopranos of the choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. o</td>
<td>Haute contre</td>
<td>Hautes-contre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. o\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>Haute contre</td>
<td>Hautes-contre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. p</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Tenors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. p\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Tenors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. q</td>
<td>Basse taille</td>
<td>First basses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. r</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Second basses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 A. r\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Second basses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. a</td>
<td>Recit de Dessus – M'. Muguet</td>
<td>Soprano solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. b</td>
<td>Duo d’Hautecontre – M'. Cavalier</td>
<td>Haute-contre duo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. c</td>
<td>Récit de Taille – M'. Muguet</td>
<td>Tenor solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. d</td>
<td>Recit d’Hautecontre – M'. Muguet</td>
<td>Haute-contre solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. e</td>
<td>Recit d’Hautecontre – M'. Cavalier</td>
<td>Haute-contre solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. f</td>
<td>Récit de Taille – M’. Muguet</td>
<td>Tenor solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. g</td>
<td>Recit de Basse taille – M’. Varin</td>
<td>Bass solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. h</td>
<td>Recit et Duo de Basse taille – M’. Bauvalet</td>
<td>Bass solo and duo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. i</td>
<td>Recit de Dessus – M’. Richér</td>
<td>Soprano solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. 494 B. j</td>
<td>Recits de Basse taille – M’. Durand</td>
<td>Bass solos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence in the solo vocal parts, H. 494 B (a-j), shows that changes were made to the original voice allocations both of the composer, and possibly of the editors for the
1764 performances. The first solo in the Introit, ‘Requiem æternam’, is scored for *taille* in the Hajdu edition, with a prefatory stave which shows a C4 clef. There is no mention in Hajdu’s critical notes, which indicate variations between his principal source and the other manuscripts he consulted,\(^\text{23}\) of any other clef being used in his sources, so it is reasonable to assume that the composer wrote the part for a *taille* singer. However, as shown in tables 4.2 and 4.4, in the 1764 manuscript score for the Rameau memorial services the solo is written in the treble clef, suggesting it was intended for a *dessus* voice. In practice the solo could be sung by either *taille* or *dessus*, but the performing part for the soloist in 1764, shown at figure 4.4, is also marked ‘Recit de Dessus’. It is quickly apparent from this part that further alterations have been made, as the first five lines have been crossed out. An examination of the other solo parts reveals that the ‘Requiem æternam’ has been written out again, in the bass clef, for the *basse-taille* soloist, as can be seen at figure 4.5. In order to accommodate the lower voice, though, the part has been altered at bars 34-35, bar 40, and towards the end of the movement at bars 274-75. The first two of these alterations, which are very similar to those made by Royer in 1750, are visible in figure 4.4, in the deleted section of the *dessus* part, where they seem to have been added as alternatives (line 2, bars 2-3; line 3, bar 3). Underneath the deletion, at the beginning of the Duo ‘Et lux perpetua’, the name of Muguet appears in the left hand margin. This name is also written at the top right hand corner of the page where it appears to have been written over that of another. Muguet, according to Constant Pierre,\(^\text{24}\) was an *haute-contre* singer, and the *dessus* part of the duo was allocated to him, the other part being given to the *basse-taille* Durand. In the full score the duo is written for *dessus* and *basse*.


It is clear, therefore, from the outset, that allocation of the solo parts has been reviewed and revised considerably, not only by changing singers but also by using voices different from those in the Hajdu edition.

Figure 4.4 – Manuscript H. 494 B. a, Récit de Dessus

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
The reasons for these changes are not clear but there are various possible explanations. The *taille* solo in the earliest manuscripts may have been intended for a *dessus* soloist for the first of the Rameau memorial services. If so, it may be the name of that singer which has been obscured by Muguet’s name on the performing part. Perhaps the role was first performed by a *dessus* singer, but then had to be reallocated because the soloist became unavailable for some reason such as illness. However, we do not have any clues to show whether the changes were made before the first or the third service, or even on a subsequent occasion, such as the service at Notre-Dame in 1766 for the late King of Poland, the only occasion of which we are aware when these parts may have been used again. Muguet’s name, though, appears on *haute-contre* and *taille* solo parts as well as the *dessus* part, and if he sang all these roles he would have had a
preponderance of the solo singing. Some sections of the dessus solo part may, therefore, have been reallocated in order to divide the roles more evenly.

The details shown in table 4.6 below of the allocation of solos in the entire work confirm that many written for dessus or taille were reallocated, most to the haute-contre voice of Muguet. They also show that solos scored for basse were sung by basse-taille. The only places where any doubt about this exists are two duos. The first, ‘Et tibi’ in the Introit, scored for basse-taille and basse, is sung by Durand (basse-taille) and a singer whose name looks like ‘Lasusee’, or perhaps ‘Lasuze’. The second, a duo for basse voices from the Sanctus, is sung by Bauvalet (basse-taille) and an unnamed singer. The performing parts in both cases, however, are headed ‘Récit de Basse-taille’. It seems certain, therefore, that the bass solos were intended for a basse-taille voice, even though they appear in the score in the standard Bass clef, F4, and not the F3 clef in which the chorus parts for basse-taille are written. The contemporary singer Marc-François Bêche, a member of ‘La musique du Roi’, tells us that, at the time, the basse voice was considered unsuitable for solo singing, but unfortunately does not give any reason for this point of view.

The first of the two solos in the contrafacta which were added to the work in 1764, the ‘Quemadmodum’ in the Graduel, appears to have been sung by the haute-contre (Muguet) for whom it was written. The Elévation was scored for dessus but sung by the taille Richer who, according to a later report in the Mercure on another concert, had the ability to sing dessus parts. Other solos in the Hajdu edition, as already shown in table 4.4 above, were either cut altogether for the 1764 performances or changed into lines for the chorus.

26 Mercure, April 1765, II, p.169. ‘M. RICHER... a conservé, avec une espèce de voix de taille, la faculté de chanter les dessus...’.
### Table 4.6 - Solo allocations

**Introit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requiem</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et lux (Duo)</td>
<td>Dessus &amp; Basse</td>
<td>Dessus &amp; Basse</td>
<td>Dessus &amp; Basse-taille</td>
<td>Haute-contre &amp; Basse-taille</td>
<td>Muguet &amp; Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te decet</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Haute-contre</td>
<td>Muguet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et tibi (solo)</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et tibi (Duo)</td>
<td>Dessus &amp; Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille &amp; Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille &amp; Basse?</td>
<td>Basse-taille &amp; Basse?</td>
<td>Durand &amp; Lasuse/Lasuze?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kyrie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Haute-contre</td>
<td>Muguet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christe (Duo)</td>
<td>Haute-contre &amp; Taille</td>
<td>Haute-contre &amp; Taille</td>
<td>Haute-contre duo</td>
<td>Haute-contre duo</td>
<td>Cavalier &amp; Muguet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requiem</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab auditionem</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Les basses-tailles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab auditionem (reprise)</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quemadmodum</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Haute-contre</td>
<td>Haute-contre</td>
<td>Haute-contre</td>
<td>Muguet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.6 continued

#### Offertorie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domine (solo)</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Varin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libera</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Varin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne cadant</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Varin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed signifer (duo)</td>
<td>Dessus &amp; Haute-contre</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed signifer (trio)</td>
<td>Dessus 1 &amp; 2 &amp; Haute-contre</td>
<td>Les Dessus et les Hautes-contre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repræsentet</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Les Basses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostias</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Haute-contre</td>
<td>Muguet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac eas</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Les Hautes-contre, les Tailles et les Basses-tailles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sanctus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus (Solo)</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Bauvalet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus (Duo)</td>
<td>Basse &amp; Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse 1 &amp; Basse 2</td>
<td>Basse-taille duo</td>
<td>Basse-taille duo</td>
<td>Bauvalet &amp; unnamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osanna (Solo)</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Les Basses-tailles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osanna (Trio)</td>
<td>Dessus 1 &amp; 2 et Haute-contre</td>
<td>Les Dessus, les Hautes-contre et les Tailles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.6 continued

#### Benedictus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Solo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus</td>
<td>Haute-contre, Taille &amp; Basse</td>
<td>Haute-contre, Taille &amp; Basse</td>
<td>Haute-contre, Taille &amp; Basse-taille</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Trio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This movement was probably omitted, as diagonal lines are drawn through the parts and no singers are named.

#### Élévation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pie Jesu</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
<td>Taille</td>
<td>Richer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Agnus Dei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Durand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Communion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Hajdu edn</th>
<th>1764 Score</th>
<th>1764 Parts</th>
<th>Singer(s)</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lux æterna</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Basse-taille</td>
<td>Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et lux (Solo)</td>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>Les Basses et les Basses-tailles</td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et lux (Duo)</td>
<td>Dessus &amp; Haute-contre</td>
<td>Les Dessus, les Hautes-contre et les Tailles</td>
<td>Chœur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Named soloists

Information about the singers named on the individual parts is often limited; some details, though, are given below in alphabetical order, together with the type of voice and the movements in which each participated.

Bauvalet (*Basse-taille*, Sanctus).

There is no information available on a singer whose name is spelt in this way, but Jean Gourret records the début of a Beauvalet (Basse-taille) at the Opéra in 1771.\(^{27}\) This singer played the roles of ‘Le Grand-Prêtre’ in Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux* in 1773,\(^ {28}\) and that of ‘Arcas’ in Gluck’s *Iphigénie en Aulide* on 19 April 1774.\(^ {29}\) Pierre lists a singer named Bonvalet who performed at the Concert Spirituel in the spring of 1774, but links him with Beauvalet in his index.\(^ {30}\) He describes Beauvalet as a ‘basse-taille de l’Opéra’, who, on his return to Paris in 1776 after a year in Naples, caused some surprise at this concert series by singing an Italian air in a falsetto voice.\(^ {31}\) Although these references all post-date the Rameau commemoration, this would seem to be the man most likely to have sung in 1764.

Cavalier (*Haute-contre*, Kyrie and Offertoire).

In this case, too, variations in spelling occur, but it is likely that they relate to one individual, and references closer to 1764 are available. The first is found in 1765, when Cavalier is named as a member of the chorus in a production of Rameau’s *Les Fêtes de*
Pierre reports that ‘Cavaillier de l’Opéra’ performed solos at the Concert Spirituel between 1766 and 1773; the programme listings show three variants of the name, Cavallier, Cavaillier and Cavalier, in 1766 alone. Gourret records the début of Cavalier at the Opéra in 1768, although, as just noted, he was in the chorus there in 1765. Cavallier is also included amongst six *hautes-contre* choral singers in the 1766 revival of Rameau’s *Anacréon* at some point during the 1771 revival of this work he (now Cavalier) took over the *haute-contre* role of ‘Batile’. In 1767 the singer is named twice in a production of Rameau’s *Hippolyte et Aricie*, firstly (spelt Cavallier) as one of ‘Les Parques’ and secondly (this time Cavaillier) as a member of the chorus. At a Court production of *Castor et Pollux* in 1770 Cavalier sang ‘Mercure’, and at Fontainebleau two years later Cavallier was in the chorus for a production of Rameau’s *Pygmalion*. The name Cavaillés is listed among the soloists for the role of ‘Olgar’ in Gluck’s *Cythère assiégée*, first performed in August 1775, and Cavalier is one of the *hautes-contre* who performed in *Zémire et Azor* by André-Ernest-Modeste Grétry on 12 May 1779, under the direction of François Giroust.

Durand was appointed to the Opéra in 1760, according to Mary Cyr, but Gourret says he made his début there in 1763. As he is named among the chorus for the 1760
production of Rameau’s *Les Paladins*, Cyr would appear to be correct.\textsuperscript{45} Durand was again in the chorus for Rameau’s *Les Indes Galantes* in 1761, but in addition he took the role of ‘Un Inca’.\textsuperscript{46} At a Court production of *Castor et Pollux* in 1763 Durand appeared as ‘Le Grand-Prêtre’ and ‘Un Spartiate’;\textsuperscript{47} he sang those roles again in Paris in 1764.\textsuperscript{48} In the same year he appeared in Rameau’s *Naïs* as ‘Pluton’ and ‘Palémon’;\textsuperscript{49} and he sang the *basse* roles of ‘Hymas’ and ‘Eurilas’ in Rameau’s *Les Fêtes d’Hébé*, a year later combining these two with the *taille* role of ‘Momus’.\textsuperscript{50} A further role in 1765 was ‘Le Grand-Prêtre’ in *Les Fêtes de l’Hymen et de l’Amour* by Rameau,\textsuperscript{51} and in 1767 he appeared as ‘Tisiphone’ and one of ‘Les Parques’ in the same composer’s *Hippolyte et Aricie*.\textsuperscript{52} Durand played different parts in subsequent revivals of *Castor et Pollux*; he was ‘Le Grand-Prêtre’ again in 1770 and 1777, and he sang ‘Jupiter’ in 1772 and 1773.\textsuperscript{53} He also replaced in those years respectively, Muguet as ‘Mercur’, and Gélin as ‘Pollux’.\textsuperscript{54} Durand then played two roles in operas by Gluck, ‘Patrocle’ in *Iphigénie en Aulide* in 1774,\textsuperscript{55} and ‘Brontès’ in *Cythère assiégée* in 1775.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., VIII: *Castor et Pollux*, ed. by Chapuis, p. cxvii.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p.cxvi.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., XVIII: *Naïs*, ed. by Reynaldo Hahn, p. cxvii.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., IX: *Les Fêtes d’Hébé*, ed. by Alexandre Guilmant, p. lxxvii.
\textsuperscript{52} Rameau, *OOR*, IV.6: *Hippolyte et Aricie*, ed. by Bouissou, p. xl.
\textsuperscript{53} Rameau, *OC*, VIII: *Castor et Pollux*, ed. by Chapuis, pp. cxviii and cxii.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. cxix, ‘1772 Rôle de Mercur: Muguet est remplacé par Durand; 1773 Rôle de Pollux: Gélin est remplacé par Durand’.
Pierre gives Durand’s dates of service at the Concert Spirituel as 1765-73, and describes him as ‘having a clear, accurate voice, with a bright, pleasing tone, which is tastefully controlled’. 57

Lasusee or Lasuze (Basse, Introit).

Enquiries on the first of these alternatives have proved fruitless, but a M. Lasuze is named on a part for ‘Tirtée’ in Rameau’s Les Fêtes d’Hébé.58 The name La Suze is recorded by Malherbe in his description of the sources for this opera, but it does not appear in the listings for performances at the Opéra or at Court.59 After 1765, though, only sections of the work were revived; Tirtée appears in the second Entrée, ‘La Musique’, which was performed in 1772, and again between 1775 and 1777. In 1770, at a Court performance of Castor et Pollux, De La Suze was a member of the chorus, and in the same opera in 1777 Lazuze sang ‘une autre voix’.60 There is also a Lasuse listed as a member of the chorus for a production of Rameau’s Pygmalion at Fontainebleau in 1772.61

If the singer is Simon de La Suze, the BnF gives his dates as 1754?-1803 and says he made his début at the Opéra in 1767.62 Gourret claims his first appearance was in the following year, and also reports that he became maître de musique at the Opéra in 1779 and maître du theatre (probably chef des chœurs) in 1792.63 Supporting evidence for this information comes from recurrence of the name in 1781, this time spelt

---

57 Pierre, Histoire, p. 143, ‘possesseur, d’une voix fraîche et précise, au timbre flatteur et brillant, qu’il maniait avec goût’.
60 Rameau, OC, VIII: Castor et Pollux, ed. by Chapuis, p. cxviii.
61 Ibid., XVII: Pygmalion, ed. by Büsser, p. clii.
63 Gourret, Dictionnaire, p. 52, ‘Cette basse-taille figura d’abord parmi les premiers sujets puis devint maître de musique à l’Opéra à partir de 1779, et enfin maître du théâtre (probablement chef des chœurs) en 1792.
Lazuse, in a production of Grétry’s *Andromaque*, where he is described as choral director (*Direction de choeur*). The date of birth suggested by the BnF, however, appears a little late for him to have been able to join the Opéra as a *basse or basse-taille* in 1767 or 1768, and certainly for him to have taken part in a *basse-taille* duo in 1764.

Muguet (*Haute-contre*, Introt, Kyrie, Graduel and Offertoire).

According to Pierre, Muguet first appeared at the Concert Spirituel on 9 June 1757, and then at the Opéra on 15 August of that year. He sang at the Concert Spirituel many times until his final appearance in April 1772. There are, however, two occasions on which he sang at these concerts when his name was not reported in the *Mercure* and is not, therefore, listed by Pierre; these are the performances of Francesco Feo’s *Confitebor* which took place in December 1762.

The *Mercure* reports that Muguet’s first role in a tragedy at the Opéra was that of ‘Ninus’ in *Pirame & Thisbé* by Rebel and Francheur on 5 February 1760. The paper later reveals, though, that on 21 February in a production of Mondonville’s *Carnaval du Parnasse*, Muguet took the part of ‘Apollon’, which he had already sung. Also in that month Muguet appeared in Rameau’s *Les Paladins*, singing ‘Un Paladin’, and, on 26 February, ‘Atis’. Another role for Muguet in Paris in 1760 was that of ‘Arcas’

---

65 Ibid., Histoire, p. 123.
66 Ibid., p. 300 (no. 894).
68 Mercure, February 1760, p. 181, ‘le rôle de Ninus [Pirame & Thistbe] a été rempli de M. Muguet... C’est le premier rôle de ce genre, qui lui ait été confié’.
69 Ibid., March 1760, p. 181, ‘Le jeudi, 21 Février, on a donné une représentation du Carnaval du Parnasse. M. Muguet a repris le rôle d’Apollon, qu’il avait déjà chanté dans cet opéra’.
71 Mercure, March 1760, p. 181, ‘M. Muguet a chanté le rôle d’Atis dans les Paladins, en place de M. Lombard, le mardi 26’.
in *Dardanus* by Rameau, a part which he sang again three years later at Fontainebleau. In 1763 he sang the *taille* role of ‘Un Spartiate’ at a Court production of Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux*, and at the 1764 performances of the same work at the Opéra he sang the roles of ‘Un Athlète’ and ‘Mercure’. Muguet would, therefore, have been very familiar with the extracts from this work which were adapted for use at the memorial services for the composer. He appeared again in later productions of *Castor et Pollux*, and in 1773 replaced Legros in the title role of ‘Castor’.

Other parts in Rameau operas included ‘Agéris’ and ‘Un Berger’ in *Les Fêtes de l’Hymen et de l’Amour* in 1765, and ‘Mercure’ in *Hippolyte et Aricie* in 1767. Muguet also played an *haute-contre* role in the third *divertissement* of *Les trois cousines* by Jean-Claude Gillier, which must have been revived after 1770. His name appears again on a copy of the part of ‘Olgar’ in Gluck’s *Cythère assiégée*, performed in August 1775, but it has been crossed out. Muguet’s final role seems to have been that of ‘Mercure’ in *Philémon et Baucis* by Gossec, which was premiered on 26 September 1775 and last performed on 13 and 18 April 1780.

Muguet is listed among the *Acteurs Chantans* at the Académie Royale de Musique in *Les spectacles de Paris* for 1769, and his address is given as ‘rue de Grenelle, Saint Honoré’.

---

72 Rameau, OC, X: Dardanus, ed. by Vincent D’Indy, p. cxxxvii.
73 Ibid., VIII: Castor et Pollux, ed. by Chapuis, pp. cxviii and cxii.
74 Ibid., p. cxix, ‘Rôle de Castor: Legros est remplacé par Muguet’.
76 Rameau, OOR, IV.6: Hippolyte et Aricie, ed. by Bouissou, p. xl.
Richér (Taille, Elévation).

The name is written with an acute accent on the ‘Recit de Dessus’ part for the ‘Pie Jesu’, but it is more usual to see it without. The taille singer, whose ability to sing dessus has been mentioned above, was Louis Augustin Richer. 81 His father, François-Joseph (André) Richer, had been a singer and composer at Court, and surintendant de la musique to the duc d’Orléans and the duc de Chartres. Louis was born at Versailles on 26 July 1740 and entered the service of the Royal Chapel in 1748. In 1752, at the age of 11, he first appeared at the Concert Spirituel, and then sang regularly there until 1781. On the death of his father in 1757 he took charge of the musical training of both the duc de Chartres and the duc de Bourbon. After the Revolution he became professeur de chant at the Conservatoire, and he died in Paris on 29 April 1819.

Varin (Basse-taille, Offertoire).

Gourret states that Varin made his début at the Opéra in 1763. 82 Pierre links Varin with Warin in his index, and informs us that the latter first appeared at the Concert Spirituel in 1769. 83 Varin is named as a soloist on 15 August of that year and Warin on 24 December 1771, but on this occasion, intriguingly, the entry is marked ‘1ère fois’. 84 If this was indeed a first appearance, the two spellings must refer to separate individuals, but if they refer to just one person, this marking must be a mistake.

There is also a Warin who is described as a pensionnaire of l’Académie des Beaux-Arts in Lyons, and whose own divertissement was performed there on 17 December 1766. 85 Had this Warin, a composer, known Rameau when he served as an organist in

81 All this information about Richer has been gleaned from two sources: M Benoit, B Dünner and N Dupont-Danican, ‘Richer (les)’, in Dictionnaire de la musique en France aux XVII et XVIII siècles, ed. by Marcellle Benoit (Paris: Fayard, 1992), p. 612; and Pierre, Histoire, pp. 110-11 and p. 191.
82 Gourret, Dictionnaire, p. 51.
83 Pierre, Histoire, p. 143.
84 Ibid., p. 296 (no. 851) and p. 299 (no. 884).
Lyons between 1713 and 1715? Did Warin travel to Paris to sing at Rameau’s memorial services, either as an old friend, or as a representative of the Académie of Lyons? It may be a remote possibility, but it is a possibility nevertheless.

Rés F. 1033

This is Michel Corrette’s edition of the *Messe*, including his *Carillon des morts*, which was published in 1764. The inaccuracies in the preface have already been discussed in Chapter 2, but as the preface mentions the Rameau memorial performance, publication must have taken place after that event. Corrette’s edition has none of the contrafacta added on that occasion, nor the additional horns, and none of the other cuts and reworkings to be discussed later. It does, though, contain some features which are in the Rameau memorial version, but not in the earliest known copy of the original composition. The first of these is the instruction at the beginning of the score ‘Il faut laisser battre le Tambour Seul, lés-passe de deux Mesures, avant de Comencer’ (let the drum beat alone for two bars before beginning [the Introit]). At the top of the next page is the heading ‘Récit de Taille ou de Dessus’ (Solo for taille or dessus), a choice which is not indicated by the composer. Another difference occurs in the ‘Te decet’ section; Gilles begins this with a solo for dessus but Corrette begins it with an hautbois solo, the player then continuing to accompany the singer, just as in the 1764 version which honoured Rameau. The remainder of Corrette’s edition though, with the exception of a few other minor differences, is the same as that by Hajdu and, therefore, Gilles’ original composition.

On page 10, at the end of the Introit, there is a faintly written instruction ‘Et repetitur Requiem’ (Repeat the Requiem). This may have been added later as there are no repeat or segno marks in the score. It is also worth noting that there are no such markings in the parts for 1er and 2er *Dessus des chœurs* which were used for the
Rameau commemoration. Many of the performing parts for this event were rewritten because of the number of alterations which were required. However, in the case of the chorus parts fewer alterations were necessary and some older parts were used again but suitably amended. In both dessus parts the word ‘fin’, written where the repeat ends, is in a different hand from that in which the rest of their parts are written, indicating that it too may have been added later. It is possible, therefore, that the original work did not have a repeat of any part of the Introit. Alternatively, if it was customary at the time of composition for performers to include a repeat, Gilles may have considered it unnecessary to write down instructions to that effect. Although Hajdu does include a repeat in his edition, he acknowledges in his commentary that the markings in the sources are not clear and that he has followed the usual liturgical practice.\textsuperscript{86}

**L. 17986 (A-B)**

The second source on which both Hajdu and Prada are silent is entitled ‘Messe de M’. Gilles, Requiem. en fa’ but it is not a full score, only a collection of manuscript parts from two different versions of the *Messe*. Half the parts appear to be copies of those catalogued as H. 494 A which were used in conjunction with the score D. 11135, and are listed in table 4.5. This is confirmed by a modern note on a slip of paper in the folder containing H. 494 A (a-r) which refers to ‘Doubles Matériel L. 17986’, although this requires some qualification, as explained below. The remainder of the parts included within L. 17986 (A-B) have the same cuts which are marked in the parts numbered Rés H. 486 (a-u), the set which matches scores L. 4311 and L. 4310. They do not contain, therefore, a ‘Hostias et Preces’ section or any of the contrafacta or other alterations which appear in H. 494 (A-B), the set used to commemorate Rameau. At some point in the past, though, these two sets of parts have been deliberately

\textsuperscript{86} Gilles, *Requiem*, ed. by Hajdu, p. xvi.
amalgamated, yet it would be impossible to use them together because they are so
different. The violin parts from one set have been placed with the violin parts from the
other, and so on, for most of the instrumental and voice parts. The exceptions were:

a) the parts for violas, which were lacking (nor were there parts for the horns and
drums which were added in 1764)

b) the only part for ‘2.\textsuperscript{e} hautbois Et flutes’ and the parts for ‘Basse’ all appeared to be
copies of those in H. 494, the 1764 version, and

c) the parts for ‘Basse Continue’, which consisted of three copies of the earlier version,
Rés H. 486, but none of the later. (This is discussed further in the section relating to
\textit{basse continue} in Part II – page 253.)

As L. 17986 (A-B) does not have any viola parts, or copies of parts for the instruments
added in 1764, there is not a complete duplicate set of the parts in H. 494 A (a-r), and
the note, mentioned above, in the folder containing that set should not be taken at face
value. However, for those H. 494 A parts included in the L. 17986 set there are at least
three copies of each, except for the woodwind parts, which have only one copy each.
Many, but not all, are almost identical to those in H. 494 A, although in one
\textit{contrebasse} part a section of the Offertoire appears to have been written twice in error.
Even the same scribal hands are evident in some copies: for example, in L. 17986 two
of the copies for \textit{hautes-contre}, and one of those an altered part in two different hands,
have been written by exactly the same scribes who copied the \textit{hautes-contre} parts in
table 4.5. There are two hands, though, on the copies of H. 494 A parts in L. 17986
which are not present in the H. 494 (A-B) set itself. Further details on the scribes in the
latter set will be given in Chapter 5.
The parts in L. 17986 (A-B) only became available late in the editing process for this study and it was not found necessary to consult them as part of that procedure. What proved of greater interest is that filed with them were three other folders, L. 17986 (C), (D) and (E). The first of these contained a *Prose des morts* said to be by Louis Homet, the second contained an anonymous *Prose des morts*, and the third, marked ‘Charles d’Helfer – Requiem’, contained instrumental parts and a *basse* part for that work, but no other voice parts and is not, therefore, a complete set. These contents are of particular interest because the parts numbered H. 494 (A-B) also have filed with them three folders (C), (D) and (E) containing copies of exactly the same works.

We know from the annotation in L. 4311 above that the *Pie Jesu* by d’Helfer may have been sung with the Gilles, and with parts for both the *Messe* and the *Pie Jesu* filed together in two separate places, we have strong supporting evidence to show that this did take place. There is also an annotation about singing a *Prose des morts* in L. 4311. By the same process of deduction, therefore, we can surely say that, as there are two versions of this composition filed with two sets of parts for Gilles’ *Messe*, then one of these versions of the *Prose* is likely to have been performed with the Gilles when there is an indication to that effect in the score. This theory is strongly supported by the presence of a *basse* part of Homet’s *Prose des morts* with one of the *contrebasse* parts of the Gilles in L. 17986 (A-B). The conclusions we can draw from this are that, when a *Pie Jesu* was inserted into a performance of the Gilles, the one by d’Helfer was almost certainly used, and that on occasions when a *Prose des morts* was sung it would have been either the setting by Homet or the alternative anonymous version which was chosen. There is no suggestion, however, that any of these works was performed at the Rameau commemorations, as no annotations about them appear in the score used then, nor is there any mention of them in contemporaneous reports.
Louis Homet (1691-1777) was a church musician who held various posts before becoming maître de musique at Notre-Dame in Paris in 1734. He remained there for fourteen years. The only composition he is known to have published is his *Prose des morts*, which appeared in 1722. His name is not written on any of the performing parts of the work held in the folder L. 17986 (C) but on the folder itself. A similar situation applies for the parts H. 494 (C): it is the folder which holds them on which ‘Prose de HOMET’ is written in pencil; the composer’s name does not appear on any of the parts. In both cases the folders appear to be fairly recent but the details on them may have been carried forward from the folders they replaced. The *Prose*, though, is not indexed in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque nationale. The New Grove Dictionary article on the composer does not give any indication as to where copies of this work may be found and the only entry for Homet in RISM refers to a 1716 collection of ‘airs sérieux et à boire’ published by J B C Ballard. That date is six years earlier than the publication date of the *Prose des morts*, performing parts of which do survive in Paris if the information on the folders containing them is correct.

The work is composed for four voices, two violins, two oboes, bassoons and basse continue, and sets the even numbered verses, the others presumably being intoned using plainchant, which is not included with the manuscript.

A subsequent enquiry has revealed that the Centre de Musique Baroque de Versailles holds under catalogue number MUF HOM 1 a work by Louis Homet, described as:

---

88 The only motets by Homet in the BnF catalogue are *Postquam magnificus* and *Exurge Deus*, which are part of the Sébastien de Brossard collection.
'Dies irae: Chant grégorien alternant avec le faux-bourdon'. This confirms that the work does alternate plainchant and choral sections. It is written for four voices and basse continue. The plainchant for the odd verses, which is shown only in the Versailles copy, matches that for the ‘Dies irae’ in the Liber Usualis. The four-part choral sections do not include in any voice the plainchant which they replace, and must, therefore, come under a wider definition of the term ‘fauxbourdon’, as discussed by Deborah Kauffman in her recent study of the form. Comparison of other features of the copies in Versailles and Paris reveals some noticeable differences. The Paris copies are in D minor and have a plagal cadence for the final ‘Amen’, whereas the version in Versailles is in B minor and finishes with a perfect cadence. For a performance with the Gilles Messe, in which the preceding and following movements, the Graduel and Offertoire, are both in G minor, the key of the Paris manuscripts is more closely related. In both versions the even-numbered verses are written for four voices in harmony, and the music for the second verse, consisting of three phrases, is used eight times in all. Whilst the first and third phrases in each version match one another, the middle phrase differs, as does the music in verse 20 at the words ‘eis requiem’. The last chord of the choral verses is also different, the Paris manuscript having a bare fifth and the Versailles copy a minor triad. The haute-contre and taille parts in the Paris manuscripts appear in the Tenor and Alto registers respectively in the Versailles copy, and in the basse voices some octave displacement occurs as a result of the difference in pitch. In other respects the two versions are the

90. L’Abbé Homet, *Dies irae* (Paris: Schola Cantorum, [n.d.]). I am grateful to M. Thomas Leconte of the Centre de Musique Baroque de Versailles for providing me with a copy.
same and, despite the differences, the manuscripts in Paris are, on the evidence of the Versailles copy, another version of Homet’s *Dies irae* or *Prose des morts*.

**B-Bc Litt D no 34.017**

The Brussels copy of the *Messe des morts* by Gilles is headed *Missa pro Defunctis: Cantata in Exequis Ludov. XIV Reg. Franc. a 6.Voc. et 6. instr. Partes 13.* (Mass for the Dead: Sung at the Funeral of Louis XIV, King of France, for 6 Voices and 6 Instruments. 13 Parts.) This inscription is surrounded by a decorative, engraved cartouche with the opening violin theme from the *Messe* shown on a scroll at the top, and the name A.R.D.Van den Boom printed at the base. The vocal parts, consisting of *dessus* (2), *haute-contre*, *taille* (2) and *basse*, are headed *Messe de Requiem a 6 voix et 6 instr.* (Requiem Mass for 6 voices and 6 instruments). The instrumental parts, *Violino* (3), *AltoViola*, *Violoncello*, *Fagotto*, and *Organo*, have the heading *Missa Solemnis Pro defunctis* (Solemn Mass for the Dead). These all appear to be copies of an early version of the work. Included with the *Messe* is a fully scored *Dies irae*, which is different from both of those filed with the Paris manuscripts. Unlike the four-part *Prose des morts* said to be by Homet, the text here is set using the six voice parts with varying full and solo sections, accompanied by instruments and continuo. Unfortunately there is no indication of the composer’s name on any of the parts.

As far as we know the *Messe* was never used at an official funeral service for Louis XIV and the inscription here to this effect must, therefore, be treated with caution. The only occasion on which we are aware the work was performed to honour the late King was the memorial service which took place in Bordeaux on 28 January 1716. Perhaps this, or another similar occasion of which we have no record, is the source of this information.
The name van den Boom indicates that the manuscript was part of the collection of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century works built up at the Collegiate Church of Saints Michael and Gudule (now the Cathedral) in Brussels. Canon van den Boom became Cantor there in 1737 and spent many years acquiring, cataloguing and preserving their music manuscripts.\textsuperscript{93} As a result of these efforts the collection remained in very good condition and much of it was bought by the Brussels Conservatoire in 1929 at the instigation of its librarian at the time, Charles van den Borren.\textsuperscript{94} With regard to the \textit{Dies irae} found with the manuscript Lenaerts tells us that, from his study of the other Requiem Masses in the collection, this section is always composed in full.\textsuperscript{95} In this case, therefore, we have further evidence that, where it was the custom to sing the Dies irae section of the Requiem, and the composer whose work was being used had not provided music for it, then another setting would be included.

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., pp. 120 & 122.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., p.122.
Chapter 5

Scribes

The preceding chapter has shown the origins of some of the alterations made to Gilles’ *Messe des morts* for the Rameau memorial commemorations; chapters 6 and 8 on Contrafacta and Reworkings will discuss other alterations in detail. An attempt will be made in this chapter to identify the scribes involved in the copying which took place in 1764. One result of all the editing of the *Messe* was the need to prepare a new score for the occasion. Many of the performing parts were also freshly copied, although in the case of some of the solo parts and of the chorus parts, which are least affected by the alterations, it appears that existing copies were amended as necessary rather than being completely rewritten (and an example of this will emerge in the following discussion).

Several scribal hands are, therefore, evident in the score, *F-Pc* D. 11135, and the performing parts, *F-Pc* H. 494 (A-B), the majority of which must date from 1764.

The copying of this version of Gilles’ *Messe des morts* can be allocated to three main scribes, who can be seen in the score and the orchestral and choral parts, but there are four other scribes discernable in the parts, making a total of seven hands in all. Another hand has written at the bottom of the first page of the score ‘Cette partition est celle qui a servi pour l’exécution de cette Messe au Service funèbre de Rameau en 1764’ (This score is the one which was used for the performance of this Mass at Rameau’s funeral service in 1764). This information, which is just visible in figure 5.1, was presumably added at a later date. As noted (Chapter 1, page 23), the fact that Rameau’s funeral took place on the day following his death with only two people present means that the comment on the score must refer to the music performed at his memorial services.
One more hand has written in large, bold, red crayon various tempo and dynamic markings throughout the score. The words ‘fort’, ‘tres Lent’ and ‘toujours’ can be seen in figure 5.1; these, and similar annotations elsewhere, will be discussed towards the end of this chapter.

Figure 5.6 - *Messe des morts*, *F-Pc* D. 11135, Introit, p. 1, mostly in the hand of Scribe 1

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Before embarking on the process of analysing and identifying the seven hands involved, the following tables indicate which sections of the score and parts were copied by each scribe.

**Table 5.2 – Items copied by Scribe 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score or part</th>
<th>Folio or part number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1-17, 20-28 and 33-38</td>
<td>All the music, underlay, dynamics and instrument names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2° violon</td>
<td>H. 494 A. b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrebasse</td>
<td>H. 494 A. f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. r'</td>
<td>Introit, part of the Sanctus, Agnus Dei and Communion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scribe 2 copied the contrafactum added to the Graduel, which begins the following table.

**Table 5.3 – Items copied by Scribe 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score or part</th>
<th>Folio or part number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>All the music, underlay, dynamics and instrument names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse</td>
<td>H. 494 A. e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recit de Dessus</td>
<td>H. 494 B. a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duo d’Haute-contre</td>
<td>H. 494 B. b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Taille</td>
<td>H. 494 B. c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Haute-contre</td>
<td>H. 494 B. d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Haute-contre</td>
<td>H. 494 B. e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Taille</td>
<td>H. 494 B. f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Basse-taille</td>
<td>H. 494 B. g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit et Duo de Basse-taille</td>
<td>H. 494 B. h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Dessus</td>
<td>H. 494 B. i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Récit de Basse-taille</td>
<td>H. 494 B. j</td>
<td>All except ‘Requiem’ solos in Introit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scribe 3 has written the contrafactum for the Elévation, the first item in the next table.

**Table 5.4 – Items copied by Scribe 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score or part</th>
<th>Folio or part number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>Music, underlay and, in Italian, dynamics and instrument names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1r &amp; 2° Alto</td>
<td>H. 494 A. c and d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2r &amp; 2° Cor</td>
<td>H. 494 A. i and j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r &amp; 2° Bassons</td>
<td>H. 494 A. k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timballe voilée [sic]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r° Dessus des chœurs</td>
<td>H. 494 A. m</td>
<td>Kyrie, Graduel, Offertoire and Sanctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r° Dessus des chœurs</td>
<td>H. 494 A. n</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. r'</td>
<td>Cues ‘Et lux…’, ‘sans le duo’ etc., and ‘Pie Jesu tacet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recit de Basse-taille</td>
<td>H. 494 B. j</td>
<td>Opening and final solos of Introit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parts which were copied by other hands are shown as follows:

### Table 5.5 – Items copied by Scribe 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Violon</td>
<td>H. 494 A. a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier hautbois et flutes</td>
<td>H. 494 A. g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second hautbois et flutes</td>
<td>H. 494 A. h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.6 – Items copied by Scribe 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Dessus des chœurs</td>
<td>H. 494 A. m</td>
<td>Introit, Agnus Dei, and Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Dessus des chœurs</td>
<td>H. 494 A. n</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taille [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. p⁴</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.7 – Items copied by Scribe 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haute-contre [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>H. 494 A. o⁴</td>
<td>Kyrie, Graduel and Offertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taille [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>H. 494 A. p⁴</td>
<td>Kyrie, Graduel and Offertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse-taille [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>H. 494 A. r⁴</td>
<td>Kyrie, Graduel, Offertoire and the beginning of ‘hosanna’ in the Sanctus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.8 – Items copied by Scribe 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haute-contre [des chœurs]</td>
<td>H. 494 A. o⁴</td>
<td>Introit, Sanctus, Agnus Dei and Communion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third scribal hand above is the easiest to identify as it belongs to Durand, chief copyist at the Opéra from 1751 to 1773. Lois Rosow has found examples of his hand which she has identified and published, and one of these is reproduced as figure 5.2.

The first letter in this, the capital E of ‘Etat’, is almost identical to that in the title ‘Elévation’ shown at figure 5.3, which is part of folio 29 from the Messe des morts. In

---

2 Ibid., pp. 148-150 & 153-55.
the latter the instrument names and dynamics (in Italian) and the tempo indication ‘Adagio’ also appear to have been written by Durand. Table 5.8 gives references for comparison of these features. More characteristics of Durand’s handwriting are discussed in Chapter 6, as his hand is also evident in one of the documents on which the third contrafactum is based.

Table 5.9 – Comparisons of Durand’s hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handwriting</th>
<th>Rosow (Figure 5.2)</th>
<th>Messe (Figure 5.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Etat (line 1)</td>
<td>Elévation (top)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Violons (line 11)</td>
<td>Viol. (first stave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pages (line 5 and others below)</td>
<td>piano (first stave and po. below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>des (line 1)</td>
<td>Adagio (above first stave)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.7 - Copy of Durand’s hand shown in Rosow, ‘Lallemand and Durand’ JAMS, 33 (1980), p. 150

The original document, AJ1517, is held at the Archives nationales in Paris (document conservé aux Archives nationales, Paris), and is reproduced with their permission, and with that of Professor Rosow.
Durand has written ‘On reprend le chœur In memoria etc.’ on folio 19v at the end of the additional Graduel to show how this new section fits in to the existing work (see figure 5.4). This supports the contention that the writing is that of the chief copyist as he would be responsible for instructions of this sort, which would not be delegated to an assistant.

Figure 5.8 - *Messe des morts, F-Pc D.11135, part of folio 29v* (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)

Figure 5.9 - *Messe des morts, F-Pc D.11135, Graduel (b), part of folio 19v showing instruction ‘On reprend etc.’ in the hand of Durand* (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Further cues in Durand’s hand can be seen on the choral and instrumental performing parts. For example, at the beginning of the Introit on the chorus parts for first and second dessus, haute-contre, taille and basse, numbered H. 494 A. m, n, o\textsuperscript{1}, p\textsuperscript{1}, and r\textsuperscript{1} respectively, after the existing ‘Requiem Æternam tacet’, written by the original copyist, the words ‘et lux perpetua duo’ in Durand’s hand have been added. This alerts the singers in the chorus to their approaching entry. On the same parts where the original scribe has written at the end of the Introit ‘On reprend le Requiem et le chœur qui suit jusqu’au mot fin’ Durand has added above, or after, the word Requiem ‘sans le duo’. This suggests that the duo must at one time have been included in the repeat but is now omitted. These additions can be seen on the part for ‘1\textsuperscript{er} Dessus des chœurs’ which is shown at figure 5.5 and, incidentally, is mostly in the hand of Scribe 5. This type of instruction is, again, one which would be added by the chief copyist rather than an assistant.

The part displayed at figure 5.5 also provides evidence which suggests that omitting the duo from the repeat was a late decision. Rather than completely rewriting this page, Durand has covered the original Kyrie on the last few lines with a collette (an alteration written on a separate piece of paper and stuck over the original), but because the replacement is longer than the original it has to be squeezed into the same space. Durand has, therefore, moved the last three bars of the Introit, which must also have been covered, on to the end of the previous line, making the latter protrude to the right of the lines above. The instruction for the repeat has been rewritten as it must have appeared originally, and only later ‘sans le duo’ has been added. Perhaps Durand omitted this phrase by mistake when copying, but it is more likely that the decision to shorten the repeat was made after he had completed the alterations. The cut could have been made after the first performance of the Messe but before the second, although the
parts for *haute-contre* and *taille [des chœurs]*, H. 494 A. o and H. 494 A. p, suggest otherwise. These parts were newly copied by Scribe 6 and the repeat instruction in each of them, including the words ‘sans le duo’, appears to have been written out all at the same time. The decision to omit the duo from the repeat must, therefore, have been made before the first commemoration service.

It is interesting to note here that, in her edition of Rameau’s *Platée*, Elizabeth Bartlet gives Durand some credit for the cues he provides for harpsichordists playing from ‘basse continue’ parts when acting as sole accompanist for a recitative or an air. Whereas, she says, Brice and Lallemand normally cued only the words on such a part, Durand included the vocal line as well.\(^3\) This not only made the player’s job easier but also improved the accuracy of performance. Similar care and attention by Durand, as detailed above, is evident in the parts for the Gilles *Messe*.

Figure 5.10 - *Messe des morts*, copy of part for 1er Dessus des chœurs, *F-Pc* H. 494 A. m, showing the last five staves in the hand of Durand and most of the remainder in the hand of Scribe 5.

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Rosow has shown that the chief copyists at the Opéra, Brice Lallemand and his successor Durand, employed and paid for their own assistants. Several scholars have identified the scribal hands of some of these assistants, although they have not been able to name them because of a lack of employment records. For example, Bartlet says that for new parts written out for *Platée* in 1759 Durand had assistants whom she calls O, P and Q. Sylvie Bouissou, though, has been able to make a possible identification of one of the scribes who helped Durand with copies of Rameau’s *Les Boréades* in 1763. In her study of the sources of this opera, Bouissou identified Durand as the scribe responsible for the main score, for some of the parts and for some corrections. Several assistants, whom Bouissou has called A - G, copied other parts. Copyist A has written the ‘Partition des chœurs’, the vocal score, which is now numbered *F*-*Pn* *Vm*². Bouissou has compared the hand in this score with that in the score of Rameau’s *Les Paladins*, numbered *F*-*Pn* *Vm*². 400, which, Peter Wolf tells us, according to a note written by Decroix, is in the hand of ‘Sf. Marvereau’. Bouissou concludes, with caution, that because of the similarities in the characteristics of the writing, both

---

manuscripts may be written by the same hand, and that Marvereau, therefore, may be
copyist A. 9

We do, however, have a firm identification of Marvereau’s hand from Jonathan Huw
Williams in his edition of Rameau’s Anacréon. He tells us that most of the manuscript
numbered F-Po Rés. A. 210, the 1766 version of the opera, is copied by Marvereau
and one of the pages from that is reproduced as Plate X in his edition. 10 Some
characteristics shown there match those in the score of Les Boréades studied by
Bouissou. Copies of two pages of the vocal score for Les Boréades, F-Pn Vm². 398,
are shown in figures 5.6 and 5.7, and the page from Anacréon is shown at figure 5.8.
Not only do the hands in both match, but they are almost certainly in the same hand as
those sections in the Gilles Messe written by Scribe 2. The Graduel from the latter has
a brace and clefs which are very similar to those in the score of Les Boréades and the
segno markings in each are almost identical. Two pages of the Graduel from the Messe
in the hand of Scribe 2 are shown at figures 5.9 and 5.10, and a copy of one page from
the Basse part in the same hand is at figure 5.11. Comparisons of similarities in the
hands follow in table 5.9.

présente avec celle de Marvereau, auteur de la copie tardive des Paladins (B.N., Vm².400), nous incitent
à assimiler, avec circonspection, Marvereau au copiste A.’; see also Jean-Philippe Rameau: Les
Boréades, p. 46.

10 Rameau, OOR, IV.25: Anacréon, ed. by Williams, pp. 94 and 135.
Figure 5.11 - Vocal score of Rameau’s *Les Boréades*, F-Pn Vm².398, Act I Scene 4, thought to be in the hand of Marverenau, with the exception of the last two staves (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Figure 5.12 - Vocal score of Rameau’s *Les Boréades*, F-Pn Vm².398, Act 2 Scene 6, thought to be in the hand of Marvereau (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Figure 5.13 – Rameau, OOR, IV.25: Anacreon, ed. by Williams, Plate X, p. 135, showing one page of F-Po Rés. A. 210 in the hand of Marvereau

Reproduced by courtesy of the Société Jean-Philippe Rameau (Reproduit avec l’aimable autorisation de la Société Jean-Philippe Rameau), and of the Bibliothèque nationale.
Figure 5.14 - *Messe des morts*, *F-Pc* D. 11135, folio 18r in the hand of Scribe 2, apart from the instructions written in large, bold crayon, which are probably by Pierre-Montan Berton (by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Figure 5.15 - *Messe des morts, F-Pc D. 11135, folio 18’ in the hand of Scribe 2*
Figure 5.16 - Messe des morts, first page of Basse part, F-Pc H. 494 A. e, in the hand of Scribe 2

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Table 5.10 – Comparisons of the hand of Scribe 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handwriting</th>
<th>Graduel of <em>Messe</em></th>
<th>Les Boréades</th>
<th>Anacréon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Segno</em> marks</td>
<td>Fig. 10</td>
<td>Fig. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>flutes (fig. 9) and, in Basse part, fe. (fig. 11, lines 5 &amp; 6)</td>
<td>flame (fig. 7, 2\textsuperscript{nd} system)</td>
<td>fort (bottom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>desiderat (fig. 10, top system)</td>
<td>des (fig. 7, particularly 2\textsuperscript{nd} system, 2\textsuperscript{nd} line)</td>
<td>doux (2\textsuperscript{nd} viol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Basses (fig. 9, top)</td>
<td>Boréades (fig. 6, top) Borilée (fig. 7, 2\textsuperscript{nd} system)</td>
<td>Bassons, Basses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ante (fig. 10, 3\textsuperscript{rd} system)</td>
<td>Acte (fig. 7, top) Aux (fig. 7, 3\textsuperscript{rd} system) and Alphise (fig. 7, above 3\textsuperscript{rd} system)</td>
<td>Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lent (fig. 9, top and fig.11, top)</td>
<td>Lent (fig. 7, top) La (fig. 7, several)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>viol. (fig. 9, top)</td>
<td>veux (fig. 6, 2\textsuperscript{nd} system)</td>
<td>viol. (top)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Prelude (fig. 11, top)</td>
<td>Premier (fig. 6, beneath title)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Et (fig. 11, lines 7 &amp; 10)</td>
<td>Eclaire (fig. 7, systems 1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, we have information from Decroix identifying Marvereau’s hand in the score of *Les Paladins*, *F-Pn Vm\textsuperscript{2}. 400*, and a cautionary attribution from Bouissou that the hand in the vocal score of *Les Boréades*, *F-Pn Vm\textsuperscript{2}. 398*, is the same. Williams tells us that Marvereau is the scribe of the *Anacréon* manuscript, *F-Po Rés. A. 210*, and this hand matches that in the vocal score of *Les Boréades*. If we accept that all this information is accurate, and we have no reason not to do so, it would appear that Marvereau is indeed Scribe 2 of the Gilles *Messe*, in view of the similarities described in table 5.9.

One of the parts copied by this scribe was the contrafactum added to the Graduel of the *Messe*. Durand himself copied the contrafactum for the ‘Elévation’ and responsibility for copying the other contrafacta is not likely to have been delegated to anyone other than a capable and experienced worker. As we have seen, Bouissou thinks that
Marvereau helped Durand with *Les Boréades* in 1763, so it is quite likely that he would also help him in 1764 with the Gilles. One other factor to bear in mind is that Marvereau succeeded Durand as chief copyist in 1773.\(^\text{11}\) This must indicate not only that Marvereau was a reliable and trusted assistant, but also that the two worked closely together, just as Durand had done with his predecessor Lallemand. All the evidence and surrounding circumstances, therefore, support the conclusion that Marvereau is Scribe 2.

Unfortunately it has not been possible to identify Scribe 1, who was responsible for copying much of the principal source, including the contrafactum in the Kyrie. For reasons already explained above perhaps he too was a trusted assistant to Durand. On the other hand, as it was the latter who amended the Kyrie on the parts for 1.\(^{e}\) and 2.\(^{e}\) *Dessus des chœurs*, Durand may also have written out an exemplar for that section, from which his assistant copied.

There remains the question of the identity of Scribes 4 to 7, and we must not overlook the possibility that they may have worked either for the Opéra or the *Musique du Roi*, for reasons which will become apparent.

The preparatory work on *Les Boréades* in which it appears Marvereau was involved was done for rehearsals which took place in Paris and at Versailles on 25 and 27 April 1763 respectively.\(^\text{12}\) To enable the rehearsals to be held in two places, arrangements were made to take the performers to the appropriate venue, those based in Versailles being taken to Paris for the first rehearsal and those based in Paris to Versailles for the second.\(^\text{13}\) We have already seen that Durand was involved with copying work for these

---


\(^\text{13}\) Ibid., pp. 43–44.
events and the name of Brice is among those for whom transport was provided from
Versailles for the first rehearsal in Paris.\textsuperscript{14} Brice held the position of ‘Garde de la
Bibliothèque de Musique du Roy’, the equivalent at Versailles of Durand’s post at the
Opéra, and he was still in the King’s service in 1771.\textsuperscript{15} He should not be confused with
Brice Lallemand, Durand’s predecessor as chief copyist at the Opéra, although the two
may have been related.\textsuperscript{16} We have information, therefore, which demonstrates clearly
that, in April 1763, performers from both the Opéra and the \textit{Musique du Roi} took part
in the rehearsals for \textit{Les Boréades}, and we also know that copyists from both
institutions were involved in preparing the score and parts. There are other notable
occasions on which joint productions had taken place. The celebrations at
Fontainebleau in 1754 to mark the birth of the duc de Berry, who was to become Louis
XVI, are one example. Lionel Sawkins has compiled a table showing how the work of
copying for the various performances at Fontainebleau was shared between Brice and
Durand.\textsuperscript{17} In 1764 musicians from the Opéra and the \textit{Musique du Roi} again joined
forces for the Rameau commemorations and, as had happened in 1754 at
Fontainebleau and in 1763 with \textit{Les Boréades}, it is likely that copyists from both Paris
and Versailles shared the work on the score and parts for the revised Gilles \textit{Messe des
morts}. The unidentified hands in the latter may, therefore, belong to copyists who
worked either at the Opéra or for the \textit{Musique du Roi}.

\textsuperscript{14} Bouissou, \textit{Rameau: Les Boréades}. p. 44.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 36, n. 24, citing Archives Nationales (AN) 0\textsuperscript{1} 3027\textsuperscript{1}, \textit{Pièces justificatives et minutes de
dépenses de tout le département} (subsequently abbreviated to \textit{Comptabilité}) Voyage de Fontainebleau,
n° 110.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 36, n. 24.
\textsuperscript{17} Lionel Sawkins, ‘Nouvelles sources inédites de trois œuvres de Rameau: leur signification pour
l’instrumentation et l’interprétation du chant’, in \textit{Rameau: Colloque International}, ed. by de La Gorce,
pp. 171-200 (p. 173, Table II, based on two mémoires in AN 0\textsuperscript{1} 2995, copies of which were supplied by
Thomas Green).
Examples of the hand of Brice, identified by Sawkins, have been compared to the hands in the Gilles *Messe*, but none of those seen in the score or parts of the latter appears to be his. Sawkins also believes that one hand which predominates in copies of parts for Rameau’s *Pygmalion* is that of Dumas, Brice’s assistant. Unfortunately there is nothing in the Gilles which matches this hand either. Another scribe, Jean Rollet, identified by both Bartlet and Thomas Green, was largely responsible for copying the manuscript of Rameau’s opera *Les Paladins* numbered *F-Po* Rés. A. 201, which was performed in 1760 and has been published in facsimile, but his hand too seems to be absent from the Gilles.

From the records which she has examined, Bouissou has found the names of other individuals to whom payments were made for copying music; these are Girault in 1753, Roëser and Héricourt in 1763, Bazire in 1766 and Houbaut in 1770. The last two were singers who obviously also assisted with copying at the Court; Bazire, an *haute-contre* soloist, was appointed to the Opéra in 1756 and Houbaut, who had been a *taille* in the Opéra chorus, was awarded a pension from them in 1748. Although some, or all, of these may have been involved with copying the Gilles in 1764, frustratingly, this is a case of knowing the names of scribes but having no identified

---

examples of handwriting which can be used for comparative purposes. Unfortunately, therefore, it has not been possible to make any firm or even tentative identifications for Scribes 4 to 7. A sample of the hand of Scribe 5 can be seen at figure 5.5, and examples of Scribes 4, 6 and 7 follow at figures 5.12, 5.13 and 5.14 respectively.

Figure 5.17 – *Messe des morts*, copy of part for Premier Violon, *F-Pc* H. 494 A. a, in the hand of Scribe 4

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Figure 5.18 – *Messe des morts*, copy of part for Haute-contre, *F-Pc H. 494 A. o*, in the hand of Scribe 6

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
Figure 5.19 – Messe des morts, copy of second part for Haute-contre, F-Pc H. 494 A. o', in the hand of Scribe 7

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
The crayon markings which were pointed out above in figure 5.1 are also visible in figure 5.9, where the words ‘Lent, tres doux et grateieux’ appear. Other, similar, tempo and dynamic marks are written in various places in manuscript *F-Pc* D. 11135 and a full list follows.

**Table 5.11 – Red crayon markings in *F-Pc* D. 11135**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Marking(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fort; tres Lent; toujours (see fig. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>sans Lenteur; moderem'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>bien Soutenue Sans Lenteur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Kyrie]</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>a demie voix; Tres Lent; Do[ux] et des Silences; doux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>do[ux]. (twice); cresc hairpins (several); fort (twice); fo[rt]. (three times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Silence // cresc hairpins (several); crescendo; do[ux]. (three times); crescen; doux; fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14’</td>
<td>fort (twice); cresc hairpins (several); Do[ux].; do[ux]. and fo[rt]. (several of each) (see fig. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lent, tres doux et grateieux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertorie</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Leger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>Leger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elévation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sans Lenteur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29’</td>
<td>moins Lent; andante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>moins Lent; andante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Agnus Dei]</td>
<td>33’</td>
<td>Doux et Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>Lent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These additions were probably made by Pierre-Montan Berton who directed the performances of the *Messe des morts* in 1764. It is quite possible, of course, that they were made at a later performance of the work. However, as stated in the previous chapter, the only occasion of which we are aware on which manuscript *F-Pc* D. 11135 and its performing parts may have been used after 1764, is the service which took place in Notre-Dame in Paris in 1766 to honour the late King of Poland. A letter
written to the *Mercure* after that event mentions the last chorus in the Kyrie and the paper’s account of it following the first service at the Oratoire for Rameau. There is no mention, however, of the musicians who participated in the later service, and it seems more likely that the crayon markings were made specifically for the Rameau commemorations, which Berton directed. Rosow has provided us with an identification of Berton’s hand and this is shown at figure 5.15. The word ‘fort’ seen in this also appears in figures 5.1 and 5.16, which shows the concluding bars of the Kyrie contrafactum. Whilst the writing in the ‘fort’ markings does vary, the sample that Rosow shows bears a close resemblance to that at the foot of figure 5.16.

A manuscript known to be in Berton’s hand which contains additions and changes to Lully’s *Alceste*, *F-Pc* Ms 1597, has also been examined, and many of the ‘fo[rt]’ and ‘do[ux]’ markings in that are very similar to those in the Gilles. One particular entry in *Alceste*, ‘a demi voix’, bears a striking resemblance to the same wording in the Kyrie of the *Messe*. This leaves little room for doubting that Berton was the originator of these markings.

---

26 *Mercure*, October, 1766, p. 131, ‘...l’effet du dernier chœur Kyrie eleison: le compte que vous en avez rendu lors du premier service célébré à l’Oratoire pour feu M. Rameau’.

27 Rosow, ‘Lully’s *Armide*, I, pp. 336-37; this example is also reproduced in Rosow, ‘From Destouches to Berton’, p. 306.
Figure 5.20 - Copy of hand of Pierre-Montan Berton (encircled) from manuscript F-Po Mat.18.[27, 1. d. [de violon] 178, f. [13’] shown in Rosow, ‘Lully’s Armide’, 1, p. 337

(Reproduced by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale and Professor Rosow.)

Figure 5.21 - The last page, f. 14’, of the contrafactum in the Kyrie of the Messe, F-Pc D 11135, showing expression marks probably added by Berton, who directed performances in 1764

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
It is noticeable that two of the contrafacta included in the work, the replacement for the second Kyrie and the Elévation, have more of these markings on them than the other sections. In particular, there are as many markings on the first contrafactum, that in the Kyrie, as there are in the whole of the rest of the Messe. The reason for this is not immediately apparent. There is, though, one theory which could be put forward to explain why this contrafactum received very close attention from the performance director. This section is based on the famous ‘tombeau’ scene from Rameau’s Castor et Pollux, and was perhaps the part of the work which was most familiar to both performers and audience. It is also the only contrafactum to use the majority of the available forces, namely five-part chorus and all the orchestral instruments apart from the horns. The performance was, of course, intended to commemorate Rameau himself and the Director may, therefore, have wanted to emphasise the expression and emotion of this section in order to make it as moving and as memorable as possible.
Chapter 6

Contrafacta

As already outlined in Chapter 1, reports of the various services which took place to commemorate Rameau tell us that extracts from his works were adapted for use within the Mass setting; in Paris it was reported that excerpts from Castor et Pollux and Dardanus were treated in this way.¹ Three contrafacta, as such revisions are known, were included in the 1764 manuscript of Gilles’ Messe des morts, two of which do come from Castor et Pollux, though there is no sign of any extracts from Dardanus in the surviving material. Perhaps whatever came from this opera was used at the first service but then replaced by something else, or omitted, at the third, and was not, therefore, retained with the manuscript. Although the two extracts from Castor had already been identified, the modifications made to them for the Rameau commemoration have not been studied until now. The previously unknown source of the third contrafactum, however, has been identified by this study, and as we will see, it is not by Rameau but by the Italian composer Domenico Alberti (c1710-1746).

The directors of the Opéra, Rebel and Francœur, who organised the first service and probably the third, would presumably have chosen the music, and would have been closely involved in the adaptation work on the contrafacta. They had previously been responsible for earlier revisions of operas, including Lully’s Armide in 1746,² his Proserpine in 1758, Destouches’ Amadis de Gaule in 1760 and Lully’s Armide again in 1761.³ It must not be overlooked, though, that Pierre-Montan Berton, who had been

---

¹ Chapter 1, notes 26, 34 and 39.
² Rosow, ‘From Destouches to Berton’, p. 301; see also Chapter 8, page 163.
appointed *batteur de mesure* at the Opéra in 1758, had become *maître de musique* in 1763, and was well known for his ability to edit and adapt works in the style of the original composer. He had been responsible for revisions of Campra’s *Les Fêtes vénitiennes* in 1759, his *Camille, reine des Volsques* in 1761, and of most of Campra’s and Desmarets’ *Iphigénie en Tauride* in 1762.4 He is also believed to have carried out revisions to *Tancrède* by Campra and *Naïs* by Rameau in 1764.5 Perhaps, therefore, in the same year, Berton may also have been involved in editing both the contrafacta and the additional work carried out on the existing Gilles composition. This is discussed further in the summary to Chapter 8.

*Castor et Pollux* was first produced at the Opéra in 1737 but when it was revived in 1754 it was considerably altered, even to the extent of replacing the original Prologue with a completely new Act 1. This later version became the basis of the next revival in 1764, with the final performance of that run taking place on 6 April.6 The work would, therefore, still have been fresh in the memories not only of the Opéra’s directors when they were selecting appropriate music for Rameau’s memorial service, but also of most of the performers and many of those attending that service.

The first contrafactum in the Gilles replaces his second Kyrie and is based on the chorus ‘Que tout gémisses’ in Act I, Scene i of *Castor et Pollux*. In this scene the Spartan people gather round Castor’s tomb to bemoan his loss and to express the hope that his name will not be forgotten. The choice was, therefore, particularly apt. The full text of the original chorus and the words of the Mass which have been substituted, together with translations, appear in table 6.1.

---

4 Rosow, ‘From Destouches to Berton’, pp. 302-03.
Table 6.12 - Words of ‘Que tout gémisses’ together with substituted words and translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of Rameau chorus</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Que tout gémisses,</td>
<td>Let all mourn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que tout s’unisse;</td>
<td>Let all unite;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Préparons, élevons d’éternels monuments</td>
<td>Let us plan and build eternal monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au plus malheureux des amants:</td>
<td>to that most unfortunate of lovers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que jamais notre amour ni son nom ne périsse;</td>
<td>that neither our love nor his name will ever perish;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que tout s’unisse,</td>
<td>Let all unite,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que tout gémisses.</td>
<td>Let all mourn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek words substituted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek words substituted</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie eleison</td>
<td>Lord have mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christe eleison</td>
<td>Christ have mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie eleison</td>
<td>Lord have mercy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already mentioned in Chapter 1 (page 17), this chorus had already been used in 1744 as the basis for a contrafactum entitled *Paroles*, which was sung before a *Te Deum* setting at a thanksgiving service for the restoration of the King’s health. On that occasion Cucuel thinks Rameau himself would have carried out the adaptation.\(^7\) Cucuel also provides an example of the chromatic lines from the opening bars of the contrafactum in which, he says, that although written in the same key as the chorus, F minor, the violins are a third lower and differences arise in the accidentals.\(^8\) These discrepancies may have come about from the use of the treble clef for the violins; if the French violin clef had been used, and allowance is made for a sharp sign being written, rather than the modern natural, to cancel a flat in the key signature, the example would be correct. The Latin words substituted for the original in 1744, ‘*Qui gemitus, quæ lachrimæ*’ (What sighing, what tears),\(^9\) have a meaning similar to those they replace,

---


\(^8\) Ibid., p. 315, ‘Tout en respectant le ton original, le texte montre quelques modifications: les violons sont baissés d’une tierce dans le prélude et la notation des accidents offre des différences’.

\(^9\) Ibid., p. 315.
whereas twenty years later, as can be seen in table 6.1, words from the Mass setting with a different meaning are utilised.

Another example of the use of the descending chromatic passage from the instrumental introduction to the Spartans’ chorus can be found in the ‘Crucifixus’ section of *La Messe à Grand Chœur et Symphonie*, written in 1758 by Jacques Antoine Denoyé, who was acting director of music at Strasbourg Cathedral from 1757 until his death on 26 July 1759. The work contains several Rameau themes and proves that his operas must have been well known far away from Paris. Denoyé uses the chromaticism at the most poignant moment in the Creed, something of which Rameau may have approved, as we can see from his own explanation: ‘the many descending chromatic intervals depict the tears and moaning caused by bitter regret’.

If Denoyé had admired this chorus, then so did others. After seeing a performance of *Castor et Pollux* in 1754 the magistrate and scholar Charles de Brosses wrote to his brother: ‘Castor’s burial is the finest Requiem one can imagine’. Ten years after the 1764 performances, Parisian audiences may well have been reminded of the Spartans’ chorus when Gluck’s *Orphée et Eurydice* was produced at the Opéra, since, as Jeremy Hayes notes, ‘The opening tombeau (tomb scene) is reminiscent of Act 1 of Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux*’. Perhaps this was Gluck’s way of paying tribute to Rameau, for we

---

know that he too admired the chorus, as the following anecdote from the *Mercure de France* reveals:

Un homme qui croyoit le flatter, lui disoit: ‘Quelle différence de ce Chœur avec celui du sacrifice dans le troisième Acte de votre *Iphigénie en Aulide!* Celui-ci nous transporte dans un Temple, celui de Rameau est de la Musique de l’Eglise. C’est ce qu’il doit être, reprit M. Gluck; l’un n’est qu’une cérémonie religieuse, l’autre est un véritable enterrement: *le corps est présent.*

(A man who intended to flatter him said [to Gluck]: ‘What a difference between this chorus and the sacrifice scene in the third Act of your opera *Iphigénie en Aulide!* The latter transports us to a temple, whereas Rameau’s is simply church music’. ‘This is how it should be’ replied Gluck ‘the one is only a religious ceremony, but the other is a real burial: *the body is there*.’)\(^\text{14}\)

Writing as late as 1791, Pierre-Louis Ginguené says of several Rameau choruses:

... le dessin étoit grand et noble, le caractère élevé, l’expression juste et dramatique. Ce dernier mérite se trouve principalement dans le beau *chœur* de Castor et Pollux: Que tout gémisse... le seul morceau peut-être de tous les operas de Rameau qui pût exciter encore une véritable émotion.

(‘the design was grand and noble, the character lofty, with expression both fitting and dramatic. The latter quality is found particularly in the beautiful chorus from Castor et Pollux: Que tout gémisse... perhaps the only extract from all Rameau’s operas which can still excite genuine emotion’. \(^\text{15}\))

---

\(^{14}\) *Mercure de France*, July 1782, pp. 42-43; see also Rameau, *OC*, VIII: *Castor et Pollux*, ed. by Chapuis, p. lxv.

A further connection with sacred music is apparent in ‘Que tout gémissse’, as the first bars sung by the chorus are themselves remarkably similar to the opening bars of Michel-Richard de Lalande’s motet *De profundis clamavi* (‘Out of the deep have I called unto thee’). This setting of Psalm 129 (130) may have been composed following the death of Queen Marie-Louise of Spain, niece of Louis XIV, in 1689.\(^\text{16}\) It was later revised, probably in 1715, when it was performed at the funeral of Louis XIV himself.\(^\text{17}\) On 12 February 1724 it was sung again at a memorial service for Marie-Adélaïde de Savoie, mother of Louis XV.\(^\text{18}\) Rameau himself would surely have known it, since it was also included in the programmes of the Concert Spirituel on, or very close to, All Souls’ Day, 2 November, in 1728, 1729, 1730, 1732, and 1733.\(^\text{19}\) Another performance of the work took place in a concert arranged on 29 January 1733 when theatres were closed following the death of the King of Sardinia.\(^\text{20}\) Whether the similarity between the two openings is a deliberate reference by Rameau to the motet, and, by association, to the events at which it was heard, is impossible to say. It does, though, remind the listener, whether at the opera or in church, of a text which was often used at funerals or memorial services, and for which there are settings by many French composers.


\(^{20}\) Ibid., p. 242 (no. 176), ‘Théâtre [sic] fermés en raison de la mort du roi de Sardaigne’.
The first few bars of the instrumental opening of Lalande’s *De profundis* are shown in figure 6.1. The chorus ‘Que tout gémiss’ and the contrafactum derived from it are at figures 6.2 and 6.3. The most noticeable difference is the key, the Lalande being in C minor, the chorus and contrafactum in F minor. Transposition was a practice Rameau often employed, even when re-using material from his own works, as Graham Sadler has pointed out.21 A change in pitch of a fourth was by no means uncommon, and one example Sadler quotes is that of the Tambourin from *Castor* which Rameau borrowed for the *Pièces de clavecin en concerts* in 1741. In doing so he transposed it down from D major to A major, but then, when using the revised movement again for the 1744 version of *Dardanus*, he transposed it back from A to D.22

---

22 Ibid., pp. 265-66.
Figure 6.23 - Opening of chorus ‘Que tout gémissie’ from Act II Scene i of Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux* (1754 version), ed. by Graham Sadler (unpublished performing edition, 1981), p. 54

Several sources (e.g. F-Pc 98080; F-Pn 51205) give readings in which bars 3–4 and 7–8 are compressed into one bar each. This corresponds to the original 1737 version, which Rameau seems ultimately to have preferred, since it was re-adopted in 1764 (and may even have been re-adopted during the 1754 run). The square brackets above show which bars need to be omitted to give this alternative (and, in my view, preferable reading).
The extract in figure 6.2, from Graham Sadler’s performing edition of the 1754 version of the opera, contains his annotation to the effect that bars 3-4 and 7-8 may have been compressed into one bar each, certainly in 1764, and possibly in 1754 as well.²³ Two surviving sources are cited as evidence for this. As the editors of the Mass were almost certainly using the current 1764 version of the opera to prepare material for the

memorial service and, as can be seen in figure 6.3, the equivalent bars in the contrafactum are compressed, there is perhaps further confirmation here that these bars had been so treated in the 1764 production. It is interesting to note that in this case Rameau’s original thoughts were reinstated. This seems to provide a parallel with the alterations made by Royer to the Introit of the Mass in 1750. As discussed in Chapter 4, some of his ideas were adopted in the 1764 version but in many places Gilles’ own work was restored.

Although originally placed at the start of Act I of Castor, the chorus ‘Que tout gémisse’ forms Act II, Scene i of the work in 1754 and 1764. In the latter version the instrumental parts are *hautbois, bassons, dessus de violon, hautes-contre de violon, tailles de violon* and *basses* (i.e. *violoncelles* and *contrebasses*), together with a four-part chorus. The contrafactum includes all these parts plus *flûtes, timbales*, a separate part for *contrebasse* and a fifth vocal line in the chorus, *basses-tailles*. These differences are evident when comparing figures 6.2 and 6.3, but the expansion of the instrumental forces is even clearer in figure 6.5. The timbales part seen here is also a good example of how the dramatic quality mentioned by Ginguené has been enhanced.

A crescendo similar to that in bars 50-53 in figure 6.5 occurs three times and on each occasion the repeated notes on the kettledrum build up the tension and underline the depth of emotion. Before the start of the second occurrence at bar 68 two diagonal lines are written in the score with the instruction ‘Silence’ above to indicate that the sound should grow from nothing. On the third occasion (bar 72) the full choir is also singing a unison C. After reaching the climax at full volume a soft chord and a minim rest precede the final cadence which is marked ‘fort’. These dynamic contrasts and silences add further to the drama and the pathos.
In the singers’ parts of the contrafactum some of the note values have had to be adapted to fit the text of the Kyrie. This includes the insertion of crotchet rests for the voices on the first beat of bars 47, 49, 59, 62 and 78. An example can be seen by comparing the first bar of figure 6.4 to that in figure 6.5. The purpose of this was probably to ensure that the stress was placed on the correct syllables of the word ‘eleison’, but it may also have helped to emphasise both the new text and the solemnity of the occasion.

Figure 6.25 - Extract from Act II Scene i of Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux* (1754 version), ed. by Graham Sadler, p. 55
Figure 6.26 - Extract from the Kyrie contrafactum in the *Messe des morts* (bars 49-56)
The contrafactum omits not only the instrumental introduction in both versions of Rameau’s chorus but also the instrumental postlude. In 1737 this consisted of seven bars, but in 1754 it was reduced to two bars which served as a link to the next scene. This gives a clear indication that the contrafactum is derived from the 1754/1764 sources. It is introduced into the Kyrie at the point where the Christe ends with a cadence to C major, the dominant of F major, the key in which the movement, and indeed the *Messe* itself, began, and to which Gilles returned at this point. In this version, though, the mood darkens as a unison phrase of four crotchets descends the F minor scale by step from c to provide a one bar link to the chorus, which carries the movement to its conclusion in F minor.

In short, the editing process which created the contrafactum has resulted in an enlargement of both the orchestral and vocal forces, but the instrumental passages which begin and end Rameau’s chorus have been omitted. The new underlay has necessitated some changes to note values and much greater emphasis has been given to dynamic markings. In every other respect, though, the contrafactum follows Rameau’s composition very closely. Its substitution for Gilles’ second Kyrie has been straightforward, even though that was in F major and the contrafactum is in F minor.

A section added to the Gradual forms the second contrafactum, which is based on Castor’s air ‘Séjour de l’éternelle paix’ from Act IV Scene i of the opera in 1737, or Scene v of that Act in the revised versions of 1754/1764. Castor, singing in the Elysian Fields, reflects on his unease, for, despite being in a place of eternal peace, he still yearns for his beloved, Télaïre. Appropriately, the words of the contrafactum, which are taken from Psalms 41 (42) and 26 (27), have similar expressions of longing for,
and pleading to, God. The full texts of both air and contrafactum are given in table 6.2, together with translations.

**Table 6.13 - Words of ‘Séjour de l’éternelle paix’ together with substituted text and translations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Séjour de l’éternelle paix</td>
<td>Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne calmerez-vous point mon âme impatiente?</td>
<td>Ita desiderat anima mea ad te Deus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’amour jusqu’en ces lieux me poursuit de ses traits</td>
<td>Sitivit anima mea ad Deum fortem vivum;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor n’y voit que son amante,</td>
<td>Quando veniam et apparebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et vous perdez tous vos attraits.</td>
<td>ante faciem Dei?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Séjour de l’éternelle paix</td>
<td>Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne calmerez-vous point mon âme impatiente?</td>
<td>Ita desiderat anima mea ad te Deus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que ce murmure est doux</td>
<td>Exaudi Domine vocem meam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que cet ombrage est frais!</td>
<td>qua clamavi ad te.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De ces accords touchants la volupté m’enchante.</td>
<td>Miserere mei Deus et exaudi me,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tout rit, tout prévient mon attente,</td>
<td>exaudi Domine vocem meam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et je forme encore des regrets!</td>
<td>miserere mei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Séjour de l’éternelle paix</td>
<td>Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne calmerez-vous point mon âme impatiente?</td>
<td>Ita desiderat anima mea ad te Deus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation**

Abode of eternal peace

Are you not calming my impatient soul at all?

Love, with its ties, pursues me even as far as this

Castor sees only his beloved

And you lose all your appeal.

Abode of eternal peace

Are you not calming my impatient soul at all?

How soft is this murmur

How cool this shade!

The delight of these touching sounds enchants me.

All is laughter, everything tells me I should stay

And yet I harbour regrets!

Abode of eternal peace

Are you not calming my impatient soul at all?

Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks

So longeth my soul after thee, O God.

My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God;

When shall I come to appear

before the presence of God?

Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks

So longeth my soul after thee, O God.

Hearken unto my voice O Lord,

when I cry unto thee.

Have mercy upon me O God and hear me,

O Lord hear my voice,

have mercy upon me.

Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks

So longeth my soul after thee, O God.

The substituted text begins with the first two verses of Psalm 41 (42), after which the first verse and its music are repeated. This pattern of repetition follows that of the original aria and continues when these words and music are heard again in the final
‘Da Capo’. The remaining text in the contrafactum is a version of Psalm 26, v.7 (27, v.8), ‘Exaudi Domine vocem meam, qua clamavi ad te: miserere mei et exaudi me’ (Hearken unto my voice O Lord, when I cry unto thee; have mercy upon me and hear me). The editors have repeated some of these words and inserted ‘Deus’ after ‘miserere mei’. The latter addition has probably been done to fit the pre-existing music, although it may have been deliberate, in order to remind listeners of the opening words of Psalm 50 (51), ‘Miserere mei Deus’. This penitential psalm would have been familiar to most Catholics and Antoine Dauvergne’s setting of the text had been heard at the Concert Spirituel, of which he was a director, on 13, 15, and 19 April 1764. In the contrafactum the two phrases ‘Exaudi Domine vocem meam’ and ‘Miserere mei Deus’ are set to repeated notes in the music, at bars 60-63 and 66-67 respectively, as shown in the examples below.

Example 6.1

Example 6.2

---

In the original these monotones were associated with the text ‘Que ce murmure est doux’ (How soft is this murmur) and ‘De ces accords touchants’ (Of these touching sounds). Their repetitive nature gives them a plainchant effect which emphasises the feelings being expressed and provides a fortuitous use for the existing material.

The aria was originally scored for flûtes, violons I and II, and basses (including basse continue). This instrumentation has been conserved by the copyist in the contrafactum, but the performing part for the flûtes which accompanies it is marked ‘Tacet’. Thus the only instruments which are required in this new arrangement are violons I and II, and basses.

After the first section of the original air (1737) there is an eleven-bar passage of recitative, during which the time signature changes no fewer than five times. This has been shortened in the 1754/1764 versions to eight bars, all in triple time, by a combination of omitting text and rewriting some of the music. The figured bass has been revised in the later versions where necessary to accommodate these changes, but the final two bars of recitative remain the same as in the original. For the contrafactum the music of the 1754 version has been adopted, but with a time signature of 2. This results in adjustments to note values and an increase in the number of bars to nine, the last of which reverts to triple time. There is no figured bass here, but the flûtes and violons have written notes which are, with only minor exceptions, a realisation of the figures in the 1754 score. The three versions of this recitative passage are shown below in figures 6.6, 6.7 and 6.8.
Figure 6.27 - Recitative from Act IV Scene i of Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux* (1737 version), *OC*, VIII, ed. by Auguste Chapuis, p. 222

Figure 6.28 - Recitative from Act IV Scene v of Rameau’s *Castor et Pollux* (1754 version), ed. by Graham Sadler, p. 160
Figure 6.29 - Contrafactum in the Graduel of the *Messe des morts*

The ‘Da Capo’ section of the air in 1737 starts at the first entry of the soloist and concludes with the four-bar instrumental passage which ends the first section and precedes the recitative. The repeat in the 1754 version is four bars shorter, beginning where the soloist’s main theme returns after the recitative and finishing when the singer reaches a tonic chord twelve bars later. The ‘segno’ sign and ‘fin’ marking have been placed in new positions, resulting in the cutting of the instrumental conclusion. The latter is restored in the contrafactum by moving the markings back to their 1737 positions, thereby providing another example of the reinstatement of the composer’s original thoughts.

In other respects the contrafactum differs very little from the air. Although the addition is headed ‘Graduel’, and initially appears to be a completely new section of the Mass, it is not intended to replace Gilles’ *Graduel*, but to follow it immediately. This is the position in which it is placed in the manuscript. The fact that the original section and
the addition are both in the key of G minor, and are both in triple time, obviates the need for an editorial link between the two. At the end of the contrafactum is written ‘On reprend le chœur In memoria &c’, an instruction to repeat the chorus in the original movement. In this way the new addition is included within the Gilles Graduel.

As noted, the source of the third contrafactum, which forms the Elévation or ‘Pie Jesu’ section added to the Messe, has not previously been identified. It is more Italianate than either of the other contrafacta and stylistically is clearly not by Rameau or any other French composer, although no contemporary reports suggest that music by other composers was involved. In order to find the source on which this is based Requiem settings by Italian composers such as Francesco Feo, Pietro Gnocchi and Giovanni Pergolesi have been examined, as well as those by Albrechtsberger, Fux, Gossec and Hasse, but of those which contain a ‘Pie Jesu’ setting none formed the basis for the contrafactum in the Gilles. An enquiry on a thematic catalogue contained on a RISM series II CD-ROM was therefore carried out at the British Library at my request and the result indicated the secular aria Caro sposo by Domenico Alberti (c1710-1746). Three copies of this aria are held by the Bibliothèque nationale de France under catalogue numbers F-Pc D. 14414, F-Pc D. 15035 and F-Pn Vm7. 7279. The last of these, as revealed by Élisabeth Lebeau, is one of the items which were previously held in the library of the Concert Spirituel.25

The aria appears to be an independent work, although the text is taken from a libretto by Apostolo Zeno for the opera Cajo Fabricio which was set by Johann Adolf Hasse, Carl Heinrich Graun and others. The singer is a widow grieving for her late husband, so the sense of mourning and loss again makes the aria suitable as a contrafactum for a

---

memorial service. In addition to her feelings of sorrow the widow pledges continuing loyalty to her late spouse; both these sentiments are ones which those organising the commemoration, and those attending, would wish to express. The words and translations are shown below.

Table 6.14 - Words of Caro sposo together with Latin text substituted and translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of Caro Sposo</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caro sposo amato oggetto</td>
<td>Dear spouse, beloved object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De soavi affetti miei,</td>
<td>Of my sweet affection,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per che fuggi, oh Dio, per che?</td>
<td>Why are you running away, oh God, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah! Se l’ombra sua tu sei</td>
<td>Ah! If you are his shadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdar pace a chi sospira,</td>
<td>In order to give peace to the one who sighs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vieni e gira, vieni e gira,</td>
<td>Come, dear shadow,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombra cara in torno a me.</td>
<td>and envelop me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin words substituted</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pie Jesu Domine,</td>
<td>Gentle Lord Jesus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dona eis requiem sempiternam,</td>
<td>give them eternal rest,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fac ut videant gloriam Dei patris,</td>
<td>grant that they may see the glory of God the Father,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloriam patris tui.</td>
<td>the glory of your Father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgo Dei, Dei genitrix,</td>
<td>O Virgin Mother of God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercede pro nobis.</td>
<td>intercede for us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first part of the substituted text, ‘Pie Jesu Domine, dona eis requiem sempiternam’, is the final sentence of the ‘Dies irae’ with the addition of the word ‘sempiternam’. In the Mass for the Dead this is the last word of the ‘Agnus Dei’, in

---

26 I am grateful to Simona Rizzardi for the translation from Italian.

27 Liber Usualis, p. 1813; the text can also be found with translation in Robertson, Requiem, p. 19.
which it is also preceded by ‘dona eis requiem’. To this has been added: ‘fac ut videant gloriam Dei patris, gloriam patris tui. Virgo Dei, Dei genitrix, intercede pro nobis’. I have been unable to trace the origin of the first part of the latter, which may simply be a pious addition, but the words of the last sentence are taken from the Gradual set for Mass on festivals of the Virgin Mary. This final sentence was set in place of the words of the ‘B’ section of the aria, which begins ‘E se un giorno’. It may not have been sung at one or both of the performances of the Messe, as this passage has been deleted on the soloist’s part and the instrumental parts.

Two copies of the Alberti aria at the BnF, including the former Concert Spirituel copy, are scored for Canto, Violino primo and secondo, Alto, Flauti, Corni and Basso (voice, first and second violins, viola, two flutes, two horns and cello). The third copy of the aria, F-Pc D. 15035, has parts for oboes instead of flutes but otherwise has the same instrumentation. The Italian names have been copied in the Elévation added to the Messe, and apart from an additional part for double bass the same scoring has been adopted. The double bass only plays with the cello for the first nineteen bars and the last eleven bars of the main section. The other differences between the aria and the Elévation are found in the voice part which, in the contrafactum, has more decoration and some elaborate cadenzas.

The first decoration appears in bar 22 of the contrafactum. The second crotchet of the same bar number in the aria becomes a quaver and two semiquavers in the Elévation, as shown below. In each of the following instances example (a) is taken from the Concert Spirituel copy of the aria, F-Pn Vm⁷. 7279 (reproduced by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale), and example (b) from the contrafactum.

---

28 Liber Usualis, p. 1815.
29 Ibid., p. 1265.
Example 6.3(a)

Example 6.3(b)

A similar example can be seen at bars 30 and 31.

Example 6.4(a)

Example 6.4(b)

At bars 35 and 36, however, the melodic line is altered, perhaps to give greater emphasis to the words ‘gloriam Dei patris’.

Example 6.5(a)

Example 6.5(b)

The first cadenza-like figure comes in bar 61 and comparison can again be seen in the examples below.
At subsequent cadence points the decorations become progressively more elaborate
until, at bar 120, the penultimate bar of the ‘B’ section, the singer in the contrafactum
begins a cadenza an octave above the equivalent note in the voice part of the aria and,
in a highly decorated run, descends to conclude at the original pitch, as shown below.

With the exception of the details shown in the above musical examples, and of the	
textual underlay, the aria and the *Elévation* are essentially the same.

Georges Cucuel tells us that Alberti’s music had an important place in the household
of the tax farmer and patron of the arts, A.-J.-J. Le Riche de La Pouplinière,30 for
whom at one time Rameau worked as *maître de musique*. He goes on to say that the
aria *Caro sposo* may have been included in a concert at La Pouplinière’s country house

---

at Passy, as Alberti’s music was popular at the time. Cucuel also expresses the view that concerts at Passy did not follow taste but took the lead and set it. Music performed at Passy was often later performed at the Concert Spirituel and symphonies by Alberti were included in that series of concerts on 30 March 1749 and 12 April 1754. Constant Pierre also refers to a performance of a ‘Suite de symph[onie]s’ by Alberti at the Concert Spirituel on 1 April 1749. Pierre gives no specific reference, however, to a performance of Caro sposo, although the general title ‘Air italien’, or ‘2 airs ital’, appears regularly in the listings, as, for example, on 15 Aug 1763, 5 Dec 1763, 26 Mar 1764 and 27 or 28 April 1764. It is, therefore, possible that on at least one such occasion Caro sposo was performed.

One of the Paris copies of this aria, F-Pn Vm7. 7279, is indisputably written by Durand, chief copyist at the Opéra. The handwriting of this copy has been compared with both that identified by Lois Rosow and that in a score of Les Boréades, most of which is known to have been copied by Durand. Certain features of his hand, such as the letters p and d which are apparent again here, have already been examined in Chapter 5 on Scribes. Others are now highlighted in order to show beyond any doubt that he copied this aria. In particular there are similarities in the Capital letters B and P as well as in the lower case letters such as g and s. Many clefs are also in the same style. Table 6.4 shows comparisons, and copies of the various documents to which it refers appear below.

31 Cucuel, La Pouplinière, pp. 371-72.
32 Ibid., p. 380, ‘les concerts de Passy ne suivent pas le gout, il [sic] le précèdent et le forment’.
33 Cucuel, La Pouplinière, p. 372.
34 Pierre, Histoire, p. 256.
38 Jean-Philippe Rameau, Les Boréades, Fac-similé de la Partition Originale, F-Pn Rés. Vmb ms 4 (Paris: Stil, 1982); the handwriting in the original score is identified as that of Durand in Sylvie Bouissou, Rameau: Les Boréades, p. 164 (see Chapter 5, note 6).
Table 6.15 - Comparisons of Durand’s handwriting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handwriting</th>
<th>Rosow Article</th>
<th>Aria Caro sposo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ballet (fig. 6.9, lines 13 &amp; 16)</td>
<td>Basso part (fig. 6.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Prelude (fig. 6.10, between bottom staves)</td>
<td>Traversa Prima (flute) part (fig. 6.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Ingle (fig. 6.9, line 14)</td>
<td>Voice part, ‘oggetto’ (fig. 6.13, line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>les seconds (fig. 6.9, line 15)</td>
<td>Voice part, ‘sposo’ (fig. 6.13, line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clefs (C and bass)</td>
<td>Fig. 6.10 (excluding bottom stave)</td>
<td>Voice and basso parts (figs. 6.13 &amp; 6.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.30 - Durand’s hand from Rosow, ‘Lallemand and Durand’, p. 150

The original document, AJ1317, is held at the Archives nationales in Paris (document conservé aux Archives nationales, Paris), and is reproduced with their permission, and with that of Professor Rosow.
Figure 6.31 - Durand’s hand (with the exception of the last stave) from Rosow, ‘Lallemand and Durand’, p. 155

_F-Po_ Mat. 18.[27, Basse générale, 204, f. [18’] by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale and Professor Rosow.
Figure 6.11 - Domenico Alberti’s *Caro sposo*, F-Pn Vm7.7279, Basso part

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)

Figure 6.12 - Alberti’s *Caro sposo*, F-Pn Vm7.7279, Traversa Prima (1st Flute) part

(by courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale)
We know, therefore, that this copy of the aria is in Durand’s hand and that it has been linked by Lebeau to the Concert Spirituel library. This, and the knowledge that some of Alberti’s instrumental music was performed at that series of concerts, and also that Italian arias were sung there in 1763 and 1764, makes it almost certain that the aria *Caro sposo* would have been one of them. There can be little doubt, then, that the Opéra directors would have been familiar with the piece. Even though it had not been
composed by Rameau, as had the other additions, the aria was considered suitable as the basis for a contrafactum to be included in the Mass chosen for his memorial services. The expressions of grief and loyalty suited the occasion perfectly. There was also a rather tenuous link with Rameau through La Pouplinière, his former patron, and the possible performance of the aria at his country house prior to its being heard at the Concert Spirituel. However, even if the Opéra directors had been aware of this, it may not have had any bearing on their decision to use the aria.

The suitability of the music chosen for sections added to the Mass has already been mentioned. In all three cases the contrafacta were arranged from passages connected in some way to mourning and loss, so the underlying mood of the music was very well suited to its new setting. For an event being organised to commemorate Rameau it was only natural that some of his music should be included, and the two extracts from *Castor et Pollux* were particularly apposite. Indeed, the second one, the aria ‘Séjour de l’éternelle paix’, even had the same key and time signatures as the Gilles section into which it was inserted. Whether this was another reason for choosing it or whether it was mere coincidence is now impossible to determine. The choices were also relevant from the liturgical point of view, as will be explained in Chapter 7 on Rites. All this evidence tells us that the Directors of the Opéra must have put a great deal of thought and care into their selections of music for the contrafacta to be performed on this particular occasion. Not only were they highly appropriate to pay tribute to Rameau and to honour his memory but they must also have helped performers and audience alike to give meaningful expression to their sorrow at his loss.
Chapter 7

Parisian and Roman Rites

Consideration will be given here to the liturgical relevance of the texts added to Gilles’ *Messe* in 1764, and this begins with some historical background.

Until the sixteenth century the chants and wording used in Masses for the Dead, or Requiem Masses, varied a great deal. There were also variations between composers and ecclesiastical institutions as to which movements were sung to plainchant and which had choral settings. The Council of Trent, however, set down in its Roman Missal of 1570 not only the standard texts to be used from then on but also the chants which would be permitted.¹ In France, though, relations between the Church and the Vatican had been under strain for some time and arguments were raging between the Catholics and other Christian denominations. There was also political resistance to what some regarded as interference by Rome in the country’s internal affairs. As a result, it was not until 1615, forty-five years after the Roman Missal first appeared, that the Assembly of Clergy decided to bring it into use.²

The differences between the Parisian and Roman rites are set out in table 7.1 below. This shows two principal divergences. The first is in the Gradual, with each rite using a different Responsory and Verse; the second relates to the ‘Dies irae’, which is

---


omitted from the Parisian rite. Other differences in wording, one in the Introit and five in the Offertory, are highlighted in bold text.\(^3\)

Table 7.16 - Differences between the Parisian and Roman rites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parisian version</th>
<th>Roman version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introit</td>
<td>Exaudi <strong>Deus</strong> orationem meam</td>
<td>Exaudi orationem meam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual</td>
<td>Si ambulem / Virga tua</td>
<td>Requiem aeternam / In memoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dies irae</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertory i</td>
<td>…defunctorum de <strong>manu</strong> inferni</td>
<td>…defunctorum de <strong>poenis</strong> inferni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>…ne cadant in <strong>obscura tenebrarum loca</strong></td>
<td>…ne cadant in <strong>obscurum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>…tibi Domine offerimus</td>
<td>…tibi Domine <strong>laudis</strong> offerimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>…quarum hocie memoriam <strong>agimus</strong></td>
<td>…quarum hocie memoriam <strong>facimus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>…de morte transire ad vitam <strong>sanctam</strong></td>
<td>…de morte transire ad vitam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the clergy had decided to use the Roman rite they had no authority over practices at Court, where long established traditions continued unchanged. One Requiem Mass, by Eustache du Caurroy, illustrates this clearly. The Parisian rite had been used by du Caurroy in about 1590 for the composition of his *Missa pro defunctis*,\(^4\) which, as noted in the Introduction, was performed at the funerals of Henri IV in 1610, Louis XIII in 1643 and of Louis XIV in 1715. In addition it had been performed at each of the annual memorial services which took place on the anniversary of the death of the previous monarch. Sébastien de Brossard, writing in about 1725,

---

\(^3\) These details are taken from: Huglo, ‘A propos du “Requiem” de Du Caurroy’, pp. 201-02; Eby, ‘A Requiem Mass for Louis XV’, p.225, Table 2; and Downs, ‘Charles d’Helfer’s *Missa pro defunctis*’, Chapter 2, pp. 17-18.

says that ‘it is amongst the best ever written, and no other is ever sung at St. Denys for obsequies and services for Kings and Princes’.  

Charles d’Helfer, who was for many years maître de musique at Soissons Cathedral, also used the Parisian rite when he composed his Missa pro defunctis. However, he adds a Gradual written in accordance with the Roman rite, so that either section may be used, although later versions of the work leave this out. By providing this alternative he may have been following the precedent set by Pierre Lauverjat and Étienne Moulinié in their works, which are discussed below. D’Helfer does, though, use two of the five versions of Roman text for the Offertory and he includes a setting of the ‘Pie Jesu’, these being the final lines of the ‘Dies irae’, which the Parisian rite omits. This Mass, written for unaccompanied voices, was first published in 1656 but subsequently had orchestral parts added by Brossard in 1688. It became remarkably popular and was performed in 1726 at the funeral service of Lalande, which took place at Versailles, where the latter had been in charge of the music for many years. It was used again for the funeral service of Louis XV in 1774. In his article on the Missa pro defunctis by François Giroust, composed in 1775, Eby points out that Giroust must have modelled his work on the d’Helfer because the sections he set match those set by

---


7 For the full text of the Dies irae see Liber Usualis, pp. 1810-13; for text and translation see Robertson, Requiem, pp. 17-19.

8 Gazette de France, 12 August 1774, p. 290, ‘En rendant compte du Service solennel célébré à Saint-Denis, nous avons oublié de dire que la Musique du Roi exécuta la Messe des morts de Delfer & le De Profundis du sieur Mathieu’ (In our report of the solemn service which took place at St. Denis [for the repose of the soul of Louis XV], we omitted to mention that the Musique du Roi performed the Messe des morts by d’Helfer and Mathieu’s De Profundis). The earlier report of the service, which had taken place on 27 July 1774, appeared on 29 July 1774, pp. 271-72. See also, Eby, ‘A Requiem Mass for Louis XV’, p. 218, and Downs, ‘Charles d’Helfer’s Missa pro defunctis’, Chapter 1, p. 118.
D’Helfer very closely. D’Helfer and Giroust, therefore, by conforming mostly to the practices and traditions of the Court which were in force at the time of du Caurroy, perpetuated the use of the Parisian rite there until at least 1775.

Changes were, nevertheless, taking place, although the picture is a mixed one. Table 7.2 attempts to show the transition from the use of the Parisian rite to that of Rome. It presents information selected from Eby’s tables 3 & 4, which contain a much broader survey, starting with Ockeghem and going on to Cherubini.

Table 7.17 - The rites used in selected Requiem Masses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Introit</th>
<th>Gradual</th>
<th>Offertory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i  ii  iii iv v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du Caurroy</td>
<td>c. 1590</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>All P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournonville</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>All P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauverjat</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P &amp; R</td>
<td>All R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulinié</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P &amp; R</td>
<td>All R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d’Helfer</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P &amp; R</td>
<td>R  P  P  R  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giroust</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R  P  P  R  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitevin</td>
<td>Late 17th century</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>All R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campra</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>All R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles</td>
<td>1700 – 1705</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>All R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that Jean de Bournonville, although maître de musique at Amiens when his Missa pro defunctis was published in 1619, used the Parisian rite. Pierre Lauverjat, who was maître des enfants de chœur at the Ste-Chapelle in Bourges and never held a

---

9 Eby, ‘A Requiem Mass for Louis XV’, Table 1, p. 224.
10 Ibid., pp. 226-27.
post in the capital, provided two Graduals with his *Missa pro defunctis*, published in 1623, one for each rite. Étienne Moulinié, *maître de la musique* to Gaston of Orléans, younger brother of Louis XIII, did exactly the same in his work, published in 1636. Both Lauverjat and Moulinié, however, used the wording of the Roman rite in the Offertory. From this evidence we can see that in Paris, and even at Court, the Roman rite was being introduced, although rather slowly.

For composers working further away from the capital the picture is much clearer. Guillaume Poitevin, for example, based in Aix-en-Provence later in the century, used the Roman rite when composing his *Messe des morts*, as did his pupils Campra and Gilles. These three works did, though, have one thing in common with the Paris rite, and that is the absence of the ‘Dies irae’ section, which could be included under the Roman rite. The case of Campra is particularly interesting as Anne Baker says his *Messe de Requiem* was written for, and performed at, a service which took place at Notre Dame on 23 November 1695 to commemorate Monseigneur François de Harlay, the late Archbishop of Paris.11 This shows that use of the Roman rite in Paris for a senior official of the Church was, by that time, perfectly acceptable. By 1750, therefore, when the Gilles work became known to Parisians, audiences would have been aware of the changes which had taken place and would not have been surprised by variations in texts or settings. In the same way they were not surprised by alterations or additions which were made to works in order to bring them more into line with the tastes of the day.

The earliest addition to Gilles’ *Messe des morts* of which we are aware is the ‘Libera me’ section included with the manuscript in Bordeaux,\(^{12}\) one of the sources mentioned at the beginning of Chapter 4. In the Office of Vigils of the Dead the ‘Libera me’ is found at the end of the third nocturn;\(^{13}\) in a Requiem Mass it comes after the formal ending of the service but before the coffin is carried from the church.\(^{14}\) The Masses by du Caurroy and Lauverjat both include a ‘Libera me’ setting. When the Introit of the Gilles was first performed at the Concert Spirituel we know from the report in the *Mercure* that an organ carillon was added.\(^{15}\) It is clear, therefore, that well before 1764 the Gilles *Messe* had been heard, either in its entirety or in part, with different additions.

As we have seen, the movements added in 1764 were set to texts beginning ‘Quemadmodum desiderat cervus’, and ‘Pie Jesu’. The first of these consists of the first two verses from Psalm 41 (42) (Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks), and verse seven of Psalm 26 (27, v.8), ‘Exaudi Domine vocem meam’ (Hearken unto my voice O Lord).\(^{16}\) Psalms 41 (42) and 26 (27) are used in the third and second nocturns respectively of Vigils of the Dead.\(^{17}\) They are not, though, included in the liturgy of the Requiem Mass authorised by the Council of Trent. However, if we look back to two earlier Requiem settings we can perhaps understand both the reason for the inclusion in the Gilles of part of Psalm 41 (42) and the relevance of its position.

---

\(^{12}\) Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale, fonds patrimoniaux, Ms. 628/1, MIC 318/319.

\(^{13}\) Harper, *Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, p. 107.

\(^{14}\) Robertson, *Requiem*, p. 23.

\(^{15}\) *Mercure*, December 1750, I, p. 164; for the original French see Chapter 3, note 37.

\(^{16}\) For the full text see Chapter 6, table 6.2.

\(^{17}\) Harper, *Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, p. 107.
The Requiems by Johannes Ockeghem, c.1410-97,\(^\text{18}\) and Pierre de la Rue, c.1460-1518,\(^\text{19}\) both contain a Tract, which follows the Gradual in the order of service, set to the text ‘Sicut cervus desiderat ad fontes aquarum’, another version of Psalm 41 (42). Thus in Gilles’ work, the contrafactum has been placed at the point where the listener may expect the Tract to begin, although the translation of the psalm which has been used is not that set by the earlier composers, and by this date the official text of the Tract is ‘Absolve, Domine’.\(^\text{20}\) Two factors give us a clear indication, however, that this addition is intended as an integral part of the Gradual and not as a separate Tract. Not only is the manuscript headed ‘Graduel’ but at the end of the contrafactum there is an instruction to repeat the final chorus of Gilles’ own Gradual. This has the effect of adding a new section to the original movement. Nevertheless, the use by earlier composers, at this point in the \textit{Messe}, of another version of Psalm 41 (42) may be what the editors at the Opéra had in mind when choosing their text. The inclusion of a verse from Psalm 26 (27) does not appear to have any similar explanation. The verse does, though, contain the words ‘Miserere mei’, which are also the opening words of Psalm 50 (51). This is a psalm used in the monastic office of Lauds of the Dead,\(^\text{21}\) and the words are, therefore, relevant in the context in which they are used.

The ‘Pie Jesu’ text is found in the liturgy at the end of the ‘Dies irae’, which follows the Tract, and is known as the Prose or Sequence. Few composers wrote polyphonic settings for this part of the Requiem Mass, perhaps because it is so long, but one exception is Marc-Antoine Charpentier. Two complete settings by him survive: one is

\[\text{\textsuperscript{19} Pierre de la Rue, Missa pro defunctis, British Library, E.1317.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{21} Harper, \textit{Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy}, p. 107.}\]
a separate *Prose des morts* (Dies irae), H 12, but the other setting is included in his *Messe des morts*, H 10, and is scored for four part choir and instruments. Charpentier also includes in this *Messe*, between the Sanctus and Benedictus, a motet for the Elevation. For this he uses the text ‘Pie Jesu’ again, even though it has already been sung as part of the ‘Dies irae’, but the music is new and the scoring is for two soprano soloists and continuo, rather than the four part choir and instruments used in the earlier section. At the end of the Sanctus the manuscript bears the annotation ‘Passez au Pie Jesu s’il y a du temps; sinon, passez au Benedictus’ (Proceed to the Pie Jesu if there is time; if not, go straight to the Benedictus). Clearly, then, the ‘Pie Jesu’ may be omitted if time does not allow it to be sung. Interestingly, the other Requiem Masses by Charpentier, the *Messe pour les trépassés*, H 2, and the *Messe des morts à 4 voix*, H 7, also have ‘Pie Jesu’ motets for the Elevation. D’Helfer and Giroust too place their ‘Pie Jesu’ settings between the Sanctus and Benedictus, so it appears to have been common practice to use this text at this point in a Requiem Mass. Evidence from Charpentier’s other masses throws further light on this. The *Messe à 8 voix et 8 violons et flutes*, H 3, also contains an Elevation motet, but to the text ‘O salutaris Hostia’. An instruction written at the end of the Sanctus here says ‘Passez à l’O salutaris pour l’élévation; sinon on chantera quelque autre motet’ (Proceed to *O salutaris* for the Elevation; or another motet may be sung). Charpentier had written numerous suitable motets, such as *Ave verum corpus* and *O sacrum convivium*. Examples of other notes providing similar alternatives can be found elsewhere. In the *Messe pour le Port Royal*, H 5, no Elevation motet is included, but before the Benedictus a note says ‘Ici l’orgue joue ou les voix de récit chantent l’élévation qu’elles voudront’ (Here the organist plays, or the
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21 Ibid., p. 93.
24 Ibid., p. 87.
soloists sing a motet of their choice). The *Messe pour le samedi de Pâques à 4 voix*, H 8, which has no set Elevation or Benedictus, also has an instruction after the Sanctus ‘Ici les voix chantent *O salutaris* ou bien l’orgue joue un couplet sur les jeux doux’ (Here the singers perform *O salutaris* or the organist plays a soft interlude). In these cases, then, there is a choice of motet or organ music, whereas in the Requiem Mass there appears to be no choice of text, only one of performance or omission depending on the time available. The insertion at this point in the Gilles *Messe*, therefore, of an Elevation motet ‘Pie Jesu’ fits in with a well established pattern.

There is no question, though, of this item being omitted from the memorial services which were held to honour Rameau. Some of the text added to the ‘Pie Jesu’ may, however, have been omitted, as has already been explained (see page 139 for the full text): in the performing parts of the *Messe*, although not in the full score, the ‘B’ section of the Elévation, beginning ‘Virgo Dei’, has been deleted, indicating that it was probably omitted from the performances in 1764.

A similar situation applies in the case of the Benedictus. The performing parts of the latter have been crossed through, but there is no deletion in the full score. In this context it is interesting to note that Harper tells us, in his explanation of the order of the Mass, that ‘By the late fifteenth century there are instances of the replacement of *Benedictus* with a polyphonic motet for the elevation’. It is probable, therefore, that, for the Rameau memorial performances of the Gilles *Messe des morts*, the Benedictus was omitted.

Although these liturgical considerations provide some historical background, it is not entirely clear whether the memorial services for Rameau, held in Paris and elsewhere,

26 Ibid., p. 91.
27 Harper, *Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, p. 119.
were full religious ceremonies incorporating the *Messe des morts*, or were simply
contert performances of Gilles’ composition. From the *Mercure* report of the first
Paris service, already mentioned in Chapter 1, we do know that, in addition to the
*Messe*, Rebel’s *De profundis* was performed.\(^{28}\) This was heard during the Offertory,\(^{29}\) and the report goes on to say: ‘at the end of the Mass, during the ceremony with
incense and holy water, this large body of musicians sang the same *De profundis* in fauxbourdon’.\(^{30}\) Some religious ceremonial did, therefore, occur. That being the case,
those parts of the service not set polyphonically, such as the ‘Dies irae’, may have been
sung to plainchant. Consideration of another aspect of this report may help to throw
further light on this question. A setting of ‘De profundis’, Psalm 129 (130), was often
heard after the end of the Mass, but what is seldom reported is a performance during
the Offertory. At one time, though, a psalm, or part of one, was sung at the offering of
gifts.\(^{31}\) The opening sentence could also be repeated at the beginning or at the end, and,
in the latter case ‘De profundis’ was one of the possible alternatives.\(^{32}\) Thus it may be
that Rebel’s setting of this psalm was sung either during a collection of monetary gifts,
or whilst bread and wine were brought to the sanctuary. If that were so it would
provide another indication that this service was both a liturgical and a musical
commemoration. Unfortunately, despite details in the report about the music, the
organisers, performers and the location, no mention is made of an officiating priest. On
the other hand, if the music had been performed in a concert version it would not have
been necessary to observe all the religious propertries. In that case ‘De profundis’

---

\(^{28}\) *Mercure de France*, October 1764, I, pp. 213-15; see Chapter 1, page 14.
\(^{29}\) Ibid., p. 214, ‘On exécute pendant l’Offertoire de la Messe, le *De Profundis* de M. REBEL’.
\(^{30}\) Ibid., p. 214, ‘A la fin de la Messe, pendant la Cérémonie de l’encens & de l’eau benite, ce grand
Corps de Musique chanta en faux-bourdon le même *De Profundis*’.
\(^{31}\) M. Huglo, ‘Offertory Antiphon’, in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. by Staff at The Catholic
University of America, X, pp. 651-52 (p. 651).
\(^{32}\) Ibid., p. 651.
would perhaps not have been sung at the Offertory but simply left in its usual position after the end of the Messe.

The performance of the second ‘De profundis’ at the end of the Mass is referred to as ‘le même’ (the same) and the report also mentions that this time it was sung in fauxbourdon. This means either a setting with alternating plainchant and harmonic passages, or one in free rhythm similar to that of Anglican chanting, in which several syllables are sung to one chord, followed by two or three other chords, each sung to one syllable, to reach a cadence point. Psalm verses of varying length can then be fitted to the same chord progression. A very good example of this is provided by Marc-Antoine Charpentier in one of his settings of De profundis, H 156. He writes music for verses 1, 2 and 4 of the psalm and directs that the same music be used for the remaining verses, for example verse 8 is to be sung to the music of verse 4. As Rebel’s De profundis is now lost we do not know whether it was composed in this way or not and are, therefore, unable to say if his composition was sung twice, or whether two different settings of the same psalm were heard.

The memorial service on 16 December 1764 also included a performance of Rebel’s De profundis during the Offertory. The Mercure tells us too that the Gilles Messe was performed and then a setting of the Dies irae by the Abbé Dugué. Inclusion of the psalm at the Offertory suggests that, again, the service may have been a liturgical commemoration, but the report then goes on to say that the Dies irae was performed after the Messe, which is not the correct position liturgically. This immediately creates a doubt over that aspect of the event. Although other details about the performance and

---

33 For a full discussion of fauxbourdon see Deborah Kauffman’s recent article, details of which are given at Chapter 4, note 92.
34 Mercure, Jan 1765, I, pp. 191-92, ‘Pendant l’Offertoire on exécuta le De profundis de M.REBEL’.
the musicians taking part are similar to those which would be found in a review of a concert it is impossible to say with any certainty whether or not that is what it was. Another Dies irae was included with Gilles’ Messe for the Rameau memorial service which took place in Orléans on 15 January 1765. This was the work by Giroust, who directed the performance on that occasion. The report, though, does not make it clear at which point during the service the Dies irae was performed. Eby notes the comments made at the time which show that it was considered an innovation to set the ‘Dies irae’ to music when it had been their custom to sing it in plainchant. Eby continues by saying that François-Joseph Gossec may have been the first composer to include a ‘Dies irae’ setting as an integral part of a French Requiem Mass. This is curious, as his table 4 shows that both Antoine Brume and Marc-Antoine Charpentier had done so earlier.

Two items which appeared in the Mercure de France provide further indications about liturgy within memorial services. The first is the report of the annual, solemn service held by Parisian musicians at the church of St Sulpice on Wednesday 10 December 1732 to commemorate their deceased colleagues. The names of those being remembered are given and we are told that there was a good attendance. The report includes the name of the officiating clergyman, M. Vasselin. It also mentions that the priest at St Sulpice, without seeking any payment, took charge of the arrangements for
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38 Ibid., p. 228.
39 Ibid., p. 227. Charpentier’s composition has already been mentioned above.
40 Mercure, December 1732, I, p. 2701, ‘Les Musiciens de Paris célébrerent le Mercredi 10 de ce mois, dans l’Eglise de S. Sulpice, le Service annuel et solennel pour leurs Confrères deffunts.’
41 Ibid., p. 2702, ‘L’Officiant fut M. Vasselin, Beneficier de l’Eglise de Paris.’
the ringing of bells, and the lighting and decoration of the altar.\textsuperscript{42} The \textit{maître de musique} at the Sainte Chapelle, M. de la Croix, directed the musicians, although there are no details of the music which was performed.\textsuperscript{43} As there is a great deal of information provided for this event, including the name of the person officiating, it is difficult to imagine that the service would be anything other than a full religious ceremony.

The second item in the \textit{Mercure} is a letter published thirty years later in 1762. We know from this that the commemoration ceremony at the church of Saint-Jean-de-Latran for the playwright Crébillon was one of great formality as it mentions ‘a number of Ministers assisting at the altar, robed in vestments’ and ‘the majestic order of the ceremonies’.\textsuperscript{44} The service was held at this particular church because it was governed by the Order of Malta and not the Parisian ecclesiastical authorities. Requests to other churches from the Comédie-Française, who wished to organise and pay for a memorial service as their tribute to Crébillon, had been turned down.\textsuperscript{45} The clergyman at Saint-Jean-de-Latran, frère René Huot, did agree to their request and he accepted a fee for his services.\textsuperscript{46} The Archbishop of Paris was said to be furious and complained to the Order of Malta. As a result Huot was sent on retreat for two weeks and fined 200 French francs for the benefit of the poor of his parish.\textsuperscript{47} This not only gives us an insight into how the church authorities regarded the theatre and those who worked

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Mercure}, December 1732, I, p. 2702, ‘M. le Curé de S. Sulpice...n’a voulu rien recevoir pour la sonnerie, le luminaire et la décoration de l’Autel, &c. mais il daigna même veiller à toute la cérémonie, au bon ordre et à l’arrangement.’
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., ‘La Musique fut exécutée par M. de la Croix, Maître de Musique de la Sainte Chapelle.’
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., July 1762, II, p. 146, ‘Le nombre des Ministres assistants à l’Autel, revêtus d’ornaments, la majestueuse régularité des ceremonies...’.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. 46, A M. le curé de Saint-Jean...185 liv.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 48, ‘M. le bailli d’Estourmel rendit une ordonnance qui condamnait le curé Huot à quinze jours de retraite ...; et à 200 francs d’amende au profit des pauvres de Saint-Jean-de-Latran.’
there but it also tells us quite clearly that the event was a liturgical ceremony and not simply a concert performance of Gilles’ *Messe*.

There is another, obvious factor which helps our consideration of the liturgical content of these memorial services, and that is the very inclusion of a motet for the Elevation. We have noted above that the instructions in Charpentier’s masses for the Dead indicate the singing of a motet at this point in the service ‘if there was time’, itself an indication that other formalities took place which governed the order of events. It is hardly likely, therefore, that the editors of the 1764 version of Gilles’ *Messe* would go to the trouble of selecting a suitable piece to use as a contrafactum for an Elevation motet if that liturgical observance were not going to be part of the commemoration.

In conclusion, therefore, we know that religious ceremonial took place at the services for Rameau in October 1764 and for Crébillon in 1762; for the latter, and for the service in 1732 we even have the name of the officiating priests. For the service in December 1764, however, the information is less clear. As these commemorations are all described as ‘service solomnel’ or ‘pompe funèbre’, it is more than likely that they followed the same basic format; some included religious formalities and it is probable, therefore, that all of them had both musical and liturgical content.
Chapter 8

Reworkings

As indicated in the Introduction and at the end of Chapter 1, many alterations were made to Gilles’ *Messe des morts* in 1764; the main additions, the three contrafacta, have already been discussed in Chapter 6. This section will look at the many other alterations made to the work, an increasingly common practice at the time, particularly with works which had been revived. The case of Act IV of Lully’s *Armide* has been well documented by Lois Rosow. When *Armide* was revived in 1746, responsibility for the alterations lay with the Opéra directors François Rebel and François Francœur, who made many small cuts of repeated material, and from static dialogue scenes.¹ Similar cuts were made to Gilles’ *Messe* in 1764 but, like *Armide* and other operas revived in the mid-eighteenth century, the *Messe* also includes additional material. Apart from the contrafacta, one example is a thirty-three bar passage added to the *Offertoire*.

In Chapter 4 it was demonstrated that ideas for some of the alterations may have originated with Royer in 1750 (see table 4.4); these will be examined in more detail here in conjunction with others. The usual aim of such alterations was to bring compositions into line with the latest tastes, which may have included the regular phrase lengths of the developing classical style. Whatever the reasons, the alterations were carried out in various ways, and these are discussed below under individual headings. In each case the wording is necessarily descriptive, but general conclusions will be drawn in the final summary. The edition which has been used when making comparison with the 1764 version of the *Messe des morts* is again that by Hajdu.

¹ Rosow, ‘The case of *Armide*’s fourth act’, pp. 219 and 226.
order to avoid unnecessary repetition when describing the differences between them, where two bar numbers are quoted adjacent to one another the first will relate to the Hajdu edition and the second to the 1764 version, e.g. bar 2 (3). Despite the change of time signature in the Introit from $\frac{4}{4}$ in the earlier edition to $\frac{6}{8}$ in the later, the narrative will refer to crotchet beats.

**Cuts**

The cuts made to the Mass as it appears in Hajdu’s edition tend to be small and localised in nature rather than large excisions. The first cut made in 1764 (and by Royer in 1750) is bar 7 of the Introit of Hajdu’s edition, with the similar passage at bar 37 of that edition also being omitted. The result of the latter cut is shown in examples 8.1(a) and (b) below, the former taken from the Hajdu edition, where the omitted bar is labelled A, and the second from the 1764 version. When the theme shown in these examples returns towards the end of the Introit at bars 308-309 (270) the same cut is made. The omitted bar was merely a repetition of the previous bar, so this is an easy cut to make, in the sense that the adjacent material does not require further amendment. The resultant shortening of the syllable ‘ter’ in the vocal part, though, is a feature which occurs here and at other points in the 1764 version of the work. This syllable is, of course, part of the word ‘aeternam’ (eternal or everlasting). As Gilles often uses notes of long value when he sets this word, it seems to be a deliberate attempt on his part to create a feeling of everlasting rest in the music. In other words he used a style of word-painting which neither Royer nor the Opéra editors favour later in the century. Michel Prada provides examples from other compositions in which Gilles has used the same technique.² If, as suggested above, one of the considerations for

---

² Prada, *Un maître de musique*, pp. 108-09.
making changes of this sort was a desire to regularise the phrase structure, that is not the case here, as the existing four-bar phrase has been reduced to three.

Example 8.1(a)
This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu. Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.

Example 8.1(b)
Instrumental passages are also cut from the earlier version in 1764, four being omitted from the Introit. The first cut, bars 20-24, contains material which does not appear elsewhere, but the chords at the beginning of bars 20 and 25 are both first inversions of the tonic and the intervening passage has been omitted. The second instrumental cut removes part of the prelude to the basse solo ‘Et tibi redetur’; the beginning of this prelude, the last beat of bar 183 (175), is the point at which, as shown in tables 4.2 and 4.4, the melody is given to the bassoons. Six bars later, a cut is made from the last beat of bar 189 to the second beat of bar 202 inclusive, but in their place four new bars are inserted in 1764 (from the last beat of bar 181 to the second beat of bar 185). This insertion includes divided bassoons playing an inversion of the thirds at bars 263 and 266 (227-28). The third cut is the interlude between the ‘Et tibi’ solo and duo, from the up-beat to bar 226 to the second beat of bar 244; this interlude is a repeat of the original instrumental prelude to the solo. The omitted section is also a slightly shorter version of the preceding solo, at bars 203-25 (186-208); although it excludes the cadence to the dominant key in the soloist’s passage, it can broadly be regarded as repeated material. The other omission, bars 264-65, is certainly that. Bar 264 is a slightly decorated version of bar 262 (226) and bar 265 is a repeat of bar 263 (227), although the 1764 version is scored for bassoons and horns rather than the violins and flutes of the earlier version.

The repeat contained in the Introit is also shortened in 1764, bars 44-60 and 66-106 being omitted. The former is part of the solo, sung in the earlier version to the phrase beginning ‘dona eis requiem’, and the latter is the duo ‘Et lux perpetua’ and its instrumental introduction.

Altogether, therefore, by the various methods described, 87 bars which were in the earlier version of the Introit have been left out in 1764.
In the *Graduel* three cuts are made from the earliest known version of the *Messe*. Two of these, bars 26-27 and 48-49 are instrumental; the first contains material very similar to, and the second is a repeat of, the two respective preceding bars. The third cut in this movement is bars 144-56, where the alterations are more complicated. The omission consists of the last two bars of a choral passage, and a four-bar instrumental link to a *basse* solo ‘ab auditione’, which is also omitted with the exception of its last two bars, 157-58 (131-32). These final solo bars have had choral parts added, some of which double the instrumental parts at that point, and they lead straight into the unaltered choral bars which end the movement. In this way two separate chorus sections in the early version are combined in order to be sung without a break in 1764. The material which has been excluded is not an exact repeat of the music which preceded it, but is similar to it.

Four omissions are made from the earlier version of the *Offertoire*; two of these are instrumental sections, at bars 5-23 and 120-21. The first contains music very similar to what follows but, apart from bars 21-23 which appear again a minor third higher in the Hostias section at bars 219-21 (192-94), it does not have an exact repeat later in the movement. The second omission, bars 120-21, is of music which is repeated immediately at bars 122-23 (94-95). Example 8.2(a) shows the earlier of these versions, in which the same minor third is played by the flutes three times, with preceding upper grace notes on the second occasion. In 1764, shown at example 8.2(b), the flutes play the middle third a semitone lower than the two outer ones. It is curious to note that in this instance, where two statements of static thirds occurred in the earlier version, one of those statements has been omitted from the later version and the other altered. However, where pairs of descending thirds are repeated, as at bars 99-101 (74-76) and 102-04 (77-79), no cut has been made, and the thirds played at bars 114-15
(88-89) and 116-17 (90-91), with the middle one a step higher on each occasion, also both remain in the 1764 version. This seems to indicate again that any lack of movement in the original music has been intentionally removed.

Example 8.2(a) Offertoire, bars 122-23, original version

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.

Example 8.2(b) Offertoire, bars 94-95, 1764 version

The third omission from the Offertoire, bars 136-58, consists of a duo for dessus and haute-contre plus an eight-bar instrumental link to the following chorus. The duo is almost the same as the dessus and basse of the chorus which follows, the principal differences being the additional choral voices and the pitch of the lower part, most of which is an octave lower than the haute-contre in the duo. The orchestral link also omitted at this point is similar in style to the rest of the movement but is not repeated.

The six bars which form the fourth omission, numbers 192-97, part of the chœur ‘Quam olim Abrahae’, are heard again at bars 273-78 (245-50) and, in place of those omitted, an additional thirty-three bars are inserted, which will be discussed later.

It is quite clear, therefore, that omissions were made from a whole range of passages, solos, duos, instrumental and choral, the majority of which consisted of material which
had either been repeated, or was very similar to that nearby in the earlier version of the
*Messe*.

There are two further passages which may have been cut from performances in 1764; the first is the ‘B’ section of the *Elévation*. This is 23 bars in length and has been crossed through on the performing parts for the soloist and instrumentalists, but no such deletion appears in the full score used for the services. The second possible omission is the Benedictus, which may have been replaced by the additional *Elévation*. The evidence for this is the same as that just described: the score does not have any deletion but in the performing parts the Benedictus has been crossed out. Although the indications are contradictory, this section may well have been omitted at one or both of the Rameau memorial services and, if so, the repeat of the Hosanna in the Sanctus would also have been left out.

**Shortening of note values**

The cut from the Hajdu edition shown in example 8.1 results in the two tied semibreves in the melodic line being reduced to one. At the other points mentioned above where this cut has been made, the effect is the same. Further instances of notes whose values have been shortened can be seen in the 1764 score, but unlike example 8.1, the majority do not arise from straightforward cuts made to the earlier version. In most cases where shortenings have been made in one part, alterations are also needed in accompanying parts, either by shortening of values in those parts too, by omission of chords or rests, or by a combination of both. This can be seen in the examples below, where in each case (a) is taken from the Hajdu edition and (b) is from the 1764 score (the key which precedes the examples – see page 172 – clarifies the labelling used). At bar 10 of the Introit, shown in example 8.3(a), the dotted minim in the *dessus*
*de violon* (DVn) has been reduced to a crotchet in bar 10 of example 8.3(b). Similarly, at bars 40–41 in example 8.4(a), where the voice now has almost the same melodic line which the DVn had in example 3, the semibreve and minim have both been shortened to crotchets at bar 33 of example 8.4(b). As a result, amendments have to be made in other parts and these are shown in the examples by means of a key which attempts to convey them in a more clear and concise way than would be achieved by a verbal description. It would, nevertheless, be helpful to draw attention to the main points.

In bar 12 of example 8.3(a), the first two crotchet beats of the earlier version have been omitted altogether in the later one, example 8.3(b). Other omissions from the earlier version occur at the second crotchet beat of bar 10 in the *basse continue* (BC) part and, in the same bar, at the third and fourth beats of the *hautes-contre de violon* (HcVn) and *taille de violon* (TVn) parts. There is also a reduction in note values in the BC part in bar 10 of the earlier version, where the third and fourth beats become a dotted quaver and semiquaver and move back to the second beat of the bar. By using this combination of omissions and shortened note values the phrases shown in examples 8.3(a) and 8.4(a) have each been reduced in length by one bar, to 3½ and 4 bars respectively (the first bar does not appear in the examples). The succeeding phrases are 6½ bars and 7 bars long respectively; in 1764 the first of these remains unchanged and the second is reduced to 6 bars. Some regularisation of the phrase structure has occurred here, therefore, but there is no consistency, and the new phrase lengths appear to be a result of the alterations described rather than being the main reason for them.

Passages from the *Graduel* which have received similar treatment are shown at examples 8.5(a) and (b) and 8.6(a) and (b). The first of these pairs shows how three bars in 8.5(a), 53–55, have been reduced to two in 8.5(b), bars 48–49; in examples
8.6(a) and (b) two bars in the top system of (a), 71-72, become one, 63, in (b), and in
the lower system of (a) three bars, 78-80, are reduced to one, 69, in (b). This last
alteration also removes a repeat of the progression of thirds in the flutes.

Alterations of this nature lead to another development. At bar 44 (36) of the Introit, the
last bars in examples 4(a) and (b) respectively, the minim rest in the voice part has
been filled by moving forward the third beat, and what follows, by half a bar. The
underlay has also been changed at this point from ‘dona eis Domine’ to ‘Requiem
aeternam’. The metrical shift continues until the omission of the crotchet rests on the
last beat of bar 53 and the first beat of 54 (bars 44-45 in 1764). Correction of the
displacement lasts only briefly, however, because in bar 55 (46), shown in examples
8.7(a) and (b), the music is brought forward again to fill in two crotchet rests. After
further, similar changes, also shown in those examples, the original metrical position is
finally restored at bar 61 (49) by the omission of two crotchet chords from bar 60.

Many of the note values in the intervening passage are reduced, including that sung in
the vocal line to the syllable ‘ter’ at bar 57 (47). It has already been noted that this
syllable was shortened as a result of the cut shown in example 1 and at the points
where that is repeated. The same syllable is shortened at bar 40 (33) as illustrated in
examples 8.4(a) and (b).

At bars 129-130 of the Hajdu edition of the Graduel, shown in example 8.8(a), Gilles
uses a slightly different device to create the feeling of eternal rest. He sets the last two
syllables of the word ‘aeterna’ to two minims but uses exactly the same chord for both.
This stillness too is altered in 1764 as part of more extensive changes, which begin ten
bars earlier at bars 119-120. These are reduced to one (108), the first bar in example
8.8(b), by the omission of three crotchet rests and by bringing forward the slightly
altered vocal entry. This was a basse solo but has become a chorus line for basses-
tailles. However, the original final note, F, is too low in that voice’s register and the last two bars have been altered to bring the line to a conclusion on c. This requires changes of tonality in the following chorus passage in order to reach the final, unchanged B♭ major chord, but the length of the passage and the rhythms remain the same. Interestingly, if the basses-tailles line had been made to end b♭, g, f, there would have been no need for any changes to the chorus, and the chords for ‘aeterna’ could have remained as Gilles wrote them. The new chords at bars 117-118 of the 1764 version, also included in example 8.8(b), are still fairly static, but it would appear that making changes to them was one reason for the other alterations made at this point. Further changes to note values have been made in the Communion movement, and some comparisons can be seen in examples 8.9 and 8.10.

Key to Examples

A  Omitted, e.g. note, rest or bar in example (a) is omitted from example (b)
B  Becomes crotchet, e.g. minim in example (a) is crotchet in example (b)
C  Becomes dotted quaver and semiquaver
D  Becomes dotted crotchet and quaver
E  Becomes crotchet, dotted quaver and semiquaver
F  Cadence appuyé written out
G  Becomes crotchet tied to dotted quaver and semiquaver
H  Becomes rest
I  Becomes quaver
J  Becomes quaver rest and quaver
K  Becomes semiquaver
L  Becomes minim
Example 8.3(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.

Example 8.3(b)
Example 8.4(a)

This example is based on the following edition: *Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo*, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.

Example 8.4(b)
Example 8.5(a)

This example is based on the following edition: *Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo*, ed. by John Hajdu, *Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era*, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.

Example 8.5(b)
Example 8.6(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.
Example 8.7(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.
Example 8.8(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.
Example 8.8(b)

Bars 112-13

Bars 117-18
Example 8.9(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.
Example 8.9(b)

Communion

[Exsus de violon, Flûtes et Hautbois]

[Lent]

[Violons]

doux

doux

doux

[Basses]

[Basses, Basses et Contrebasses]

[Lux, lux aeternum]

[L]

[D]

[B]

[DVn]

[HeVn]

[TVn]

[B]

[Ba]

[na, lux aeternum in aeternum, eis Domine, sanctis suis in aeternum]

[D] [B] [I]
Example 8.10(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.
The instances given above are typical of the way note value reductions have been carried out, but they occur in many other places in the work. A full list is provided in table 8.1 below.
Table 8.18 - Note value reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Bar nos. in H</th>
<th>Bar nos. in 1764</th>
<th>Effect of reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introit</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>3 bars to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-43</td>
<td>33-35</td>
<td>4 bars to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44-60</td>
<td>36-48</td>
<td>17 bars to 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(repeat)</td>
<td>40-43</td>
<td>273-75</td>
<td>4 bars to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduel(a)</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>3 bars to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>4 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78-80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119-20</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132-33</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertoire</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109-10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>205-06</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>212-13</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224-25</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>4 bars to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>4 bars to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2 bars to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhythmic changes

In many places in the 1764 version of the *Messe des morts* the rhythm has become more dotted than it was in Gilles’ original. This can be illustrated by comparing the two crotchets labelled D in bar 12 of example 8.3(a) and the dotted crotchet and quaver in bar 11 of example 8.3(b). On occasions this change from even note values to dotted rhythm is combined with note value reduction. As has already been mentioned above this happened with the crotchets labelled C at bar 10 of example 8.3(a), which became a dotted quaver and semiquaver at bar 10 of example 8.3(b). In other cases the dotted crotchet and quaver become a crotchet tied to a dotted quaver and semiquaver in 1764.

Comparison of bar 41 in example 8.4(a) with bar 33 of example 8.4(b) shows that the soloist’s word ‘dona’ has been treated in this way. By altering this rhythm the editors have matched it to that used for ‘Requiem’, the opening word of the piece, shown in example 8.1(b), and in doing so, they have made explicit the implicit rhythm of Gilles’ notation. Another instance of a change to the same rhythm can be seen in the final bars of examples 8.4(a) and (b). Here the two crotchets in the *dessus de violon* (DsVn) part, shown in the second half of bar 44 in example 8.4(a), not only adopt this rhythm in bar 36 of example 8.4(b) but also play it, as already mentioned above, in its new metrical position at the beginning of the bar. With the soloist singing ‘Requiem’ at this point, and other parts having rests, the altered rhythm gives an even closer match to that of the opening ‘Requiem’ in example 8.1.

The editors in 1764 have also shown their skill by trying to retain, despite all the changes, another rhythmic feature of the earlier version, the dotted quaver and semiquaver on the second crotchet of the bar. A good example is the *taille de violon*
(TVn) part at bar 13 of example 8.3(a), labelled E, where a minim has been altered to a
crotchet, dotted quaver and semiquaver at bar 12 of example 8.3(b).

Additions

The first addition to the Messe in 1764 is the very opening bar, in which the timbales
voilées (muffled kettledrums) sound three crotchet beats on f and a fourth on c. These
lead to a drum roll on f on the first beat of the following bar, which is a rest in the
equivalent, opening bar in Hajdu’s edition. Strokes are marked in the score above the
crotchets in the first bar; these, and the method by which the drums were muffled, are
discussed in the sections headed ‘Ornamentation’ and ‘Timbale voilée’ in part II of this
thesis (pages 242 and 249-52 respectively). Not only is this opening bar an addition to
the work but the drum part itself is completely new. After creating this sombre
atmosphere, the drums continue to feature in both instrumental and choral sections of
the Introit. In the Kyrie, as described in Chapter 6 (Contrafacta), they play a prominent
role in building up the tension and emotion. Then, however, nothing further is written
for them. The tonality changes in the next movement, the Graduel, to G minor, which,
together with G major, predominates in the rest of the work. Retuning of the drums
would, therefore, be required, but, at that time, this did not usually take place during
the performance of a single work.³

Five new bars added at the beginning of the ‘Te decet’ section of the Introit were
written for solo oboe and basse continue, as already shown in Table 4.2. When the
dessus soloist enters at bar 162 (154) the oboe continues with an independent,
decorative part which, in effect, creates a duo with the singer as far as bar 175. There is
no evidence that oboes were included in the original work, but the only movements of
the Messe in which they are not heard in 1764 are the Graduel and the Elévation. In

most places they double the violin parts, but in the Kyrie contrafactum the oboes and the flutes play together at times, independently of the violins, with the flutes playing some phrases alone. On this occasion, therefore, sufficient players would be needed for both flutes and oboes to be played at the same time, for in the eighteenth century these instruments would usually be played by the same performers and only one or the other would appear in the score.4

The horn parts for the Introit and Kyrie are newly written and, in both movements, are in the key of F, whereas the contrafactum for the Elévation includes existing parts for horns in Eb. The players, therefore, must have instruments equipped with crooks which enable them to effect a key change. This technical development of the horn enabled its role to be expanded from use simply as ‘cors de chasse’ (hunting horns), usually in D or C, and restricted to hunting, celebratory or festive scenes, to use also as ‘orchestral’ horns. Compositions by Jean-Pierre Guignon for such instruments, described as ‘cors de chasse allemands’ (because the players came from Germany),5 were included in programmes at the Concert Spirituel in December 1748.6 Cucuel confirms that the players on this occasion were in the service of La Pouplinière;7 he also reports evidence that Guignon, in a letter to Rameau, signed himself ‘chef de violons’ for La Pouplinière.8 This is further evidence of the links already mentioned in Chapter 6 between this wealthy patron and the music performed at the Concert Spirituel.

---


5 Masson, L’Opéra, p.529, ‘...les cornistes allemands de La Pouplinière’.


7 Cucuel, La Pouplinière, pp. 329-30, ‘deux nouveaux cors de chasse allemands, qui sont certainement ceux de La Pouplinière’.

The changing role of the horn is illustrated very well in Mary Cyr’s edition of
Rameau’s *Les fêtes d’Hébé*. This opera was premiered in 1739, and the third scene of
the first entrée includes horns, this time in F, to indicate the sound of the hunt. The
final scene of the second entrée has a chorus and dances in celebration of a victory, and
these include parts for trumpets and horns in D. For the 1756 revival Rameau made
additions to the eighth scene of the third entrée, in which horns are used as an integral
part of the orchestra. A *Loure grave* (slow dance) includes horns in E which sustain
mainly tonic and dominant harmonies. The horns also have a supporting role in the
subsequent *Musette en Rondeau* and chorus; in the instrumental accompaniment for the
latter, soft, melodic horn passages briefly double the *dessus* voice.

The parts for horns in the *Messe* provide mainly harmonic support. Occasionally,
though, they double the bassoons with the melodic line in the Introit, and in the Kyrie
join in with the melody at the end of phrases. In 1764 there were two horn players at
the Opéra, Hebert and Grillet, and it is highly likely that they would have performed
these parts at the Rameau memorial services. In the Kyrie the role for the horn does not
extend to the contrafactum within that movement, which is curious, as all the other
instruments and singers do perform in that. In the score of the contrafactum, there is,
however, a line for a third DVn, for which no separate performing part survives.
Interestingly, La Gorce informs us that Hebert and Grillet, the horn players, were also
required to play the *haute-contre* and *taille de violon* as part of their duties at the
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9 Mary Ellen Cyr, ‘Rameau’s *Les fêtes d’Hébé*’, 2 vols (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of
10 Ibid., pp. 263-77 and 280-83.
11 Ibid., pp. 360-63.
12 Ibid., pp. 369-71 and 375-82.
Opéra. Could it be, therefore, that these players were called upon to perform the third violin part at this point, either on violins or violas? That would seem to be one possible explanation. As the part is only a few bars in length, it may have been written on a single piece of paper which, after use, could easily have been mislaid.

A further point of interest regarding the addition of horn parts is provided by Malherbe, who notes that the Bibliothèque de l’Opéra in Paris holds a manuscript for a late revival of *Castor et Pollux*, in which horns are included. He gives no further details, however, as the alteration was made after Rameau’s death and, as a result, did not have the authority of the composer.

The four new bars in the Introit (181-85), which replaced one of the omissions from that movement, have already been discussed above in the section headed ‘Cuts’. The cut of bars 192-97 from the Offertoire, mentioned under the same heading, has been replaced in 1764 by 33 new bars (141-173). The first 13 of these are written for *dessus 1 & 2, haute-contre* and *taille*, accompanied by flutes, oboes, strings and continuo; then follow 20 bars of full chorus, which are immediately followed by the section’s concluding choral bars in the original, 198-200. In the first part of this addition, the two lower voices combine to give a three-part vocal texture; the *taille de violon* (TVn) has an independent part at bars 149-50, but with that exception the instruments double the voices. The underlay used, beginning with ‘Sed signifer Sanctus Michael’, has already been set for duo, chorus and for a trio of upper voices between bars 135 and 179 of the Hajdu edition, and although new music is used to set it again from the final
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14 La Gorce, ‘L’orchestre’, p. 32, ‘...à deux musiciens chargés aussi de jouer les parties intermédiaires de haute-contre et de taille de violon, Hebert et Grillot’.
16 Ibid., p. xc, ‘...la version adoptée par les directeurs de l’Opéra après la mort de Rameau, et, par conséquent, sans la volonté de l’auteur’.
beat of bar 140 to bar 173 in the revised version, the previous style is continued and
the addition begins with another trio of voices. The downward motion on the word
‘representet’, sung earlier at bars 179-80 (128-29) as a basse solo, is adopted by the
upper voices in the new section at bars 148-49. The haute-contre and taille then sing
the same word to a rising scale and a few bars later it is sung in the chorus by the
basses-tailles and basses in contrary motion. When the chorus continues with the text
‘Quam olim Abrahae’ the music is again new, but in the same style as that already
heard, indeed the bass line progression at bars 167-69 recurs at bars 176-78 and 182-84
in the 1764 version. The first two of these passages are shown in example 8.11(b); in
the earlier edition the equivalent bars are 201-03 and 208-10, the first of which appears
in example 8.11(a).

Where the new material joins the existing closing bars of this section, further changes
have been made. The alterations leading up to this point have resulted in the crotchet
beat which had been the first in bar 198, shown in example 8.11(a), becoming the last
in the previous bar, 173 in example 8.11(b). A change of time signature from $\frac{3}{4}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$
then takes place and the crotchet at the beginning of bar 199, example 8.11(a), is
changed to a minim, which creates a hemiola in bar 174 of the new version, example
8.11(b). The harmonies are also different at this point; the lines for the TVn and for the
inner voices have been altered, resulting, perhaps unintentionally, in a bare fifth on the
final chord, shown in bar 175 in example 8.11(b). In the Hajdu edition the endings of
this section and of the Offertoire are exactly the same, but in the 1764 version, when
the hemiola is heard again at the end of the Offertoire, the original harmonies have
been retained.
Example 8.11(a)

This example is based on the following edition: Jean Gilles: Requiem (Messe des morts): For four soloists, chorus, orchestra, and continuo, ed. by John Hajdu, Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 47 (Madison, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 1984). All rights reserved.

Bars 201-03
Example 8.11(b)

Bars 167-9

Bars 176-78
A much shorter addition of just three bars has been placed in the Sanctus between bars 21 and 22 (21 and 25). The addition is shown at the beginning of example 8.12, and is scored for bassoons and basse continue with music which anticipates that of the following three bars (25-27), although the insert ends in octaves and the anticipated phrase on a D major chord. The first bassoon plays the melody which the DVn then repeats, with the exception of the last note, $d'$ for the bassoon but $f#'$ for the violin. The second bassoon plays the line the basse soloist then sings and the BC part is the same for each phrase, although ending an octave lower, on $D$, in the addition.

**Example 8.12**

There is another alteration at bar 39 (41) of the Sanctus, which can be seen in example 8.13. This again gives prominence to the bassoons. In the original the BC here plays alone three crotchets on $d$; above that, in 1764, the bassoons add $a$ and $f#'$ on each crotchet beat, and on the first beat of the next bar, with upper grace notes before all but the first. Although there is no extra bar at this point the bassoons are adding some interest to a static BC part.
Example 8.13

Royer, as we have seen in Chapter 4, gave some independence to the bassoons in the alterations he made to the Introit in 1750. His allocation to the bassoons of the melody in the Prelude to ‘Et tibi’ is retained by the editors in 1764, and, in the four new bars added immediately after that, the editors included bassoons playing in sixths; this, and the further additions shown in examples 8.12 and 8.13, continues this more independent style. We must not overlook, though, the contribution Rameau himself made to the development of the role of this instrument, which includes the frequent use of divided bassoons.\(^\text{17}\) It is particularly appropriate, therefore, that these inserts have been included.

The *contrebasse* (double bass) was introduced to the Opéra orchestra when Montéclair played it there in about 1700. At first it was used for dramatic effect in, for example, storm scenes, but composers soon began to appreciate the harmonic and rhythmic support it could provide for large ensembles, and by the 1730s it had a regular place in the orchestra.\(^\text{18}\) The double bass is added to the continuo group in the 1764 version of the *Messe*, and supports instrumental and choral passages; it also accompanies the


vocal quartet in the *Offertoire*, but does not play during vocal solos or duos. Mary Cyr points out that it is often difficult to tell from the bass line in the full score exactly which combination of cellos, bassoons and double basses is playing at any one time.\(^\text{19}\)

That certainly applies in this case, and it has been necessary to consult the individual parts for clarification. For this reason separate lines for the different bass instruments are occasionally shown in the transcription which forms part II of this thesis, particularly in the Introit and *Graduel*. These two movements provide further evidence for Cyr’s observation of the slightly simplified rhythms sometimes written for the *contrebasse*.\(^\text{20}\)

There are two further, short additional passages for existing instruments in the later movements of the *Messe* in 1764. In the Agnus Dei, between bars 66 and 69, the flutes have a new part very similar to that of the *hautes-contre de violon* (HcVn), but an octave higher. The Communion has completely new parts for the first and second violins from bars 30 to 39, providing a soft accompaniment for the voices of the choir, previously accompanied only by the continuo. In the same movement a new part is also added for the HcVn between bars 29 and 45 and this, for most of that time, doubles the *taille* voice part. The strengthening of this part, and of others in this movement, are shown in table 8.2 below.

**Unexpected consequences**

The various alterations to the *Messe* have occasionally produced results which may not have been intended. The chord with a bare fifth at bar 175 of the *Offertoire* has already been mentioned above. A similar situation has arisen in the *Graduel* with the chords on

\(^{19}\) Cyr, ‘*Basses*’, p. 155.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., pp. 162-63.
the second and third beats of bar 112 and the first beat of the following bar. As can be seen in example 8.8(b), these chords also lack a third, unlike those around them.

In the Introit the alterations have brought about clashes between some of the parts. Three instances are now given, and the examples in which they appear are shown as written in the source document in order to demonstrate the probable errors. The edition in Part II of this thesis has been emended in the second and third cases, with appropriate comments in the critical notes, to give a reading which is perhaps closer to that intended. On the third crotchet beat of bar 33, shown in example 8.4(b), the DVn and Cor 2 are playing $g'$ against $f'$ in the HcVn, which seems uncharacteristic for Gilles, but may have been acceptable to listeners some sixty years later. Even more unlikely is the clash in the same example, on the first beat of bar 34, between the $d''$ and $f'$ in Cors 1 and 2, and the $e''$ of the dessus soloist. Bearing in mind that the performing part for this solo was written for a basse-taille singer at a pitch one octave lower than that in the score, the resultant clash between the soloist’s $e'$ and the $f'$ in Cor 2 would have been harsher still. One more clash which has arisen can be seen in example 8.7(b), on the second beat of bar 47, between $d'$ in the HcVn and $e$ in the basse.

**Strengthening of Parts**

We have seen already in table 4.3 that in some cases, what were originally basse solos became choral lines for basses-tailles and basses in 1764. There are more passages which became choral items in the later version, and earlier instrumental solos were later written for a full desk of players. In other instances one line has been strengthened by another and full details are provided in table 8.2 below. Comments on some typical alterations follow the table.
Table 8.2 - Strengthening of Parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Bar(s)</th>
<th>Scoring (seul unless stated)</th>
<th>Bar(s)</th>
<th>Scoring (tous unless stated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introit</td>
<td>81-107</td>
<td>BC, and duo of D and B</td>
<td>69-95</td>
<td>DVn, Bs, and vocal duo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139-49</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, B, BC</td>
<td>127-37</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb, Bn, Bs, Cb, BT &amp; B and Cors from bar 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183-89</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC</td>
<td>175-81</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, Cors, Bn, Bs Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284-86</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, BC</td>
<td>246-48</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, Bn et Bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293-95</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, BC</td>
<td>255-57</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, Timb, Bn et Bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>DVn et Fl HcVn, TVn, BC</td>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb, HcVn, TVn, Cors, Bn, Bs et Cb, and five-part choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, BC</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs et Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, BC</td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduel(a)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HcVn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>HcVn, TVn, Bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, Bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn, TVn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>BC, Fl</td>
<td>44-47</td>
<td>Bn, Bs et Cb, DVn et Fl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-69</td>
<td>Fl, BC</td>
<td>59-62</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, Bn, Bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157-58</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC (all tous), B seul</td>
<td>131-32</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn, TVn, Bs et Cb, and five-part choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertoire</td>
<td>90-92</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC (all tous), B (seul)</td>
<td>65-67</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs, Cb, B (seul), BT and B (chef)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92-99</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC (all tous), quartet of D, HC, T, BT</td>
<td>67-74</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs, Cb, vocal quartet and five-part choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110-13 &amp; 123-27</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, BC (all tous), quartet of D, HC, T, BT</td>
<td>84-87 &amp; 95-99</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs, Cb, vocal quartet and five-part choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173-79</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, BC, and trio of D1 and 2, HC</td>
<td>122-28</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bs, and D1 and 2, HC, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179-84</td>
<td>DVn, BC, B</td>
<td>128-33</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb, Bn, Bs, Cb, BT, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201-07</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC</td>
<td>176-82</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208-39</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC, T</td>
<td>182-211</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, Bn, B (seul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240-48</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, BC and B</td>
<td>212-20</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, Bn, Bs, Cb, HC, T, BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>257-67</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, BC and B</td>
<td>229-39</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, Bn, Bs, Cb, BT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.2 continued

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, BC and B</td>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, Tvn, Bn, Bs, Cb BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58-63</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, and trio of D1 and 2, HC</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, Tvn, Bs, and D1 and 2, HC, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedicteus</td>
<td>74-80</td>
<td>BC and T</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>DVn2, Bs and T (seul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81-103</td>
<td>BC and trio of HC, T and B</td>
<td>11-33</td>
<td>DVn1 and 2, Bs, and vocal trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, BC</td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81-83</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, BC</td>
<td>81-83</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Bn, Bs, Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>37-41</td>
<td>BC and T (tous)</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td>Bs, HcVn, T, and DVn from bar 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-47</td>
<td>TVn, BC, T, BT (all tous)</td>
<td>33-39</td>
<td>DVn, HcVn, TVn, Bs, T, BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47-51</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, TVn, BC, D, T, BT (all tous),</td>
<td>39-43</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bs, D, T, BT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-53</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, TVn, BC, D, T, BT, B (all tous),</td>
<td>43-45</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bs, D, T, BT, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78-85</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn, TVn, BC (all tous), B seul</td>
<td>70-77</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bn, Bs, Cb, BT, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, HcVn (all tous) and duo of D and HC</td>
<td>92-97</td>
<td>DVn, Fl, Hb, HcVn, TVn, Bs, D, HC, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Introit, at the duo ‘Et lux’, bar 81 (69), the *dessus* singer is doubled by the DVn in 1764. The source document at this point has the annotation ‘avec violons’ against the *dessus* line, so the decision to include the violins may have been a late one. Similarly, in the Benedictus, the *haute-contre* vocal line is marked ‘avec P⁷ viol’ and the *taille* is marked ‘avec S⁴ viol’. As already mentioned above, however, this movement may not have been performed in 1764 because it was probably replaced by the *Elévation*.

The Kyrie begins with a *taille* solo in both versions of the *Messe*. In the original, after the solo, an instrumental interlude, in which the DVn repeats the soloist’s theme, leads to the Christe, a duo sung by *haute-contre* and *taille*. This interlude, bars 11-21, has had all the voices of the choir added in 1764 (also bars 11-21). The three upper voices,
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dessus, hautes-contre and tailles, double the instrumental parts, DVn, HcVn, and TVn respectively; the part for basses-tailles is new, and the basses sing the BC part, except for minor differences. Choral voices are also added in the Offertoire between bars 240-48 (212-220), where the earlier version has a basse solo, ‘Fac eas Domine’, accompanied by solo, divided violins, one continuo instrument and organ or harpsichord. In 1764 this passage is sung by the hautes-contre, tailles, basses-tailles and basses of the choir, with all first and second violins plus all continuo instruments, bassons, basses and contrebasse. The two upper voices copy the violin parts one octave lower and the basses-tailles and basses sing the same as the basse soloist in the earlier version.

Another point of interest arises from the ‘seul’ markings on the instrumentation in the Hajdu edition of the Messe, as shown under the heading ‘Scoring’ on the left-hand side of table 8.2. This marking applies to all the parts listed in that column, voices and instruments, unless stated otherwise. In the case of the basse continue (BC), Hajdu explains that the marking indicates that only one bass instrument plays with the keyboard instrument.21 Many of the instrumental ‘seul’ markings are found in solo vocal passages, and the effect of this would be to make the singer more audible. There are some exceptions, though, one of which is found at bars 78-85 of the Communion, where the basse soloist has an instrumental accompaniment without ‘seul’ markings. The contrast between solo and full instrumental sections in the earlier version of the Messe would also provide dynamic variation, for which there is a dearth of markings in the principal source used by Hajdu.22 In 1764 the situation is reversed; there are very few ‘seul’ markings for the instruments but more indications of dynamics, including ‘doux’ in soft passages, even though they are intended for all players per part. For

21 Gilles, Requiem, ed. by Hajdu, p. xvi.
22 Ibid., p. xvi.
example, in the Hostias section of the Offertoire, between bars 176 and 220, the instruments which accompany the singers are marked ‘doux’, not ‘seul’. The change in dynamics, therefore, is achieved by instructing the players to reduce their volume, rather than reducing the number playing to one per line.

Summary

It is evident from the foregoing that the revisions made to the Messe des morts in 1764 were extensive; they were rather unequal, though, with considerable changes to phrasing and rhythm in some places, but elsewhere long sections unaltered apart from some minor details. The expansion of the orchestra and the strengthening of various parts in the original composition not only made full use of the instrumental and choral forces available for the Rameau commemoration, but would also make the work more audible to a large congregation. The shortening of note values, the consequent reduction in phrase lengths, and the omission of rests, all have the effect of maintaining movement in the music, but some of the quiet, reflective moments in the original are lost as a result. Technical developments, such as crooks which enabled horns to change key, were introduced and the roles of existing instruments, like the bassoons, were expanded in ways which reflected the practices of the day.

Many of the cuts removed either repeated material or passages of a static nature, and, as already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, these were exactly the kind of revisions made by Rebel and Francœur to Armide in 1746. This evidence shows that these composer-directors were probably also responsible for the editing process in 1764. However, Pierre-Montan Berton, who conducted the musicians at the Rameau memorial services, may also have been involved in the alterations, as he is known to have edited many works performed at the Opéra, some of which have already been
specified in Chapter 6. A full list of them appears in the Almanach des spectacles de Paris for 1781; this is reproduced by Emile Campardon, who claims it was compiled by Berton himself. Although the Messe des morts is not included, the list does contain a statement to the effect that, in addition to the various named operas, over a period of fifteen years there were few performances of revived works, where cuts, enlargements or orchestral additions were deemed necessary, on which Berton did not work. Indeed, Rosow puts forward evidence suggesting Berton was in charge of the 1766 revisions of Armide, which is not on the above-noted list either, but does just fall within the fifteen years mentioned. The alterations to the Messe des morts, however, were made outside that time span, although the period specified may have been only an approximation. The only evidence of Berton’s involvement in alterations to the Messe is the red crayon performance directions which he wrote on the score. Rosow maintains that, despite the alterations made to Armide in 1746, which affected mainly the fourth act, the opera ‘remains untouched by Rameau’s innovations in harmony, counterpoint and orchestration’. Further alterations involving all parts of the opera were carried out in 1761, but still, according to Rosow, they show ‘a certain restraint’. The new material was written in the style of the original for the existing instruments, the editor, Francœur, having chosen not to use additional timpani and clarinets, even though they were available. The way the instruments were used had been modernised, though, with the bassoons, for example, occasionally playing as a

---


24 Ibid., pp. 60-61, ‘Indépendamment de ces ouvrages éparés dans divers opéras, il s’en est peu donné depuis quinze ans, à l’exception des nouveaux, où il [Berton] n’avait travaillé soit pour les coupures ou augmentations jugées nécessaires, soit pour ajouter aux effets de l’orchestre...’.

25 Rosow, ‘From Destouches to Berton’, pp. 303-05.


27 Ibid., p. 228.
tenor instrument in addition to its normal bass role.\textsuperscript{28} Only three years later, as we have seen, no such restraint was evident in the case of Gilles’ \textit{Messe}. Admittedly the circumstances in 1764 were special, but the editors had no hesitation in using modern instruments, or in adding to a work composed some sixty years earlier contrafacta based on later compositions, and of a different style, one even from an Italian source. The comparison, therefore, between the treatment of Lully’s \textit{Armide} and of Gilles’ \textit{Messe} provides a good example of how editorial alterations to existing repertoire at the Opéra continued to develop.

It should not be assumed that such revision produces an unworthy or debased form of the original composition. In recent decades we have become accustomed to hearing examples of Mozart’s arrangements of Handel’s oratorios or Mendelssohn’s version of the \textit{St Matthew Passion}. It remains to be seen how successful the revision of the Gilles \textit{Messe des morts} was, but at the time this thesis was being prepared for submission the premiere performance in the U.K. of the 1764 version was being planned by the University of Hull Early Musick Ensemble for 19 March 2010.

\textsuperscript{28} Rosow, ‘The case of \textit{Armide}’s fourth act’, p. 231.
Appendix 1

The list of performances of Gilles’ *Messe des morts* given below has been compiled from various sources, and attempts to provide a record which shows both how widely and how often the work was used. However, it should not be regarded as complete as there may be references to other performances in publications which have not been consulted as part of this study.

The sources in which references have so far been found are:

Arnavon, Joseph-François, *Journal sur la ville d’Avignon* (Avignon: Bibliothèque municipale, fonds patrimoniaux, médiathèque Ceccano, Musée Calvet MS 1520)


Escoffier, Georges, ‘Formes institutionnelles et enjeux sociaux des pratiques musicales au XVIIIe siècle: L’exemple du Concert de Grenoble’, *RdM*, 87 (2001), 5-32


Mattheson, Johann, *Der Musicalische Patriot* (Hamburg, 1728)

*Mercure de France*


Vallas, Léon, *Un siècle de musique et de théâtre à Lyon, 1688-1789* (Lyon: Masson, 1932)


Key to abbreviations:

B.M. Bibliothèque municipale (Public library)

M *Mercure de France*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>Gilles’ own funeral service</td>
<td>Bougerel, p.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 1.1716</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>Memorial Service for Louis XIV</td>
<td>Prada, p.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 8.1726</td>
<td>Grenoble</td>
<td>Memorial Service for the late duchesse d’Orléans</td>
<td>Mattheson, p.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 1.1727</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>Service for the late duc de la Force</td>
<td>M, février, p.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 8.1730</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Service for Le Maréchal de Villeroy</td>
<td>Vallas, p.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 9.1730</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Service at L’Eglise de la Charité</td>
<td>Vallas, p.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1750</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel (Introit only)</td>
<td>M, déc I, p.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1750</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel (Introit only)</td>
<td>Pierre, 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 4.1751</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Grenoble</td>
<td>Memorial Service for the late duc d’Orléans</td>
<td>Escoffier, pp.9 &amp; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 4.1754</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel (Introit only)</td>
<td>Pierre, 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1755</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 1.1756</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Memorial Service for Royer</td>
<td>Labbet, Sentiment, p.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 4.1757</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1757</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel (Introit only)</td>
<td>Pierre, 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 5.1758</td>
<td>Moulins</td>
<td>Memorial Service for M. Palu</td>
<td>Prada, p.204, citing Affiches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1758</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 4.1762</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 7. 1762</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Memorial service for Crébillon</td>
<td>Collé, p.301 and M, juillet, II, p.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1762</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 3.1763</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Performances of Gilles’ *Messe* continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1763</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1764</td>
<td>Arles</td>
<td>Service for J. Bourdelon</td>
<td>Signorile, p.90, citing B.M. Arles, Ms.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.9.1764</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Memorial service for Rameau</td>
<td>M, oct, I, p.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10.1764</td>
<td>Avignon</td>
<td>Memorial service for Rameau</td>
<td>Arnavon, Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.1764</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Memorial service for Rameau</td>
<td>M, jan 1765, I, p.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1.1765</td>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>Memorial service for Rameau</td>
<td>M, mar, p.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1765</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel</td>
<td>Pierre, 760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Grenoble</td>
<td>Memorial service at L’église de l’Hôpital for the Dauphin</td>
<td>Escoffier, pp.9 &amp; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Concert at l’Académie des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Vallas, p.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.1766</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Memorial service for the ex-King of Poland at Notre-Dame</td>
<td>M, oct, I, p.131 and nov. p.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1770</td>
<td>Aix-en-Provence</td>
<td>Funeral service of Archbishop de Brancas</td>
<td>Durand, p.88, citing Bureau d’avis, Aix; Verwijmeren, p.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1770</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Concert Spirituel (Introit only)</td>
<td>Pierre, 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.7.1771</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Memorial service for J-C Trial</td>
<td>Bachaumont, 5, p.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5.1774</td>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>Memorial service for Louis XV</td>
<td>Machard, p.298, n.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1774</td>
<td>Versailles</td>
<td>Memorial service for Louis XV</td>
<td>Eby, p.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aspects of Performance

This part of the thesis, as already mentioned in the Introduction to Part I, includes the first critical edition of the 1764 version of Jean Gilles’ *Messe des morts*. The contemporary reports of the performance of this version discussed in Chapter 1 (page 13) mentioned that 180 musicians took part, but the Rameau commemorations were notable events with large congregations. The 2010 performance is being planned with only thirteen singers, including soloists, and twenty players, although this should be regarded as an absolute minimum, as it leaves one player per part in many passages, with the consequent need for competence and reliability. A group consisting of thirty-two instrumentalists and twenty singers, including soloists, would be preferable. The suggested combination would be eight violinists, four players for each viola part, four each for bassoon and cello parts, two flutes, two oboes, two horns, one double bass, one timpanist, and four singers for each chorus part.

In order to provide some guidance to intending performers, discussion of certain matters of eighteenth-century performance practice (*notes inégales*, ornamentation, tempos, and the method by which the drums would have been muffled) precedes the edition. Some anomalies in the notation of the bass line of the score, which includes the lower strings, and in the *basse continue* markings are also examined.
Notes inégales

The practice of playing in unequal rhythm notes which were written in equal values was very common in France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The topic has been exhaustively discussed in recent years and our present knowledge has been summarised by Stephen Hefling in his book on the subject.¹ David Fuller has also written a detailed article in the New Grove Dictionary.² Both sources contain extensive bibliographies. One of the main conditions for the use of notes inégales is the relationship between time signatures and the notes which could be treated as unequal. Thus in ¹ or ² (= ¾) when beaten in two, quavers were unequal and in ¹ (= Ⅵ₄) when beaten in four, semi-quavers were unequal. In triple time, notes of half the value of the denominator were unequal, i.e. in ³⁄₈ crotchets were unequal and in ⁴⁄₈ quavers were unequal. The beat itself was never unequal but notes within the beat were. Where these criteria are met inequality could be applied to notes in pairs which were moving in stepwise motion, the first note of the pair being lengthened and the second shortened.

The Introit of the Messe has a time signature of ¹ and at bars 119 to 122 the flutes, oboes and upper strings have pairs of slurred quavers moving by step. Thus the requirements for inequality are met and the slurs would even suggest that the quavers should be treated as unequal.³ In the same section at bars 124 to 126 the bass string part has a dotted version of what is written in equal quavers in the bassoons. Dotted and equal versions of the same passage at the same point in the music is another indication that inequality is expected.⁴ In all probability therefore, the equal quavers at this point should be treated as notes inégales and played accordingly. The flutes, oboes

⁴ Ibid., p. 263, and Fuller, ‘Notes inégales’, p. 191.
and upper string parts from bars 131 to 134 are also written in pairs of slurred quavers, and this suggests that the whole of this passage from bars 119 to 134 should be played with unequal rhythm.

Fuller tells us that the amount of inequality applied could vary from almost imperceptible to the equivalent of double dotting.\(^5\) He also says that the question of how unequal a passage should be is one of those not mentioned in treatises but is left to ‘that imaginary oracle, le bon goût.’\(^6\) Montéclair states that ‘it is very difficult to give general principles on the equality or inequality of notes because it is the style of the piece that one performs which decides it’.\(^7\) However, Hefling provides a comparative table which includes columns showing the writers who have mentioned inequality and the degree of inequality to which they refer.\(^8\) Twenty-six authors are listed and sixteen refer to mild inequality, which probably means a ratio of no more than 2:1. Six of the other writers mention variable alteration, and the remaining four strong inequality. This summary suggests, therefore, that mild inequality was more commonly applied. When one takes into account the nature of the piece being performed a mild degree of inequality would seem appropriate for the Messe des morts.

The question which then arises is whether the written dotted passage should be played in the same rhythm as the notes written equally, but treated as unequal, or whether the dots should be given extra value to distinguish this line from the others. Hefling provides an example from Georg Muffat, who studied in Paris and spent many years working in Germany, passing on to musicians there his knowledge of the French style

\(^{5}\) Fuller, ‘Notes inégales’, p. 190.
\(^{6}\) Ibid., p. 191.
\(^{8}\) Hefling, Rhythmic Alteration, pp. 10-11.
of playing. The overture of Muffat’s *Florilegium Secundum* of 1698 contains a passage in which dotted notation is written in the violin part and even notation in another.\(^9\) Hefling concludes ‘it seems unlikely that a difference in execution was intended, particularly when the parts move in parallel motion’.\(^10\) In the Gilles score the bass string and bassoon parts at bars 124 to 126 of the Introit are not only in parallel motion but in unison and any difference in execution would make the passage sound very disjointed. It is probable, therefore, that even though the parts are written differently both should be played in the same unequal rhythm.

**Ornamentation**

The practice of decorating or ornamenting music developed in different ways, with variations in the use of symbols and in their realisation, not only between different countries, but also between composers in the same country. This confusion led C. P. E. Bach to state in his *Versuch über die wahre Art de Klavier zu spielen*, first published in 1753, that it is ‘better for composers to specify the proper embellishments unmistakably, instead of leaving their selection to the whims of tasteless performers’.\(^11\) He goes on to compliment the French by saying that ‘they notate their ornaments with painstaking accuracy’.\(^12\) However, each composer or theorist used his own system of symbols and realisations, which were usually, but not always, explained in a preface or table. Often, though, the instructions were written for players of particular instruments; there was no standardised system in use which applied to all instruments. Thus different instrumentalists may have interpreted the same symbol in different ways, or applied a similar interpretation to different symbols. In the case of C. P. E. Bach it is

---

\(^10\) Ibid., p. 32.
\(^12\) Ibid., p. 79.
obvious from the title of his treatise that he was addressing keyboard players. Similarly Johann Joachim Quantz had written his Versuch einer Anweisung die Flute traversiere zu spielen in 1752 for flautists.\textsuperscript{13} In France L’Art de toucher le clavecin was first published by François Couperin in 1716 specifically for players of the harpsichord.\textsuperscript{14} Other treatises were written for the benefit of singers and a selection of these is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bénigne de Bacilly</td>
<td>Remarques curieuses sur l’art de bien chanter, Paris, 1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Antoine Bérard</td>
<td>L’art du chant, Paris, 1755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bacilly’s book is an important source of information on singing in seventeenth-century France. Its aim was to reform and standardise the system of ornamentation and pronunciation in French singing.\textsuperscript{15} Although it was written earlier than the period in question here, some of the practices Bacilly describes remained in use well into the eighteenth century.

Bérard was appointed to the chorus at the Académie Royale de Musique (the Opéra) in 1733 but soon left to spend three years at the Théâtre-Italien. He returned to the Opéra in 1736 and was given solo roles, but was ‘booed and hissed’ in Rameau’s Les Indes galantes.\textsuperscript{16} His performances must have improved quickly because he was promoted to

\textsuperscript{14} François Couperin, L’Art de toucher le clavecin, (The Art of Playing the Harpsichord), ed. by Anna Linde, trans. by Mevanwy Roberts (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1933).
\textsuperscript{15} Anthony, French Baroque Music, p. 414.
acteur des rolles, one of the principal men, on 1 May 1737.\textsuperscript{17} He remained with the Opéra until September 1749\textsuperscript{18} and would therefore have had considerable experience and knowledge of the practices there. His treatise contains both descriptions of ornaments and instructions on technique, thus providing a valuable record of the way the symbols used were realised by Opéra performers. In particular, by the use of four signs, he indicates how trills may have been interpreted according to the feelings expressed in the text. Mary Cyr demonstrates this, basing her realisations on Bérard’s musical examples, one of them being ‘Lieux funestes’ from Dardanus in which Rameau himself has marked where trills are required.\textsuperscript{19} Bérard would have been very familiar with this passage as he took the part of Arcas in the 1744 revival of the work.\textsuperscript{20} Although the signs Bérard uses are different from those usually found in Opéra material, the realisations he describes are valid for the equivalents used at the Opéra. Perhaps Bérard hoped by making this record, that, like Bacilly before him, he would establish the standard which others would follow.

Montéclair was another author who spent a considerable number of years at the Opéra. He was appointed in 1699 as a basse de violon player and also later played the double bass. His service continued until his retirement in 1737.\textsuperscript{21} His treatise is significant in the present context because it gives particular attention to the treatment of Latin texts.\textsuperscript{22} The author claims that ‘Latin music perfects technique and French music perfects taste’.\textsuperscript{23} He makes a plea for ‘unanimous agreement regarding the most

\textsuperscript{17} Sadler, ‘Rameau’s singers’, p. 460.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 326.
\textsuperscript{22} A translation of pages 77-90 in Part 3 of his treatise, which is concerned solely with vocal ornamentation, can be found in: \textit{Montéclair: Cantatas}, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, pp. xiii-xviii.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Montéclair: Cantatas}, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xiii.
appropriate symbols to represent melodic ornamentation’, but also says ‘it is almost impossible to indicate in writing the proper ways of executing ornaments’. However, he goes on to provide explanations and examples of eighteen principal ornaments. In more recent times Frederick Neumann has published the results of his studies of the Baroque treatises on ornamentation, showing their points of agreement and their differences. Despite the emphasis on J. S. Bach in the title this book contains detailed information on French ornamentation and its development. Since then the presentation given by Nicholas McGegan and Gina Spagnoli at the Rameau tercentenary conference in Dijon in 1983 has been published. This provides a summary of descriptions given by various authors, including Bérard and Montéclair, of how to perform different ornaments. It includes a comparative table showing both the ornament symbols used by the treatises’ authors, and their realisations. The table also shows the symbols commonly used at the Opéra in Rameau’s day. These were included following a study of the performance material of the time. Although the list is not exhaustive it is of particular relevance here because it was the Opéra directors and musicians who prepared and performed the Gilles Messe des morts in 1764 at the Rameau memorial services in Paris.

At the same 1983 conference Lionel Sawkins drew attention to examples of ornaments included in Solfèges d’Italie by P. Levêque and J.-L. Bêche, published in 1772. The authors, both singers at the Chapelle royale, were the musicians in charge of the training of the young singers at Court and produced a table of ‘Agréments du Chant’ for their instruction. Sawkins also shows examples of these ornaments in the

24 Montéclair: Cantatas, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xiii.
performance material for *Pygmalion* which was used for productions between 1748 and 1755.  

The suggestions given below for the realisation of ornaments found in the accompanying edition of the Gilles *Messe* are therefore based principally on the McGegan and Spagnoli table and the Levêque and Bêche *Solfèges d’Italie*. Both sources give reliable evidence of the performing practices of the time, as the former is based on a study of contemporary material, and the latter is written by Court musicians who must have had a detailed knowledge of their subject, both from their own practical experience and their teaching duties. In some cases, however, reference has been made to the other sources mentioned and singers must remember that these suggestions are not the definitive realisations. A performer has the freedom to offer his or her own interpretation as long as it is in keeping with the feelings being expressed in the text and it is in good taste. In contrast to the differences on other matters this point is one upon which there is some agreement. C. P. E. Bach, when referring to embellishments which lack signs or consist of many short notes, says ‘their use is governed chiefly by taste; as a result they are too variable to classify’.  

Monsieur de Saint-Lambert, in his *Nouveau traité de l’accompagnement* of 1707, having spoken of the ways in which licences may be taken with the basic rules of accompaniment, says ‘the fine judgement of a skilled accompanist might permit himself still others…since they would rely solely on his good taste’.  

Bacilly argues in his treatise against strict adherence to rules and concludes ‘good taste alone has to be the judge’.  

Montéclair says that it is

---

not sufficient just to know the music well or to have a good voice; ‘one must also have
taste, soul, vocal flexibility and discernment to give the words the expression
appropriate to their meaning’. Bérard sums up the position in his ‘General Rule’,
which states ‘Above all it is the character of the words which must decide the length,
the strength or sweetness, the rapidity or slowness of all the different ornaments’.

The various ornament symbols found in the 1764 manuscript of Gilles’ *Messe des morts*
are discussed in turn below and suggestions for performance are shown in the
Table of Agréments. The name applied to each ornament is that commonly used, even
though there may be alternatives. Just as names may differ, so the suggestions for
realisation may be varied by the performer, depending on the meaning of the text, the
tempo and the note value. The overriding considerations should be to remain
consistent with the practices of the time and to make any realisation appropriate for the
occasion on which the work is being performed.

The sign which appears most frequently in the source is the cross (+), indicating a
tremblement (trill) or cadence. The latter name gradually replaced the former as the
opportunity to insert a trill frequently arose when approaching a cadence. There are,
however, different types of cadence for which the same sign (+) is used. Other
symbols found in the manuscript include the chevron (↔), with or without a stroke, the
vertical line (I) and the inverted v (∨). Grace notes are also used as ornaments.

---

33 Bérard, *L’art du chant*, p. 136, ‘C’est surtout au caractère des paroles de décider la durée, l’énergie ou
la douceur, la vivacité ou la lenteur de tous les différents agréments’.
34 *Montéclair: Cantatas*, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xiii.
The slur and cross are often found in the Gilles score above two consecutive notes at the approach to a perfect cadence. The examples for this progression given by Levêque and Bêche and McGegan and Spagnoli show the cross above the second note, although in the Gilles manuscript the cross is often placed between the notes. Levêque and Bêche use the term *cadence appuyée, or parfaite, or achevée*, but their realisation is similar to that shown by Montéclair for what he calls *cadence appuyée*. However, his sign, a $t$ for *tremblement*, does not have a slur above. McGegan and Spagnoli, unlike Levêque and Bêche, distinguish between *cadence appuyée* and *cadence parfaite*, even though the realisations they give are very similar. Both show the same sign in their examples of the *cadence appuyée*, but for the *cadence parfaite*, McGegan and Spagnoli include a stroke symbol (*pincé*) above the first note, and this is rarely found in the Gilles score (see the discussion of the *pincé* below). The term *cadence appuyée* has, therefore, been adopted in the Table of Agréments on page 243; in their description of this type of *cadence*, McGegan and Spagnoli say it is used on strong final notes, which is where it appears in the Gilles score.

The *cadence* is prepared with an appoggiatura above the written note, and of approximately half its length, which resolves to the written note and is then trilled with the note above. It may begin slowly, accelerate and conclude with anticipation of the following note. This suggested interpretation is based upon the examples given by both

---

37 McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing style at the Opéra’, p. 222.
38 Ibid., pp. 211-12.
Levêque and Bêche and McGegan and Spagnoli. Further possible interpretations may be found in the preface to J. R. Anthony’s edition of DeLalande’s *De Profundis*.\(^{39}\)

\[\sim\text{ and } \sim\]

There are many places where the chevron and stroked chevron appear in the Gilles *Messe*, either in the middle, or at the end, of phrases. The chevron is used by Levêque and Bêche to indicate a *cadence feinte*. This, like the *cadence appuyé*, is prepared with an appoggiatura which falls to the written note but then oscillates once only with the note above.\(^{40}\) McGegan and Spagnoli show that the chevron was also used at the Opéra for the *cadence feinte*,\(^{41}\) and they say that the ornament is found in the middle of phrases.\(^{42}\) Montéclair too uses this symbol for the *cadence feinte*, but he adds a stroke through it. He says it is used when the sense of the words is incomplete and should be almost imperceptible.\(^{43}\) The use of the stroked chevron at the Opéra is not shown in the McGegan and Spagnoli table but examination of the solo parts of the Gilles manuscript reveals that the chevron is found 64 times and the stroked chevron 13 times. In the latter cases none appears on a note lower in value than a crotchet. This perhaps indicates that on these notes the trill may be longer than the one oscillation mentioned by Levêque and Bêche above. Unfortunately, the situation is complicated by the appearance of the cross symbol in some places in the Gilles score, for example bars 11, 29, and 53 of the Offertoire, but the use of a chevron or stroked chevron at the same point in the singers’ parts, indicating perhaps that the symbols are interchangeable.

---


\(^{40}\) Levêque and Bêche, *Solfèges*, p. vi, ‘La Cadence feinte se prepare comme la Cadence appuyée, et se termine par un seul Martellement’.

\(^{41}\) McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing style at the Opéra’, p. 222.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 212.

\(^{43}\) *Montéclair: Cantatas*, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xv.
Two examples of a *cadence feinte* are, therefore, given in the Table of Agréments, one with a cross, the other with a chevron.

Further instances of the use of a cross are found in the Gilles at places where it would be more appropriate to begin a trill without suspending the previous note. Montéclair uses the cross symbol for a *cadence subite*, which he says is begun without any preparation.\(^44\) Levêque and Bêche also use this symbol for a *cadence subite* and they too say it begins straight away.\(^45\) McGegan and Spagnoli report that in the Opéra material the cross has often been changed to the chevron where this ornament is appropriate.\(^46\) However, their table shows both symbols are used.\(^47\) This gives rise to more confusion as each symbol may indicate either the *cadence subite* or the *cadence feinte* above. In order to decide which *cadence* to perform when either symbol is marked consideration should be given to the tempo, note value and the point at which the ornament appears in the phrase.

The discussions of the use of the cross so far have all involved a downward progression, but there are some places in the Gilles where a cross is marked in a rising melodic line. The only *cadence* used in this situation is the *cadence jetée*, which is similar to a *cadence subite* in that the trill starts immediately on the main note. Although the cross is used in the Gilles score to indicate where this *cadence* is

\(^{44}\) *Montéclair: Cantatas*, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xv.
\(^{45}\) Levêque and Bêche, *Solfèges*, p. vi, ‘La Cadence subite se bat d’abord sans être préparée’.
\(^{46}\) McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing style at the Opéra’, p. 212.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., p. 223.
appropriate, McGegan and Spagnoli say no specific symbol was used for it at the Opéra.\textsuperscript{48}

Very few of these markings appear in the primary manuscript source; most occur in the solo singers’ parts, and may, therefore have been late additions. The symbol was used at the Opéra to indicate a \textit{pincé},\textsuperscript{49} the French term for the mordent, a sequence of main note, lower note and main note. McGegan and Spagnoli say the speed can vary according to the context.\textsuperscript{50} Montéclair says it has no sign but is better understood through the use of small added notes.\textsuperscript{51} Levêque and Bèche call it a \textit{flatté}.\textsuperscript{52} The example they provide, and those given by Montéclair, are all on notes approached from below. That context applies in all cases where the \textit{pincé} symbol appears in the Gilles manuscript and the suggested realisation on page 244 is common to the authors mentioned.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{\textbullet} or \textsuperscript{\textbullet}
\end{enumerate}

Although there are some grace notes in the primary source document, more have been added to the performing parts. A single grace note can signify various ornaments depending on the context in which it is found. In the Opéra material McGegan and Spagnoli show that when the quaver grace note moves upwards by step to the following note the intended ornament is a \textit{port de voix}\textsuperscript{53} and when moving downwards

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{\textbullet} or \textsuperscript{\textbullet}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{48} McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing style at the Opéra’, p. 212.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p. 223.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., p. 213.
\textsuperscript{51} Montéclair: \textit{Cantatas}, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xvi.
\textsuperscript{52} Levêque and Bèche, \textit{Solfèges}, cited by Sawkins, ‘Nouvelles Sources Inédites’, p. 189.
\textsuperscript{53} McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing Style at the Opéra’, p. 223.
between two notes a third apart the grace note is a coulé.\textsuperscript{54} These are discussed separately.

\textit{Port de voix}

This is an appoggiatura rising by a tone or semi-tone to the main note. Rameau’s name for it is the \textit{port de voix battu en montant}.\textsuperscript{55} Both Montéclair and Levêque and Bêche say it should always be accompanied by a \textit{pincé} or \textit{flatté}.\textsuperscript{56} However, Bérard does not mention the \textit{pincé} and Mary Cyr provides an example without a \textit{pincé} which is called the \textit{port de voix entier}.\textsuperscript{57} McGegan and Spagnoli provide three examples of \textit{port de voix}, called \textit{achevé}, \textit{appuyé} and \textit{feint}, all of which have a \textit{pincé}. The first of these, the \textit{achevé}, is indicated at the Opéra by a semiquaver or quaver appoggiatura, and the second, the \textit{appuyé}, by a quaver or a crotchet appoggiatura.\textsuperscript{58} Their third example, the \textit{port de voix feint}, is, they say, always shown in the Opéra material with the appoggiatura as a long note.\textsuperscript{59} In their comparative table they show that a crotchet, minim or semibreve appoggiatura was used at the Opéra.\textsuperscript{60} As almost all the appoggiaturas which appear in the Gilles manuscript are quavers this would suggest either their \textit{port de voix achevé} or \textit{port de voix appuyé} would be appropriate for performance of this music. The description of the \textit{port de voix achevé} by McGegan and Spagnoli says it is only to be sung at the end of a phrase and the appoggiatura is short so that one may spend time on the final note.\textsuperscript{61} This matches very closely the example given by Levêque and Bêche for their \textit{port de voix achevé}, so that is the suggested

\textsuperscript{54} McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing Style at the Opéra’, p. 224.
\textsuperscript{56} Montéclair: Cantatas, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xvi; Levêque and Bêche, \textit{Solfèges}, cited by Sawkins, ‘Nouvelles Sources Inédites’, p. 189.
\textsuperscript{57} Mary Cyr, ‘Eighteenth-Century Singing’, p. 327.
\textsuperscript{58} McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing Style at the Opéra’, p. 223.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., p. 214.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 224.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., p. 214.
realisation for a quaver appogiatura which is shown in the table. Levêque and Bêche, though, do also use a quaver appogiatura in their example of the port de voix feint, which has a longer delayed resolution. As already mentioned above the McGegan and Spagnoli example of the latter shows it with appogiaturas of longer note value. There are some appogiaturas in the 1764 manuscript which may be crotchets rather than quavers. These appear in the Introit, and all but one are in the Te decet section. In this part of the Messe the appogiaturas in question resolve downwards so they come under the heading of coulé rather than port de voix. The coulé is always shown either as a quaver or a semiquaver, but for some reason, perhaps haste or lack of care, the scribe has not written them here very clearly. The context in which they are set, though, indicates very strongly that they should be treated as quavers. The one remaining appogiatura which looks very much like a crotchet is at the end of the second phrase of the opening vocal solo. It is not clear, even when examining the original manuscript, whether or not the appogiatura is intended to be a quaver or a crotchet, although in the performing part it is a quaver. Where this phrase is repeated, however, on the return of the opening material towards the end of the Introit, a quaver appogiatura is clearly written in the manuscript. As we have just noted with the coulé, appogiaturas which were undoubtedly intended as quavers look like crotchets, and the same may apply in this instance. The placing of the appogiatura at the end of a phrase also conforms to the conditions McGegan and Spagnoli describe for the use of the port de voix achevé, which, as mentioned above, they say is only sung at that point. This ornament is not indicated by a crotchet, only by a quaver or semiquaver. It would also seem strange to have only one crotchet appoggiatura in the entire work. Nevertheless, we have to accept the possibility that a crotchet is what was intended. A suggestion for

---

63 McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing Style at the Opéra’, p. 224
the realisation of a port de voix with a crotchet appoggiatura is, therefore, provided in the table below.

Coulé

This is a grace note usually found between descending thirds, and that is the case with all the examples in the Gilles manuscript. The grace note anticipates the beat of the note to which it descends.\textsuperscript{64} Although Montéclair says there is not always a sign,\textsuperscript{65} McGegan and Spagnoli say that the Opéra material contains grace notes to show where it should be performed.\textsuperscript{66} The example McGegan and Spagnoli provide is curious in that the first full bar of the realisation has one grace note between the principal notes but when that bar is repeated there are two grace notes.\textsuperscript{67} This implies that the realisation may be varied in a repeat, but the original passage they use does not have any sign or grace notes marked. Bérard describes a coulé as a ‘stepwise-descending, small and very gentle inflection of the voice’,\textsuperscript{68} so the realisation suggested here is of just one grace note, which is, without exception, what appears in the manuscript used for the 1764 performances.

\textsuperscript{64} Neumann, Ornamentation, p. 86, citing Bérard, L’Art du Chant, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{65} Montéclair: Cantatas, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, pp. xiii-xiv.
\textsuperscript{66} McGegan and Spagnoli, “Singing style at the Opéra”, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., p. 224.
\textsuperscript{68} Bérard, L’art du chant, p. 119, ‘il faut descendre par degrés conjoints, & ménager une petite inflexion de voix très douce’, also cited by Neumann, Ornamentation, p. 86.
should allow the note above to be heard almost imperceptibly and briefly before the
second note. Montéclair uses the same name for this realisation, although instead of
using a sign he inserts a grace note just before the second main note; similar
insertions can be seen in both the earliest version of Gilles’ Messe and the 1764 score.
Montéclair says this ornament is suitable for tender or plaintive moments but not when
the mood is one of either gaiety or anger, which describes well its use in the Rameau
contrafactum. This symbol has also been added to the soloists’ parts in 1764 in the
context described by McGegan and Spagnoli ‘on notes of some length on the
penultimate syllable at the ends of phrases’.

In the Messe des morts this sign appears on repeated groups of four quavers in the
string parts of the Elévation (Pie Jesu) section. Montéclair’s definition of the symbol
reads ‘The balancement, called tremolo by the Italians, produces the effect of a
tremulant stop on the organ’. This stop, by altering the airflow through the pipe,
causes the sound of the notes to undulate instead of remaining steady. In his vocal
examples Montéclair shows groups of repeated quavers or crochets under a wavy line,
with each group having only one syllable for the singer. As no change of pitch is
involved a vibrato effect must be what is intended. However, Sébastien de Brossard
tells us, in his definition of the Italian term tremolo, that ‘one finds it used frequently
… to tell all string players to bow repeated notes in a single stroke, in order to imitate

---

69 Levêque and Bêche, Solfèges, cited by Sawkins, ‘Nouvelles Sources Inédites’, p. 189; McGegan and
Spagnoli, ‘Singing style at the Opéra’, p. 225.
70 Montéclair: Cantatas, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xiv.
71 Ibid., p. xiv.
73 Montéclair, Principes de musique: Divisez en quatre parties (Paris 1736, repr. Geneva: Minkoff,
1972), p. 85; ‘Le Balancement, que les Italiens appellent Tremolo, produit l’effet du tremblant de
l’Orgue.’ Translation in Montéclair: Cantatas, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xvi.
74 Montéclair: Cantatas, ed. by Anthony and Akmajian, p. xvi.
the organ tremulant. He goes on to cite as an example the ‘Trembling Chorus’ from Lully’s opera *Isis*, in which both voices and strings should give the effect of shivering with cold. In this instance though, instead of a wavy line, slurs have been used to group repeated notes together. Stewart Carter has written a history of the use of this device by string players. Although much of his evidence relates to Italian sources, he also mentions the use of the technique in other countries, including France. He adopts the term ‘slurred tremolo’ which David Boyden had earlier used in his book on the history of violin playing.

From the sources he has studied Carter concludes that the slurred tremolo should be played by repeating the four notes of the same pitch in the same bow stroke, lightly articulated with a gentle pressure of the finger on the bow. The device was regularly used at emotional moments such as those associated with sorrow or death. The Italian organist and theorist Girolamo Diruta recommended its use at the Elevation of the Host, one of the most solemn points in the Mass. Perhaps the appearance of this effect in a contrafactum at this very point in the *Messe des morts* is a coincidence, as the origins of the music are secular, but also, incidentally, Italian. It is possible, though, that because the tremolo appeared in the original it was one reason for considering it particularly suitable for its intended purpose here.

---

76 Ibid., p. 168, ‘Cela se marque aussi fort souvent pour les Voix, nous avons un excellent exemple de l’un & de l’autre dans les *Trembleurs* de l’Opera d’Isis de Monsieur de Lully.’ (This chorus is in Act IV, scene i of the opera).
80 Ibid., p. 56.
Breath marks

McGegan and Spagnoli say these are frequently added to the Opéra material, are similar to the pincé sign, but larger, and are placed in the middle of the stave.\textsuperscript{82} There is one possible such mark in the Pie Jesu section of the Gilles, which, at the word ‘gloriam’, is not wholly within the stave but partially above it. The mark may be a mistake or smudge by the scribe. Nevertheless the place at which it appears is shown in the transcription by the use of the modern breath mark symbol.

A vertical stroke appears above or below the notes in the opening bar of the timbales voilées part at the beginning of the Messe (see figure 5.1), and again in bar 264 of the Introit. The sign is similar to the pincé but as the timbales (kettledrums) are each tuned to one pitch, in this case $f$ and $c$, realising a pincé, involving neighbouring notes, is impossible for them. Two other possibilities can also be ruled out. A rapid succession of notes in the timbale part is indicated on the first beat of bar 2, and in many other places, by strokes through the note stem. So the vertical stroke does not indicate that. Secondly, if a roll were intended a long note on one pitch would probably have been written, rather than the shorter notes at different pitches which are given. Another explanation is therefore needed. Does the stroke stress the absence of a roll?

The appendix to Neumann’s treatise on ornamentation lists seven possible interpretations of this sign.\textsuperscript{83} The first is staccato articulation, usually implying greater articulation than the dot. The second is a dynamic accent. The other possibilities are: cancellation of notes inégales, a gamba vibrato, voice pulsation, and two types of

\textsuperscript{82} McGegan and Spagnoli, ‘Singing style at the Opéra’, pp. 216-17.
\textsuperscript{83} Neumann, Ornamentation, p. 594.
mordent. The circumstances for the first three of these other alternatives do not apply here, and, as the mordent is the equivalent of the pincé, this interpretation also is irrelevant for the reasons already explained above. This leaves a staccato or an accent as the two possible realisations.

In his later book on performance practices Neumann says dots and strokes are the most common symbols for staccato articulation.\(^8^4\) They can, though, indicate accentuation and they are imprecise. How much the notes were to be shortened or how strongly they were to be accented was left to the player to judge depending upon the context.\(^8^5\) Neumann also points out that some composers consider the dot and stroke have different interpretations. Among them he lists Leopold Mozart (Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule, ch.1, sec.3, par.20), Francesco Geminiani (Art of Playing on the Violin, London, 1751), L’Abbé le Fils (Principes du violon, 1761) and Durieu (Méthode de violon, 1796, p.11).\(^8^6\) The common factor with these authors, however, is that all of them use only strokes to show detachment. Other composers, like Michel Corrette, say dots and strokes have the same meaning.\(^8^7\) Clementi, writing some time later, uses both dots and strokes for staccato but adds that the dots should be less staccato than the strokes.\(^8^8\) Although this evidence comes from string, woodwind and piano tutors it all points to the stroke being an instruction for staccato playing or separation of the notes. It would seem highly likely, therefore, that this is also the intended instruction to the timpanist. As the drums were muffled for the memorial services in question here, and thus the mood a sombre one, accentuation of the notes

\(^8^5\) Ibid., p. 226.
\(^8^6\) Ibid., pp. 230-31.
\(^8^7\) Ibid., p. 230, citing Michel Corrette, Méthode pour apprendre aisément à joüer de la flute traversière (Paris, 1735), p. 21.
\(^8^8\) Ibid., p. 231, citing Muzio Clementi, Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Pianoforte (London, 1801), p. 5.
would seem to be neither intended nor desirable. This strongly suggests, therefore, that
the notes should be shortened so that they are heard separately and distinctly.

Table of Agréments and suggested realisations

**Cadence (tremblement) appuyée**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e - is.</td>
<td>e - is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cadence feinte**

or

**Cadence with vertical stroke (·) performed as above, with possible additional
oscillation(s)**

**Cadence subite**

**Cadence jetée**
Table of Agréments and realisations continued

Port de voix achevé

Port de voix feint

Alternative realisation, without *pincé*, shown in final bar of second *cadence feinte* example

*Pincé*

*Accent*

*Coulé*
Tempo

The indications of tempo in the score are, in most cases, clear both at the start of movements and when changes occur. The exceptions are the Kyrie and Benedictus, neither of which has any tempo marking at the beginning, and the Graduel (a) and Sanctus, which are both marked ‘gracieux’. These are discussed here, but for those seeking further information on tempo, Robert Donington’s books *The Interpretation of Baroque Music* and *Baroque Music: Style and Performance* provide both a valuable summary of the sources of information and sound, practical advice.

The Kyrie has a time signature of 3, which Brossard says is rather gay;\(^89\) Donington, however, cites Quantz as saying ‘the sense of the words should be taken into account, the movement of the notes, especially the fastest, and in quick arias the skill and voice of the singer.’\(^90\) He goes on ‘It is the same with church music as it is with arias; except that both expression and tempo should be more restrained than in opera, to show respect for the sacredness of the place.’\(^91\) The soloist who begins the Kyrie is asking for mercy, and he has some semiquavers and ornaments to sing; these considerations suggest a moderate tempo rather than a gay one.

The time signature for the Benedictus is 2, which Brossard says, in his definition of the equivalent *alla breve* symbol, should be conducted ‘à deux temps graves, ou à quatre temps fort vîtes’.\(^92\) Donington translates this as ‘two steady beats or four extremely quick beats’,\(^93\) but later sums up his review of the available information with the

\(^89\) Brossard, *Dictionaire*, p. 177, ‘Quand on le marque par un simple 3 le mouvement en est d’ordinaire un peu gai’.
\(^91\) Ibid., p. 385.
\(^92\) Brossard, *Dictionaire*, p. 154.
\(^93\) Donington, *Interpretation*, p. 421.
sentence ‘In practice none of the possible indications for a two-pulse rhythm can be relied on, and it is the music itself and not the notation from which we must discover it’. The shortest written notes in the Benedictus are quavers, but there are also grace notes and ornaments to realise; the tempo should, therefore, be slow enough to enable these to be sung comfortably, but fast enough for the singers to convey effectively the uplifting sense of the text.

Finally, the marking ‘gracieux’ for the Graduel (a) and Sanctus indicates not only the style in which these movements should be performed, but also a moderate tempo, the equivalent of the Italian andante.95

---

94 Donington, Interpretation, p. 424.
Instruments

Timbale voilée

At the beginning of the score this indication is written in the singular but it is clear from the notes to be played, $f$ and $c$, that two drums are required, one tuned to each pitch. The kettledrum had become firmly established as an orchestral instrument by the end of the seventeenth century, its earlier improvisatory role being restricted to ceremonial field music. 96 Jeremy Montagu states that despite players having written-out parts it was still customary for some improvisation, for example by rolling a final held note, or by breaking the rhythm of other long notes. 97 A written example of the latter can be seen in this version of Gilles’ Messe at bar 149 of the Introit, where the timbales part has two minims but other parts have a semibreve. The Corrette edition of the work, published in 1764, which does not include a drum part in the score, does, nevertheless, give an instruction to sound the drum (tambour) for two bars before starting the Introit. 98 Improvisation is, therefore, needed in this case. The main distinction between tambour and timbale is that the former were not tuned to a specific pitch but the latter were.

As mentioned already in Chapter 2 (page 31), Michel Vovelle has written about a Provençal custom in which the coffin of the deceased was carried in procession around the town accompanied, at least for people of any importance, by music. 99 He says that

98 Gilles, Messe des morts, ed. by Corrette, p. 1, ‘Il faut battre le Tambour Seul, lés-passe de deux Mesures, avant de commencer’.
99 Vovelle, Piété baroque, pp. 86-7; ‘…la coutume du ‘tour de ville’ qui fait accomplir au défun…un circuit obligé dans la cité’ (p. 86), ‘…le cortège est accompagné de musique, du moins dans les convois des gens importants’ (p. 87).
bells of churches and convents would also be rung, but there is no mention of the musical instruments utilised, although an outdoor procession of this kind would almost certainly have included tambours (side drums). Joel Cohen is of the opinion that the rhythm of the Introit of the Messe brings this ‘tour de ville’ to mind and the drum reinforces the image, helping to explain its regular use in eighteenth-century performances.  

_Tambours voilés_, or muffled drums, had first been included in compositions in France by Rameau in the overtures to his operas _Zaïs_ and _Naïs_ in 1748 and 1749 respectively. Masson describes the overture to _Zaïs_, which, in Rameau’s words, ‘depicts the unravelling of chaos’, as a good example of programme music: the first of the two sections is solemn, starting with the muffled drum, followed by sharp clashes of distantly related keys, and the second section is lively and more polyphonic. The opening beats of the _timbales voilées_ in the 1764 version of the Gilles Messe may perhaps have been intended, in part, as a tribute to Rameau for this innovation. Very similar drum beats also begin the funeral march at the opening of Berlioz’s _Symphonie funèbre et triomphale_, a work written to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the 1830 revolution. It might, therefore, be possible to suggest a link spanning 90 years between Rameau, this version of the Gilles Messe and Berlioz.

Quite how the muffling of the sound was done in France at the time is difficult to establish, but one clue comes from the writer Guillaume Thomas Raynal. The premiere of _Zaïs_ in 1748 must have caused some discussion, for he comments: ‘it is said about

---

100 Vovelle, _Piété baroque_, p. 87, ‘il est accompagné des sonneries de cloches de toutes les églises urbaines et conventuelles’.
101 Cohen, Sleeve notes for CD 2292–45989-2, p. 16.
L’ouverture le décrit en deux mouvements qui sont déjà de beaux exemples de symphonie à programme: l’un solennel, débutant par le tambour voilé, avec de brusques juxtapositions de tonalités éloignées... l’autre “vite” et plus polyphonique...’.
the overture that one could imagine being at the burial of a Swiss guard, because a roll on drums covered by gauze heralds by a muffled sound the unravelling of chaos’. In the context of this study the funereal image is relevant, but the method of covering the drums even more so. Corroboration of the use of this method, though, is lacking, as very little information is available from that period. James Blades makes reference to a work by Eisel published in Germany in 1738 which says that for funerals either the drum skin can be covered with woollen cloth or the heads of the drum sticks can be wrapped in chamois leather. Altenburg’s treatise, published in 1795, says ‘If they [the drums] are to be muffled, as for example on the occasion of mourning, they are covered with a black cloth. This [muffling] can also be done by wrapping the beater or stick heads with leather, cloth or the like.’ These German sources, therefore, give two different methods for muffling the sound produced by drums. Georges Kastner, writing in Paris in about 1840, also refers to Eisel’s treatise because it mentions different types of stick, the use of which, in his time, was generally regarded as a new development. He goes on: ‘the author says that if no cloth is available, in order to produce a muting effect the stick heads can be wrapped in skin, or sticks can even be

---

103 Raynal, ‘Nouvelles littéraires’ (1748) in Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique, ed. by Tourneux (1877-1882), I, p. 142, cited in Masson, L’Opéra, p. 532, note 1, ‘On a dit qu’à l’ouverture on croyait être à l’enterrement d’un officier Suisse, parce qu’un roulis de timbales couvertes d’une gaze annonce par un bruit sourd le débrouillement de chaos’. Masson notes that the use of the word ‘timbales’, instead of ‘tambours’, appears to be an error but, he says, it leaves a doubt as to the true nature of the instrument.

104 James Blades, Percussion Instruments and their History (London: Faber, 1970), p. 250, citing J. P. Eisel, Musicus autodidaktos (Erfurt, 1738), p. 66. (The section on kettledrums begins on p. 66 but the reference to muffling is on pages 68-69: ‘Will man aber die Paucken in ihrem Schalle eben also wie die Trompeten dämpffen, so darf man nur die Felle mit wollenen Tuche bedecken, in cleren Ermangelung aber die Schlägel mit semischen Leder fest überziehen, oder die Köpffe gar von Wolle machen und mit Leder überziehen, oder Flor, welches einen hohlen und dumpffigen Klang, dap sie auch Trauer-Collationen und Musiquen assistiren können’). I am grateful to Wendy Harris-Taylor for the translation.


made with woollen heads which are wrapped in skin or crêpe’. 107 This confirms that the usual method of muting in Germany in 1738 was by use of a cloth and the alternative was to wrap the stick heads. Kastner’s explanation of ‘Timbales voilées’ in France states ‘sometimes kettledrums are muffled, that is to say they are covered with a piece of material, the result of which is to deaden the sound’. 108 Castil-Blaze’s definition of the muting of timbales is even more specific: ‘In order to reduce their sound and to change their harsh rumblings into a sombre, dull murmur, one throws a piece of cloth over the instrument, and the timpanist hits the cloth which, by covering the skin, prevents it vibrating’. 109

These statements from the nineteenth century both refer to the use of cloth over the instrument as the normal method of damping. However, there are occasions when covered sticks were used in Paris. David Charlton has drawn attention to the use of the terms ‘baguetes garnies’ (covered sticks) in Dalayrac’s Lina (1807) and ‘bâton de sourdine’ (muting stick) in Spontini’s Fernand Cortez (1809 version). 110 His examination of other manuscripts reveals that the terms ‘timbales voilées’, ‘timbales couvertes’ and ‘avec, or en, sourdines’ appear in at least 27 operas performed in Paris between 1775 and 1809. 111 Even though the latter terms were in regular use during that

107 Kastner, Méthode complète, p. 75 n. 3, ‘Si on n’a pas de drap, dit l’auteur, pour produire l’effet de SOURDINE, on y peut suppléer en enveloppant de peau la tête des baguettes ou même en fabriquant des baguettes avec les têtes de laine enveloppées de peau ou de crêpe.’
108 Ibid., p. 68, ‘On voile parfois les Timbales, c’est-à-dire qu’on les couvre d’un morceau d’étoffe, ce qui a pour résultat d’en assourdir le timbre; cet effet s’indique par les mots: TIMBALLES VOILÉES, (TIMPANI COPERTI).’
110 D. P. Charlton, ‘Orchestration and Orchestral Practice in Paris 1790-1810’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1973), p. 214; the translations are mine. I am grateful to Professor Charlton for letting me have copies of the relevant pages of his thesis.
111 Ibid., p. 335.
period, Charlton believes experimentation with soft-headed sticks, in order to vary orchestral colour, may have started in Paris by 1790.\textsuperscript{112}

The use of \textit{timbales voilées} by the Opéra performers in 1764 may, on the basis of this information, provide a very early example of their orchestral use in France. Edmund Bowles, in his article on timpani in early music, states that in the mid eighteenth century the obtrusive, unvarying sound from wooden knobs was a problem, and that ‘for generations timpanists had wrapped their sticks in cloth to dampen the percussive sounds to a dull thud for playing in funeral processions’.\textsuperscript{113} He continues: ‘it was only natural to expand the practice to musical performances in general when the occasion demanded.’\textsuperscript{114}

From the evidence above, the best indication we have is that covered sticks came into orchestral use in France later than elsewhere, and that prior to their introduction drums were muffled by having a woollen, or cloth cover placed over their skins. Charlton does point out though that this method would cause some loss of clarity in pitch.\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{Basse stringed instruments}

When the \textit{Messe} was first written the \textit{basse de violon} would have been the stringed instrument which played the bass line, but during the first two decades of the eighteenth century the slightly smaller \textit{violoncelle} (cello) took its place. By 1733 the usual continuo string players at the Opéra were three cellos and double bass playing in the ‘petit chœur’, the smaller group which accompanied solos or duos, and eight cellos and double bass in the ‘grand chœur’, used in full orchestral and choral passages.\textsuperscript{116}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{112} Charlton, ‘Orchestration’, p. 216.  
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., p. 424.  
\textsuperscript{115} Charlton, ‘Orchestration’, p. 336.  
\textsuperscript{116} Cyr, ‘\textit{Basses}’, p. 161.
\end{flushright}
These numbers remained unchanged in 1764.\(^{117}\) There is a difference in tuning, however, between the *basse de violon* and the cello. The four-string *basse de violon* was tuned in 5ths upwards from B♭, a tone lower than the cello, but this lowest note in the *basse de violon* register, which is out of the cello’s range, still appears in the 1764 score, though not in the parts. In the score it is seen in the Introit at bars 30 and 270, but each time is written with the octave above, and in the Graduel it is found at bar 33, where it is written to be played alone. The separate *basse* part shows only the higher B♭ in the case of the first two occurrences, and, for the third, the note in the part is one octave higher than that in the score.

**Basse continue**

It was pointed out when discussing the added double bass part in Chapter 8 (page 197) that it is not always clear from the full score which bass instruments are playing at any one time; here reference to the individual parts was necessary in order to ascertain which bass instruments were included in the general heading ‘tous’. Separate performing parts survive for 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) Bassons, and for Basse and Contrebasse, but not for Basse continue. There are, however, regular markings of B.C. in the source, although nowhere are there any figured bass symbols to indicate the presence of a keyboard continuo. This version of Gilles’ *Messe des morts* was prepared for performance in a large church with a considerable number of both players and singers, and the absence of a keyboard continuo may not be surprising when one considers that a harpsichord, for example, would not have been audible, other than in the most lightly scored passages. Was an organ available on this occasion though? It may have been an organ that Gilles had intended as the continuo instrument in the original, this being the

custom in his time at Toulouse, as elsewhere.\footnote{Gilles, \textit{Requiem (Messe des morts)}, ed. by Hajdu, p. xiii.} Unfortunately, there is no information in the archives at the Oratoire about an organ in 1764,\footnote{Félix Raugel, \textit{Les Grandes Orgues des Églises de Paris et du Département de la Seine} (Paris: Fischbacher, 1927), p. 157, ‘les archives de l’Oratoire sont muettes en ce qui concerne les orgues... jusqu’à la fin de l’Ancien Régime’.} but if the church did have one then in the same position as it is today in a gallery above the main entrance, and the orchestra and singers were at the far end of the nave, this may have created difficulties with sound delays or other communications between the performers. On this occasion, though, a ‘batteur de mesure’ was directing, thereby removing one role of the keyboard player, who would then only be needed for accompanying solos and other lightly scored sections. It is quite possible, therefore, that no keyboard part was included in this version of Gilles’ \textit{Messe}.

The performance of this version of the work in 1764 involved the musicians of the Paris Opéra, and there is evidence that use of the keyboard there had declined during the course of the eighteenth century. From a study of the autograph scores of Rameau’s operas, and of those scores known to have been copied from autographs, together with original editions overseen by Rameau, Graham Sadler has observed a remarkably consistent pattern of figuring. In the vocal solos, recitatives, airs, duets and other ensembles the figuring of the continuo part is very detailed; in the overtures, dances and choruses, however, there is no figuring at all.\footnote{Graham Sadler, ‘The role of the keyboard continuo in French opera 1673-1776’, \textit{EM}, 8 (1980), 148-57 (p. 150).} This makes it likely that the keyboard continuo was not played during instrumental sections and choruses. Sadler also shows that, in certain surviving BC parts used at the Paris Opéra, the bass line of unfigured passages is completely absent, with words like ‘ouverture’ or ‘choeur’ indicating omission of a movement; this adds support to the evidence of the pattern of
figuring. In fully scored arias (e.g. ‘Un orison serain’ from *Les Boréades*) in his late operas, Rameau tends to figure only the passages where the soloist is actually singing, suggesting that, interestingly, there were extensive passages of a single piece without keyboard accompaniment.

By 1758, in the production of Dauvergne’s *Les Fêtes d’Euterpe*, the harpsichord was used to accompany only the recitatives and one of nine arias. The one aria which is accompanied by solo flute and continuo is figured, the other eight are not. Later still, when Rameau’s *Zoroastre* was revived in 1770, Grimm reports the complete absence of a keyboard instrument in the orchestra.

These examples prove that use of the keyboard continuo at the Opéra was declining. Considering its sparing use in the Dauvergne performed in 1758 it is certainly possible that the Gilles *Messe des morts* was performed in 1764 at Rameau’s memorial services without a keyboard continuo, even though this is six years earlier than Grimm’s report. There are two further pieces of evidence which support this contention. Firstly, in the discussion on manuscripts in Chapter 4, it was noted that, in the performing material in *F-Pc* L. 17986(A-B), there were three *basse continue* parts for an earlier version of the *Messe* but none for the 1764 version. This lack of a *basse continue* part for the later version, and the absence of the same part from the set of copies used for the Rameau services, suggest that no keyboard continuo part for the 1764 performances ever existed. Secondly, it was noted in Chapter 6 in the discussion on the contrafactum added to the Graduel that figured bass in a section of recitative from the original aria had been realised in the instrumental parts. Perhaps the very reason for doing this was...

---

124 *Correspondance littéraire de Grimm et de Diderot*, VI, p. 347, ‘…pour marquer les progrès qu’on fait de jour en jour en musique, on a supprimé dans cette nouvelle salle le clavecin’.
the absence of a keyboard continuo for the performance; if a keyboard player were going to be available, the figures could simply have been copied on to the contrafactum. These different factors, together with the lack of figuring in the score, all point to the conclusion that the performances took place without keyboard continuo. For this reason no suggested realisation has been provided.

If this hypothesis is correct, what then is meant by the regular indications of ‘B.C.’ in the score? Some clues are provided by comparing the bass orchestral parts to the full score. The results for the Introit can be seen in the chart below, in which the line to the right of the instrument’s name shows when it is playing and the gaps show the rests. The markings in the score are shown in normal type, with some of the editorial additions in smaller letters. Further editorial markings not shown here arise from the layout, which requires separate staves in places for bassons and contrebasse.

At the opening of the Introit ‘tous’ is marked, and the parts reveal that bassons, basse and contrebasse all begin to play. Again at bars 41, 56 and 97 ‘tous’ is marked and all the bass instruments are playing. Where ‘B.C.’ indications occur at bars 29, 46 and 71 it is only the basse that continues to play. This pattern is not followed consistently however. For example, at the beginning of the ‘Te decet’ section, in bar 150, the oboe begins a solo with the basse alone accompanying. There is no ‘B.C.’ marking at this point but there is one 25 bars later at the entry of the bassons and contrebasse, where, at first sight, a ‘tous’ marking would be more appropriate. However, the instrumental prelude to ‘Et tibi’ begins at this point and the bassons have the melody and, because of their independent part, a separate stave in the score. Here then ‘B.C.’ means both basse and contrebasse. The latter drops out when the soloist enters with ‘Et tibi’ at bar 186, and basse and bassons combine to form the continuo, whilst the other instruments
continue to play. Between bars 209 and 229 two-part cors and bassons alternate with a male voice duet and the basse alone provides the continuo.

In the Offertoire ‘tous’ is marked only at the beginning of the movement and at bar 176, the instrumental introduction to the ‘Hostias’ section. In both these places bassons, basse and contrebasse are all playing the bass line in support of other instruments. The only ‘B.C.’ marking in the movement appears where the soloist begins to sing ‘Hostias’ at bar 182. At this point the bassons and contrebasse both stop playing to leave the basse as the sole continuo instrument. Although there are no other ‘tous’ and ‘B.C.’ markings in the score in this movement, all the bass instruments play during choral sections and the basse alone during solo or semi-chorus passages. The one exception to this is the quartet ‘Domine Jesu Christe’, beginning at bar 42, in which both basse and contrebasse play the bass line.

The general pattern which emerges from these two movements is that ‘tous’ occurs at the start of full instrumental or choral sections and ‘B.C.’ where a solo voice or duo begins. ‘Tous’ in these circumstances unarguably means bassons, basse and contrebasse playing in unison, and ‘B.C.’ indicates basse alone. Where these markings have this interpretation they have been retained in the present edition. There are places, though, where this pattern recurs, but without any markings in the full score. In these cases ‘tous’ has been added editorially to mean all bass instruments, and ‘Bs’ is marked to indicate basse alone. However, where ‘B.C.’ indicates basse plus either contrebasse or bassons, or where no indication is given, the combination of instruments playing is specified in editorial brackets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II, Table 1 – Tous and B.C. markings in Introit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’basse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bar no. | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 |
| Bassons | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| C’basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Score | tous | B.C. | tous |

| Bar no. | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 | 135 | 140 | 145 | 150 |
| Bassons | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| C’basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Score | [Bs] |

| Bar no. | 155 | 160 | 165 | 170 | 175 | 180 | 185 | 190 | 195 | 200 |
| Bassons | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| C’basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Score | B.C.[Bs et Cb] | [Bs] |

| Bar no. | 205 | 210 | 215 | 220 | 225 | 230 | 235 | 240 | 245 | 250 |
| Bassons | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| C’basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Score | [tous] |

| Bar no. | 255 | 260 | 265 | 270 | 275 | 280 | 285 | 290 | 295 | 300 |
| Bassons | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| C’basse | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Score | [Bs] |
Editorial method

The primary source for this performing edition of the *Messe des morts* by Jean Gilles (1764 version) is manuscript *F-Pc* D. 11135 held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France; the transcription has been carried out from a microfilm copy of the manuscript. In the critical commentary this is called the source. Its set of associated performing parts, numbered *F-Pc* H. 494 A, a-r, and *F-Pc* H. 494 B, a-j, is the secondary source, referred to in the commentary as the parts, or part. On occasions, in cases of possible error in the primary source, or in order to help resolve differences between the primary source and the parts, reference has been made to the earliest identifiable version of the work, edited by John Hajdu. When emendations have arisen in such circumstances a note to this effect is included in the commentary.

The source document and the performing parts have numerous minor differences. In an attempt to keep the critical commentary within reasonable proportions certain symbols have been used in the score to show editorial additions of items which do not appear in the primary source, but are in the parts. The explanation of these symbols is as follows:

( ) round brackets indicate appoggiaturas and dynamics added in such circumstances, ◐ ◐ angled brackets indicate ornaments included for the same reason.

Dotted slurs or ties indicate where these items appear in the parts but not in the primary source.

Other variants between the score and the parts are noted in the critical commentary.

Bar numbers and page numbers are editorial.

Other editorial additions are in square brackets.

125 Gilles, *Requiem (Messe des morts)*, ed. by Hajdu.
The clefs in the source have been retained, with the exception of the under mentioned, whose original clefs were:

**Instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Clef</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hautes-contre de violon</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailles de violon</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Singers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singers</th>
<th>Clef</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hautes-contre</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailles</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basses-tailles</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessus soloist (Elévation)</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *hautes-contre de violon* and *tailles de violon* have been assigned C3 clefs in the transcription as these instruments are the equivalent of modern violas. The transposing treble clef, the standard one for modern tenors, has been used for both the *tailles* and the *hautes-contre*, who were high tenors, not falsettists.\(^{126}\)

Redundant accidentals have been omitted. Those lacking in the score on notes at the beginning of a bar, following their use on the preceding note, have been added without individual comment. Cautionary accidentals are shown small above the note.

The eighteenth-century practice of placing slurs in vocal parts across bar lines to indicate the continuation of a melisma has been retained. These slurs have no effect on articulation. Slurs between appoggiaturas and their succeeding notes which were lacking in the source have been added without individual comment. The stem direction of such appoggiaturas has also been amended to the modern convention.

Two parallel diagonal lines appear in places in the source to signal a break, the end of a section or a change of some other kind; these have been retained.

---

The tempo and expression marks added in crayon by the *batteur de mesure* in 1764 appear in bold italic type to distinguish them from those written by the copyist. The orthography of both the expression marks and the underlay has been modernised. The *crescendo* hairpins, which in the source have vertical lines at the right hand end, have also been modernised. Dynamics in French, which were abbreviated in the source to *fo.* and *do.* or *f* and *d,* have been expanded to *fort* and *doux* without individual comment. Instrumental names at the beginning of the *Elévation* are in Italian; these have been retained, as they must have been taken from the Concert Spirituel copy of Alberti’s aria. The short instrumental names, however, are editorial, and are the same as those used elsewhere, for the sake of consistency with the rest of the score and the critical notes. Dynamic markings in this section and its individual parts, with the exception of the first violins, are also in Italian; these have been expanded from *p* or *f* or *for.,* to *piano* and *forte* without individual comment.

In the source, solo vocal lines are written above the bass instrumental line, but full choral sections appear above all the instruments. It has not been possible to reproduce that layout here, so all the vocal parts have been placed above the bass instruments.

The beaming in the source has been retained in all but the vocal parts; with the latter the beams have been altered to fit the syllabic changes in the underlay.

A repeat within Graduel [b] has been written out in full to improve clarity, with explanatory remarks in the commentary. In the case of other repeats, where *segno* markings were lacking in the source, these have been added to the score and noted in the commentary.

Asterisks are used to draw attention to a comment in the notes.
Abbreviations

The abbreviation H is used when referring to the Hajdu edition of the Messe. Other abbreviations used in the score and commentary are shown below.

Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fl</td>
<td>Flûtes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>Hautbois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVn</td>
<td>Dessus de violon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HcVn</td>
<td>Hautes-contre de violon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVn</td>
<td>Tailles de violon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor</td>
<td>Cors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timb</td>
<td>Timbales voilées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>Bassons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>Basses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Contrebasse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dessus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Hautes-contre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tailles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Basses-tailles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Basses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text and translation

Introit
Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis. Te decet hymnus, Deus, in Sion; et tibi redetur votum in Jerusalem. Exaudi orationem meam, ad te omnis caro veniet.

Rest eternal grant unto them O Lord, and let light perpetual shine upon them. Thou O God art praised in Sion, and unto thee shall the vow be performed in Jerusalem. Thou that hearest the prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come.

Kyrie
Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison.

Lord have mercy, Christ have mercy, Lord have mercy.

Graduel
Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine; et lux perpetua luceat eis. In memoria aeterna erit justus, ab auditione mala non timebit.

Rest eternal grant unto them O Lord, and let light perpetual shine upon them. The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance, and shall not be afraid of evil tidings.

Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum, ita desiderat anima mea ad te Deus. Sitivit anima mea ad Deum fortem vivum; quando veniam et apparebo ante faciem Dei?

Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks, so longeth my soul after thee O God. My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God; when shall I come to appear before the presence of God?

Exaudi Domine vocem meam, qua clamavi ad te. Miserere mei Deus et exaudi me, exaudi Domine vocem meam.

Hearken unto my voice O Lord, when I cry unto thee. Have mercy upon me O God and hear me, O Lord hear my voice.

Offertoire
Domine Jesu Christe, Rex gloriae, libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum de poenis inferni et de profundo lacu; libera eas de ore leonis, ne absorbet eas tartarus, ne cadant in obscurum; sed signifer Sanctus Michael representet eas in lucem sanctam, quam olim Abrahae promisisti et semini ejus.

O Lord Jesus Christ, King of glory, deliver the souls of all the faithful departed from the pains of hell, and the depths of the pit; deliver them from the lion’s mouth, let not hell swallow them up, nor let them fall into darkness; but let the standard-bearer Saint Michael bring them into the holy light which thou promised to Abraham and his seed.

Hostias et preces tibi Domine laudis offerimus; tu suscipe pro animabus illis quarum hodie memoriam facimus; fac eas Domine de morte transpire ad vitam, quam olim Abrahae promisisti et semini ejus.

We offer thee O Lord sacrifices of prayer and praise; receive them for the souls of those whose memory we recall this day; O Lord make them pass from death to life, which thou promised to Abraham and his seed.
Text and translation continued

Sanctus
Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth, pleni sunt coeli et terra gloria tua. Hosanna in excelsis.

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest.

Elévation
Pie Jesu Domine, dona eis requiem sempiternam; fac ut videant gloriam Dei patris, gloriam patris tui.

Gentle Lord Jesus, give them rest eternal; grant that they may see the glory of God the Father, the glory of your Father.

Virgo Dei, Dei genitrix, intercede pro nobis.

O Virgin Mother of God, intercede for us.

Benedictus
Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

Agnus Dei
Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, dona eis requiem; dona eis requiem sempiternam.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant them rest; grant them rest eternal.

Communion
Lux aeterna luceat eis Domine cum sanctis tuis in aeternam, quia pius es. Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis.

Let eternal light shine upon them O Lord, together with thy saints in heaven, for thou art gracious. Rest eternal grant unto them O Lord, and let light perpetual shine upon them.
Messe des morts

Jean Gilles

(1764 version)
Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine.
Toutes les bas[ses]-tailles*

Et lux perpetuam lucem at eis, et lux perpetuam
Sans Lenteur
Haut[bois seul]

[doux]

Te de -

[Ba] (doux)

---

Hb

-cet hym-nus De - us,

te de - cet hym-nus De - us in

D

---

Hb

Si-on te de - cet hym-nus De - us.

Bb

---

168

-cet hym - nus, te de - cet hym - nus De - us in Si - on

D

---
et tibi redestur votum in Jerusalem.
ad te om-nis ca-ro ve-ni-et ex-au-di o-ra-tio-nem me-am

ca-ro, om-nis ca-ro ve-ni-et ex-au-di o-ra-tio-nem me-am

ad te om-nis ca-ro ve-ni-et ex-au-di o-ra-tio-nem me-am
DVn, Fl et Hb

HcVn

TVn

Cor 1

Cor 2

D

Hc

T

BT

B

Timb

Bn et Hs

Cb

[Violons et flûtes]

[...]
ca - ro, ad te om-nis ca - ro, om-nis ca - ro ve - ni - et.

ad te om-nis ca - ro, om-nis ca - ro, om-nis ca - ro ve - ni - et.

ad te om-nis ca - ro, om-nis ca - ro, om-nis ca - ro ve - ni - et.

ad te om-nis ca - ro, ad te om-nis ca - ro ve - ni - et.
301

Fl et Hb
Lent

DVn

HeVn

TVn

D
Mineur lent et doux

HC

Chris-te e-le-i-son.

T

Chris-te e-le-i-son.

BT


B

Timb

Bn

Bs

Cb

Très Lent
Doux, et des silences

A demie voix

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison,

doux

doux

doux

doux

doux

doux

doux

doux
un peu gai, marqué sans vitesse

Chœur

In memoriam aeterna erit justus,
in memoriam aeterna erit justitiam
non, non timebit.
In memoria, in memoria aeterna erit justitia.
ante faciem Dei. Quem ad rno dum desiderat

cervus, desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum

ta desiderat anima mea ad te Deus.

Exaudi Dominne
de- si-de-rat cer-vus, de-si-de-rat cer-vus ad fon-tes a-
qua-rum, i-ta de-si-de-rat an-ima me-a ad te De-
us.

On reprend le cheeur
In memoria &c.
[Graduel (a), bar 78]
rum de poenis inferni, et de profundo lacu.

Libera Domine, libera ammas fludemum de fine

to rum de poenis inferni, et de profun
Domine Jesu
fun do la cu, et de pro fundo lacu

Christe Rex, Rex glorieae, libera, libera, libera

Quatuor

[328]
Deus misereatur nobis, et exaudi nos, Deus nostro.
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De poënis inferni et de profun...
Ne absorbeat e as tartarus.

-o-nis, ne absorbeat e as tartarus.
Ne cadant in obscurum,
Léger Gracieux

Ne cantant in obscurum.
tet e - as, re - pre - sen - tet e - as in lu - eem,

re - pre - sen - tet e - as

re - pre - sen - tet e - as

in lu - eem sanct - am, sed si - gnif - er Sanctus Mi - cha - el re - pre -
in lu - eem sanct - am, sed si - gnif - er Sanctus Mi - cha - el re - pre -

Sed si - gnif - er Sanctus Mi - cha - el re - pre -

Sed si - gnif - er Sanctus Mi - cha - el re - pre - [tous]
Hemen aatu Domine luvis offerimus, tua suscit.

Hemen aput animabus ilis, quorum hoc die memoriam.

Hemen animus, fec, fac eas Domine, demorte trans.
Noble et gracieux

[Sanctus]

[Deux de violon, Flûtes et Hautbois]

[Hautes-contre de violon]

[Tailles de violon]

[Basses-tailles]

[Basses, Basses et Contrebasse]

Sanc -

tus, Sanc - tus, Sanc - tus Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth,
Pleini sunt coeli et terra gloria

[duo]
tua Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth.

pleni sunt coeli et terra.
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
glo - ri - a - tu - ra. Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel -
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in

Les B[asses]-T[ailles]*

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in
Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis.

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis.

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis.

Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na, Ho - san - na in ex - cel - sis.
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DVn 1
forte piano

DVn 2
forte piano

Fl
forte piano

Cor
forte piano

HcVn et TVn
forte piano

D
- tris, glo -

Bs
forte piano

358

DVn 1

DVn 2

Fl

Cor

HcVn et TVn

D

 Bs

Adagio
Virgo Dei Dei genitrix intercedo pro nobis.

intercede de pro

Da Capo
Qui tollis pectora mundi dona, dona eis
Requiem aeternam dona eis

Domine, dona eis

Domine, requiem

na, dona eis

Domine, dona eis re-
380

D  is Do  - mi - ne, re  - qui - em a e - ter - nam do - na

HC [très doux] Re  - qui - em a e - ter - nam

T a e - ter - nam do - na e - is,

BT - qui - em a e - ter - nam, do - na, do - na e -

B [tous] [très doux] Re  - qui - em a e - ter - nam do - na e - is, do - na

Br, Bs et Ch
Requiem aeternum do\-na\-e\-is Do\-mi\-ne.

Requiem aeternum do\-na\-e\-is Do\-mi\-ne.
lucat eis, communis tuis in aeternum, et lux per-
DVo, Fl

e et Hb

HeVn

t

TVn

D

-a luceat eis, eum sanctis tuis in ae-

HC

luceat, luceat eis, eum sanctis tuis in ae-

T

luceat, luceat eis, eum sanctis tuis in ae-

BT

tu a luceat eis, eum sanctis tuis in ae-

B

tu a luceat eis, eum sanctis tuis in ae-

Bn, Bs

et Ch
**Critical commentary**

Discrepancies with the primary source are shown in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Stave(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2-3</td>
<td>TVn</td>
<td>$d'$ in source and part erroneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3-4</td>
<td>Cor 1</td>
<td>Two crotchets in source and part emended to conform to HcVn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3-4</td>
<td>Cor 2</td>
<td>Two crotchets in source and part emended to conform to Bn, Bs et Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4-5</td>
<td>Timb</td>
<td>Crotchet in source and part emended to conform to Bn, Bs et Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Cor 2</td>
<td>$f$ in source and part emended to improve harmonic progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4-7</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb</td>
<td>Parts have $\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb DVn 2 part has $\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Timb</td>
<td>$c$ in source and part erroneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4-5</td>
<td>TVn</td>
<td>$bb$ in source and part erroneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>DVn, Fl et Hb</td>
<td>G’ in source, $a'$ in parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1-54.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Crossed out in D part but present in BT part, with tempo marking $\text{trés mesuré}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>Bs’ in source is lacking in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>Cor 1</td>
<td>Taken from part. Source has $a'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>Cor 2</td>
<td>$f'$ in source and part erroneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>DVn</td>
<td>Parts lack $\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Part, for Basse-taille, has $\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.1-2</td>
<td>DVn</td>
<td>Notes tied in DVn 2 part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introit continued

36  Cor 2  taken from part. Source has

36-37  D  part, for Basse-taille, has

39-40  D  part, for Basse-taille, has

39.3  HcVn  $f'$ in source, $g'$ in part

45.5  DVn, Fl et Hb  DVn 1 part has redundant *fort*

46.1  DVn, Fl et Hb  *doux* in DVn 1 part should be at 46.2

47.1-3  Cor 2  taken from part. Source has $g'$ and $f'$

47.2  HcVn  $d'$ in source and part erroneous

47.5  TVn  $f$ in source and part erroneous

52.5  Cor 1  $a'$ in source and part erroneous

53.1  Cor 2  $g'$ in source, $f'$ in part

53.2  Cor 1  $a'$ in source, $d''$ in part

53.4  DVn  parts lack +

54.2  All ex DVn  parts marked *vite*

58.3-4  Cb  two crotchets taken from part. Four quavers in source, as in Bn et Bs

61.2-69.1  DVn, Fl et Hb  source marked ‘flûtes’ but there are no rests in DVn and Hb parts

69.1  All except

69.2-93.4  DVn  taken from part, as D in source is marked ‘avec violons’

71.2-95.1  B  solo part written for BT

76.1-78.1  Bs  part lacks ties

86.1  D  part has +

88.1  D  dot lacking in part

88.2-3  DVn  parts have two quavers

91.2-3  DVn  parts have two quavers

95.1  D & B  minim in parts

103.2-7  D  D 1 and 2 parts have 2-5 and 6-7 beamed together with underlay set accordingly

104.2-7  D  as above

112.5-6  DVn, Fl et Hb  DVn parts lack slur and +

114.4  BT  part lacks +

117.4  Bn, Bs et Cb  each part lacks +

119.2-127.1  DVn, Fl et Hb  source marked ‘flûtes’ but there are no rests in DVn and Hb parts

125.1-126.1  DVn, Fl et Hb  notes tied in Fl and Hb parts
Introit continued

127.2-137.1 DVn, Fl et Hb source marked ‘Violons’ but there are no rests in Fl and Hb parts
B taken from part; source indicates sung only by BT

129.4 DVn, Fl et Hb DVn 1 part lacks ↙

129.5 DVn, Fl et Hb 2nd parts lack +

130.1 DVn, Fl et Hb Fl and Hb 1 part lacks +

143.1-145.1 DVn, Fl et Hb notes tied in Fl and Hb parts only
B part has 2-5 and 6-7 beamed together with underlay set accordingly

145.2-7 B as above

148.1 Cor 1 part lacks +

148.1 Bn et Bs each part has ☞c

149.1 DVn DVn 1 part has fermata and is marked fin
DVn & Bs DVn 2 and Bs parts marked fin
D, HC, T & B part have fermata and, except for second copy of HC (H. 494 A. o i), are marked fin

156.1 D part has ↙

159.2 D part has ↙

164.3 D part has ↙

164.4 Hb Hb 1 part has ☞, Hb 2 part has +

166.1-6 Bs part lacks slurs

175.3-185.1 Bn C4 clef in source, and in part from 181.2

175.3 Cor 2 f in source, c’ in part

176.2 Cor 2 g’ in source, f’ in part

176.3 Bn part lacks appoggiatura

180.2 Cor 2 ♩f’ in source, ♩g’ in part

180.3 Cor 2 g’ in source, f’ in part

181.2-185.1 Bn see 175.3-185.1 above

189.1 BT no appoggiatura in part

190.1 BT part has dot to indicate ♩f tied from previous bar followed by coulé e and ♩d

191.1 BT part lacks slur from previous bar

191.1-3 TVn source has crotchet and two quavers

193.1 BT part has ↙

194-195 Cors 1 & 2 taken from parts: source has both parts on one stave before and after this point, but these bars show only Cor 1 with downward stems

198.2 Cor 2 coulé lacking in part

201.2 Cor 2 appoggiatura deleted in part

205.1 BT as 190.1 above, although here part lacks dot

204.1 DVn DVn 1 part lacks +

206.1 Cor 1 part has rest

207.1 Cor 2 part has rest

214.1 BT & B parts have ↙ but lack slurs from previous bar
Introit continued

216.2  Bn  Bn 1 part lacks appoggiatura
217.1  DVn  source has f'' written on stave in error
229.1  Bn  source lacks upward stem
231.1-2  BT  d' in source and part erroneous
232  D  parts for D 1 & 2 have f'' twice
233.3  T  c' in source erroneous
234.1-4  D  parts for D 1 & 2 lack appoggiatura and have f''
234.1-3  HC, T, BT & B  parts have f''
238.4  DVn, Fl et Hb  DVn parts lack +
241.1-4  Cor 1  c' in source, c'' in part
242.3-5  D  parts for D 1 & 2 have appoggiatura e'' with slur and + to d'' and e''
HC & B  parts have f''
BT  part has f' c' with slur and + to b2 and c'
242.4-5  T  part has quavers
245.1-3  D 1 & 2  part has g' and g' and lacks +
HC, T, BT & B  parts have g''
251.3-5  D  parts for D 1 & 2 have g'' with slur and + to f#'' and g''
251.3-4  T  part has b with slur and + to a and g
255.1  DVn, Fl et Hb  DVn parts lack +
261.1  Cor 1  b' in source, c'' in part
263.4  T  part lacks +
264  All  time signature in parts is C
264.1  Voices  All parts have o and B also has a fermata
269.1-281.1  D  part written one octave below source for Basse-taille
270.5  Bs  Bb' in source is lacking in part
273.4  Cor 1  a' in source, f' in part
274-275  D  part, for Basse-taille, has e is Domine.
274.1  Cor 2  f' in source and part erroneous
274.3-5  Bs  part lacks appoggiatura and +, and has g and f
279.3  TVn  a in source erroneous
280-281  D  part, for Basse-taille, has e is Domine.
**Kyrie**

11.3  BT  erroneous $a$ in part
14.3  B  parts lack +
14.4  BT  $g$ in source and part erroneous
15.1  HC  parts lack +
16.3  BT  erroneous $a$ in part
19.3  BT  $g$ in source and part erroneous
20.3-21.1 BT  part has $g$ and $f$ respectively
28.2-3 Cor 2  erroneous $f'$ in part
35.1-36.1 DVn  taken from part, as lacking in source
35.2  TVn  $e'$ in source and part erroneous
46.1-50.1 DVn  score lacks upward stems but in parts DVn 1 and DVn 2 play in unison
46.1-53.2 DVn  DVn 3 lacks a performing part
50.2-53.2 Bn  C4 clef in source and part
53.3  Fl et Hb  source lacks §
58.1  All parts  fermata in source does not appear in any part
61.1  HC  parts lack +
62.3  HC  parts lack "
64.2-68.1 Fl et Hb  in parts Fl et Hb rest and
64.2-68.1 DVn  DVn 1 plays what is written for Fl et Hb in source
66.3-4 DVn  DVn 1 part has ♩ ♩
66.2-3 DVn, HcVn & TVn  DVn 2 and other parts have ♩ ♩
73-76  Bn  C4 clef in source
73.2-77.1 DVn, Fl et Hb  in parts DVn 1 and Hb also play what is written for Fl in source

**Graduel [a]**

1-140  HcVn  C1 clef in source, C3 in part
        Cb  taken from part as source lacks any indication of instrument’s involvement
1-78.1 TVn  C2 clef in source, C3 in part
3.1  HcVn, TVn  two crotchets in part
6.1  DVn et Fl  DVn 2 part has +; Fl 1 part lacks "
7.1-2 DVn et Fl  Fl 1 part has ♩ ♩ $b'$ and ♩ $a'$
8.1  HcVn  part lacks +
9.2  DVn et Fl  DVn 1 part lacks §
10.5  DVn et Fl  DVn 1 part has +
14.1-19.1 DVn et Fl  source marked ‘flûtes’ but in parts Fl 1 & 2 play 1st and DVn 1 & 2 play 2nd
15.5  DVn et Fl  erroneous $g'$ in DVn 2 part
20.2  DVn et Fl  DVn 2 part lacks ♩
28.2  Bs  part marked p°. [piano]
**Graduel [a] continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>Bs' in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>HeVn</td>
<td>erroneous ♭ in source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>DVn</td>
<td>erroneous d’ in DVn 2 part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-43</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>source has 🌀 is Do-mi-ne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>DVn</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>HeVn</td>
<td>part lacks #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1-2</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>part has ♬ g and ♬ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>part has 🌀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>DVn et Fl</td>
<td>erroneous f’’’ in DVn 1 part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.1 &amp; 66.1</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>♭ lacking in source but shown in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Segno mark is editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2-140.1</td>
<td>DVn et Fl</td>
<td>DVn 1 part has additional eb’’’ in key signature and natural signs to cancel this when required (except in the case of 105.3 below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TVn</td>
<td>C1 clef in source, C3 in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>D, HC, T &amp; BT</td>
<td>parts lack marking marque sans vitesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>parts lack tempo markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>DVn et Fl</td>
<td>Fl 2 is only part with +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bn, Bs et Cb</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>HC &amp; T</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>DVn et Fl, D</td>
<td>parts lack 🌀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>DVn et Fl</td>
<td>DVn 1 part lacks ♯ to cancel eb’’’ in key signature (see 78.2-140.1 above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.2-113.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>taken from part; source indicates sung only by BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>DVn et Fl</td>
<td>Fl 1 &amp; 2 parts have 🌀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bn, Bs et Cb</td>
<td>parts lack +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2-3</td>
<td>DVn et Fl</td>
<td>Fl 1 &amp; 2 parts have ♤ ♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduel [b]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-end</td>
<td>DVn 1 et Fl</td>
<td>Fl parts marked tacet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>DVn 1</td>
<td>♬ in source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>DVn 1</td>
<td>part lacks +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduel [b] continued

26.3 DVn 2 part lacks  
32.1 DVn 1 part lacks +  
33.2-3 DVn 1 emended from \( g' \) and \( a' \) to conform to part and rhythm in other parts  
41.1 HC source and part have \( e\flat \) but context requires \( e\natural \), which is in both Rameau’s original aria and the 1754 revision  
50.5 DVn 1 part lacks +  
51.5 Bs part lacks +  
59.1 DVn 1 part lacks +  
61.3 DVn 1 part lacks +  
63.2-3 DVn 1 \( \flat \) and \( \natural \) in part  
79-91 All not in source, which has Segno marks at bars 78 and 23 and ‘fin’ at bar 34; repeat written out in full to improve clarity. Instruction ‘On reprend…’ appears after bar 78 in source

Offertoire

2.2 DVn, Fl et Hb parts, with the exception of Fl and Hb 2, lack +  
11.1 BT part has \( \flat\flat \)  
18.2 DVn parts lack +  
25.2 TVn erroneous \( g \) in source and part emended to conform to H  
29.3 BT part has \( \flat\flat \)  
46.2 DVn DVn 2 part lacks +  
48.4 T part has \( \flat e' \)  
53.2 HC part has \( \flat\flat \)  
56.2-3 BT part has \( \flat\flat \)  
57.1 TVn erroneous \( bb \) in source and part emended to conform to H  
57.1 D part lacks +  
57.2 TVn erroneous \( bb \) in source and part emended to conform to H  
64.2 TVn part lacks +  
70.2-71.1 DVn, Fl et Hb, HC\( \flat \flat \) parts lack tie  
73.1-2 DVn, Fl et Hb parts lack slur  
73.2 HC\( \flat \flat \) parts lack +  
80.3 BT part lacks \( \flat \)  
81.2-84.1 Fl source marked ‘Viol.’ but music is only written in flute part  
84.2-3 TVn part has \( \flat\flat \)  
86.2 DVn, Fl et Hb parts have \( \flat d' \) and \( \flat e b' \)  
95.3 HC source lacks \( \flat e b' \) in solo stave  
Bn, Bs et Cb Cb part has \( \flat \)  
96.1 D solo part lacks fort
Offertoire continued

98.1-99.1 D $\downarrow a$, $\downarrow g'$ and $\downarrow f'$ in source erroneous
99.1 BT source has $\downarrow$.
104.1 DVn, Fl et Hb $+$ in DVn parts only
110.1 DVn, Fl et Hb, HcVn, D parts lack $+$
111.3 HC emended to $\downarrow g'$ to comply with HcVn; source has $\downarrow g'$ and $\downarrow f\#'$, probably intended to be quavers but lacking beam, and parts have erroneous $\downarrow f\#'$
112.2 HC parts lack appoggiatura
117.1 HC parts lack $\downarrow$
122.2 D parts marked $a3$
122.2-128.1 Bs C3 clef in source and part
126 DVn, Fl et Hb Fl and Hb 1 part lacks this bar
127.2 DVn, Fl et Hb & D 1st parts lack $+$
134.1 D 1st part marked $tous$
136.3 TVn erroneous $f'$ in source and part emended to conform to H
139.2 DVn, Fl et Hb parts have $\downarrow e''$ and $\downarrow d''$
139.2 T parts lack $+$
140.1 Bn, Bs et Cb parts have $D$
140.2 D 1st part marked $a3$
140.2 HC parts marked $p. chr.$
140.2-153.1 Bs C3 clef in source and part
145.2-5 DVn, Fl et Hb 1st parts have $\uparrow$
& D but DVn 1 & D1 lack $\nearrow$
2nd parts have $\downarrow$
but D 2 & Fl and Hb 2 lack $+$
146.1 DVn, Fl et Hb only DVn 2 part has $+$
147.1 TVn $a$ in source
149.3 D D 2 part and source have $d''$
153.2 D & HC parts marked $tous$
154.1-3 T $d'$ in source and parts erroneous
155.2 DVn, Fl et Hb Fl and Hb 1 part has $+$
157.2 T parts lack $\downarrow$
160.1 DVn, Fl et Hb $g'''$ in Fl and Hb 2 part erroneous
161.2 HC parts lack $+$
161.2-162.1 BT taken from part; source has $\downarrow c'$ and $\downarrow b\flat$
Offertoire continued

162.4 DVn, Fl et Hb $e''$ in parts erroneous
166.1-2 DVn, Fl et Hb Fl and Hb 2 part has $\frac{1}{2}$
168.1 Cb part lacks $+$
171.2 Bn, Bs et Cb $b$ in parts erroneous

B

174.1 D parts lack appoggiatura
175 DVn, Fl et Hb 1st parts have $\frac{1}{2}$; DVn 2 part has $0$
182.2 HcVn part lacks $+$
184.1 T part lacks $+$
185.3-4 T part has two crotchets
186.5 T part lacks $b$
191.2 T part lacks $\bowtie$

196.1 HcVn $eb'$ in source erroneous
203.4 DVn parts lack $+$
207.1 T part lacks $b$
210.3 DVn parts lack $+$
212.1-220.1 B taken from parts; tacet in source
224.2 T erroneous $d'$ in source and parts emended to conform to H

227.1-2 DVn, Fl et Hb DVn 1 part has $\frac{1}{2} d''$ and $\frac{1}{2} eb''$
228.2 T parts lack $+$
229.2-239.1 B taken from parts; source indicates sung only by BT
233.1-2 Cb part has $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$
251.1 DVn, Fl et Hb & D parts lack appoggiatura
251.4 BT part lacks $+$
252.1 All parts, with the exception of D2, T and Cb, have $\frac{1}{2}$.

Sanctus

5.2-3 DVn, Fl et Hb DVn 2 part has $\frac{1}{2} g'$ and $\frac{1}{2} a'$
12.3-5 BT part has $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ with slur
18.2-3 BT part lacks slur
18.4-5 BT part lacks slur
19.2 BT part lacks $#$
20.1-2 BT part has $\frac{1}{2} d'$ and $\frac{1}{2} c\#$
21.1 HcVn $b'$ in part erroneous
43.1 BT BT 2 part lacks $+$
46.1 BT appoggiatura $b$ in BT 2 part erroneous
48.3 All Segno mark is editorial
48.3-70.2 D parts have ‘Osanna’ in underlay
50.1 HcVn part lacks $#$
51.2-3 D taken from parts to conform to DVn, Fl and Hb; source has $\frac{1}{2} d^\#$’ with $+$ at 51.2
Sanctus continued

52.2-56.1 B taken from part; source indicates sung only by BT
56.2-70.2 B copy of part (H. 494 A. r) has ‘Osanna’ in underlay
59.2 T part lacks +
60.2 D parts marked a 3, perhaps indicating a trio with HC and T, who sing in unison to 65.1
HC first copy of part marked P[etit] ch[œu]r, second copy marked P.C. (see also 65.2 below)
60.2-65.1 DVn, Fl et Hb Fl and Hb 1 part is the same as those for DVn 2 and Fl and Hb 2
   Bs C3 clef in source and part
64.1 DVn, Fl et Hb DVn 2 and D2 emended to b’ to conform to D 2 part and & D each other; source and parts for DVn 2, Fl and Hb, and source for D 2, have a’
65.2 HC both copies of part marked tous (see also 60.2 above)
65.2-72.1 Bn, Bs et Cb source has two staves in bass clef with only one difference; the upper stave has d at 71.2 which is lacking in parts
66.3 T c’s in part erroneous
70.3 HC first copy of part (H. 494 A. o) has erroneous a’
71.3 DVn, Fl et Hb parts have \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \) and \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \) with +
   D parts have \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \) and \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \) with +

Elévation

1 DVn 1 part has \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \) time signature
1.1 Fl parts lack piano
6.1 Fl parts lack forte
9.1 DVn 2 part has redundant forte
13.1 Fl parts lack piano
15.1 Fl parts lack forte
16.1 Fl parts lack piano
17.1 DVn 1 source lacks dot
   Fl parts lack forte
18.1 Fl parts lack piano
19.1 Fl parts lack forte
20.1 Fl parts lack piano
25.1 Cor Cor 2 part has f’
28.1 HeVn et TVn source and parts have erroneous g’; emended to conform to Alberti aria
30.1 DVn 1 part lacks forte
30.4 HeVn et TVn parts have c’
30.4 D part has erroneous \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \).
33.4 DVn 1 part lacks z
34.1 Cor Cor 2 part has \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \) and \( \text{\textcopyright\text{\textcopyright}} \)
36.1 Cor emended to f’ to conform to parts as e♭’ in source erroneous
Elévation continued

40.1  DVn 2, HcVn
      TVn, Fl & Cor parts lack forte
41.1  DVn 2, HcVn
      TVn, Fl & Cor parts lack piano
44.1-2  HeVn & TVn  minim in source; quaver beams taken from parts
46.1  DVn 1, HcVn
      TVn, Fl, Cor
      & Bs parts lack forte
51.1  HeVn, TVn
      Fl, Cor & Bs parts lack piano
53.1-2  D rhythm in part is ♩ ♩
55.3  DVn 2 & Bs parts lack forte
56.1  DVn 2 & Bs parts lack piano
57.3  DVn 2 & Bs parts lack forte
58.1  DVn 2 & Bs parts lack piano
65.2  HeVn et TVn source and parts have erroneous c’; emended to conform to Alberti aria
67.1  Fl erroneous ∨’’ in source for Fl 1 emended to conform to part and DVn 1
      DVn 1, HcVn
      TVn, Fl, Cor
      & Bs parts lack forte
69.1  HeVn, TVn
      Fl & Bs parts lack piano
      Fl Fl 1 emended to g’’ as f’’ in source and part erroneous
71.1  HeVn, TVn
      Fl, Cor 2 & Bs parts lack forte
72.1  HeVn, TVn
      Fl, Cor 2 & Bs parts lack piano
75.2  D as ’’ in source emended to comply with part, DVn 1 and Fl 1
77.1  Cor parts lack forte, Cor 2 c’ in score erroneous
77.2  DVn, HcVn
      TVn, Fl & Bs parts lack forte
78  D ossia shows what is written in singer’s part
79.1  DVn 2, HcVn
      TVn, Fl, Cor
      & Bs parts lack piano
81.1  Fl parts lack forte
82.1  Fl parts lack piano
83.1  Fl parts lack forte
84.1  Fl parts lack piano
85.1  DVn 1 part lacks mezzo forte
      HeVn, TVn
      & Fl parts lack cresc
Elévation continued

88.1  DVn 2, HcVn  
      TVn, Fl & Bs  parts lack _forte_

92.1  HcVn, TVn  
      & Fl        parts lack _piano_

94.1  HcVn, TVn  
      & Fl        parts lack _forte_

95.1  HcVn, TVn  
      & Fl        parts lack _piano_

96.1  HcVn, TVn  
      & Fl        parts lack _forte_

99-121 All deleted in parts

99-120.1 HcVn et TVn source marked _Col B[ass]o._; part in C3 clef one octave higher than Bs

102.1-5 D  part has 

105.2  DVn 1  part lacks +

119.1  DVn 2, HcVn  
      TVn & Bs parts lack _forte_

120-21 D  _ossia_ shows what is written in singer’s part

Benedictus

1-end  DVn 1  taken from part as HC in score is marked ‘avec P’ viol’

     DVn 2  taken from part as T in score is marked ‘avec S’ viol’

33.1  All  _Segno_ mark is editorial

Agnus Dei

1.4  TVn  erroneous _b_ in source and part; emended to conform to H

5.3-4  HcVn  erroneous _d’_ and _e’_ in source and part; emended to conform to H

12.1  DVn, Fl et Hb  Fl and Hb parts have _g’_

13.3  DVn  in parts _doux_ at 12.3, but moved to conform to other parts

67.1  Bn, Bs et Cb  Cb part has _/._

69.2  DVn Fl et Hb  tous marked only in Fl and Hb 1 part

70.1  TVn, Hc, B,  
      Bn, Bs et Cb  _lacking_ in source but shown in TVn and HC parts

83.1-3 DVn et Fl  DVn 2 part is third lower than source
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communion</th>
<th>TVn</th>
<th>taken from part, as lacking in source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.1-91.1</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>erroneous e’ in source and part emended to conform to H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>C3 clef in source and part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-97</td>
<td>TVn</td>
<td>plays in unison with HcVn but source lacks downward stems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.1-97.1</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>erroneous f in source and part emended to conform to H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>source has ( \overrightarrow{\downarrow} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>e( \overrightarrow{\downarrow} ) in source erroneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>